

unanimously:

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the following contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications:

	Name of Vendor(s)	Dollar Value of Contracts
47-85	Industrial Arts Graphic Arts Supplies	
	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	\$ 3,181
	John H. Burke & Co., Inc.	4,135
	Chaselle, Inc.	101
	A. B. Dick	612
	Meeks Printing Supplies	6,892
	Multigraphics	3,216
	Patton Printing Supplies, Inc.	12,130
	Polychrome Corp.	335
	T. G. Roberts, Inc.	6,994
	Vari-Comp Systems, Inc.	792
	TOTAL	\$ 38,388
55-85	Office and School Supplies	
	Alperstein Bros., Inc.	\$ 14,238
	Antietam Paper Company	49,353
	Baltimore Envelope	12,554
	Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Company	21,759
	Boise Cascade	5,861
	Chaselle, Inc.	100,144
	Earth Sciences Research Co., Inc.	4,751
	M. S. Ginn Company	101,486
	Globe Office Supply Company, Inc.	717
	Interstate Office Supplies	29,398
	Kurtz Bros., Inc.	5,466
	John G. Kyles, Inc.	3,138
	Office Boy	4,290
	The Paper People	144
	Pyramid Paper Company, Inc.	964
	Shady Grove Office Supply & Equipment	653
	Westvaco/US Envelope	3,528
	TOTAL	\$358,444
56-85	Electrical Supplies and Equipment	
	Empire Electronic Supply Co.	\$ 5,229
	General Electric Supply Co.	8,760
	Interstate Electric Supply Co., Inc.	43,142
	Maurice Electrical Supply	7,931
	C. N. Robinson	14,401
	Tricounty Electrical Supply Co., Inc.	14,064
	TOTAL	\$ 93,527
57-85	Telecommunications Control Unit (TCU)	

	IBM Corporation	\$ 25,665
	(Annual Cost)	
58-85	Industrial Arts Hand Tools	
	Allegheny Educational Supply, Inc.	\$ 10,649
	Brodhead-Garrett Co.	4,932
	Fries, Beall & Sharp Co., Inc.	4,739
	Rockovich Power Tool Serv., Inc.	281
	Seldon Enterprises	1,181
	Thompson & Cooke, Inc.	28,720
	TOTAL	\$ 50,502
61-85	Door Closers and Exit Devices	
	Contract Hardware Sales	\$ 122
	M. D. Kramer	4,675
	Safemasters	385
	Southern Lock & Supply Co.	5,610
	Taylor Security and Lock Co.	38,923
	TOTAL	\$ 49,715
65-85	Industrial Arts Lumber	
	Allied Plywood Corporation	\$ 5,605
	Mann & Parker Lumber Company	52,648
	NELCO	5,970
	TOTAL	\$ 64,223
69-85	Cafeteria Disposable Supplies	
	Acme Paper & Supply Company	\$ 22,511
	Kahn Paper Company	16,755
	Monumental Paper Company	15,608
	VSA/Mid Atlantic, Inc.	44
	TOTAL	\$ 54,918
	GRAND TOTAL	\$735,382

Resolution No. 89-85 Re: Engineer Appointment - Facility
Wiring for Cable TV

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint an engineer to provide required design services and administration of construction contracts for facility wiring for TV in all schools; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the Architect/Engineer Selection Procedures approved by the Board of Education in November, 1975; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with the firm of Von Otto and Bilecky, Professional Corporation to provide required design services and administration

of construction contracts for facility wiring for cable TV at all Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Council be informed of this appointment.

Resolution No. 90-85 Re: Amendment to Architect's Contract
Gaithersburg High School (Area 3)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, On May 21, 1984, the Board of Education approved an architectural contract for Thomas Clark and Associates (TCA) to provide required design services and administration of the construction contract for an addition at Gaithersburg High School; and

WHEREAS, Alterations to the existing building are required to create additional science, typing, and foreign language classrooms; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Thomas Clark and Associates, has submitted a fee proposal of \$29,500 to provide design services and to administer the construction contract for the alterations; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the contract for Thomas Clark and Associates, dated May 22, 1984, be increased by \$29,500 to recognize additional architectural services for alterations to the existing Gaithersburg High School facility.

Resolution No. 91-85 Re: Utilization of FY 1985 Future
Supported Project Funds for Staff
Development in Holistic Grading

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend a \$2,500 grant award in the following categories, within the FY 1985 Provision for Future Supported Projects, from MSDE for teacher training in holistic grading used for assessing the Maryland Functional Writing Test:

Category	Amount
01 Administration	\$2,286
10 Fixed Charges	214
TOTAL	\$2,500

and be it further

Science Magnet Program at
Montgomery Blair High School

Dr. Cody explained that staff were there to answer questions. Dr. Paul Vance, associate superintendent, introduced Dr. Michael Haney and Mr. Phillip Gainous, principal of Blair.

Dr. Cheryl Wilhoyte, director of magnet programs, stated that the magnet program was designed to be a unique opportunity for talented students at the high school level. While students would be participating in a very rigorous study of the disciplines, their education would be enhanced by interdisciplinary connections. Students in Grades 9 and 10 would have a four block period which was designed so that the magnet team could assure concept development and application to real life problems. Students might be in a mathematics class for two periods and apply math concepts in a physics class for two periods. The next day they might use the computer to analyze their data. The other four periods of the day they would be in the comprehensive high school at Blair earning credits in English, social studies, language, fine arts, and electives. The highly qualified faculty and special equipment in the renovated C building would offer a unique combination of sophisticated science equipment linked to computers both within laboratories and the classroom. During their junior and senior year students would participate in cooperative efforts and experiences with scientists and researchers in local labs of government and private industry. She explained that this program differed from other high school programs because of the inverted science curriculum which began with physics in Grade 9 and completed chemistry by Grade 9, biology and earth science in Grade 10. Students would have approximately seven periods a week of science as opposed to the normal five periods. The grade level faculty teams would develop interdisciplinary connections. Probability and statistics would be introduced at an earlier time so that students could use these skills to do research. A seminar would be dedicated to equipping each student with increasingly sophisticated research skills, and every senior would be required to complete a senior project. Students completing the high school curriculum before their junior year would have an opportunity to maintain part of their day in a high school setting with appropriate individualization.

Dr. Cronin said that one of the concerns was that this would develop a school within a school, and he asked about the way they planned to integrate the magnet students and teachers into the comprehensive program. He noted that there seemed to be teachers from Blair working with teachers in the school system, and he asked how they saw this as a benefit for the entire school system. Mr. Gainous reported that the magnet team and resource teachers from social studies, English, and foreign languages had just completed a two-day seminar where they worked together to develop the interdisciplinary approach. Some of the planning involved helping those departments understand the kind of students they would have. They also developed plans on how the magnet staff would bridge the gap between

the regular program and the magnet program. Dr. Haney added that the magnet program students would spend four hours in separate rooms with special teachers; however, during the other half of the day, the students would not travel together. There were students who would be in all levels of English. They wanted these students to be integrated with the rest of the school as much as possible. They also wanted some interdisciplinary connection between the magnet courses and the non-magnet courses. For example, in the junior and senior year they might open courses in technology and the law and technical writing which would be open to all students in Blair. These courses could not be offered at Blair without the magnet students. While the magnet program teachers were hired to teach in the magnet, they were also members of their own departments. They wanted these teachers to feel that they were a part of the Blair staff. He reported that there was already some indication of spillovers from the magnet to other programs in MCPS.

Dr. Wilhoite stated that at Takoma Park Junior High School they held a future conference involving all students at Takoma Park, students from the home schools of magnet students, and 200 students from across the county. She explained that each Blair staff member had two other MCPS staff members as a part of their discipline team to provide them feedback about curriculum and training.

Mr. Ewing said that he was impressed with the design of the program. He had a concern that they made sure the resources put into the program were put there as a consequence of a conscious decision to allocate the resources for that purpose and did not cost the rest of the program at Blair but enriched it. Dr. Pitt replied that in the same services budget at Blair they had maintained the funding put in there by the Board and County Council a couple of years ago. Mr. Ewing thought the magnet was a very exciting program, and he was aware of a very substantial amount of community participation. He felt that the mechanisms for continuing the community involvement were very important. He suggested they think of ways to involve the whole community including the parents of the students in the magnet program because they probably would live some distance away. Dr. Wilhoite replied that they would continue to be sensitive to that. Dr. Vancefelt that they had made some significant progress in involving the community. He cited the leadership of Kay Meek, Janice Taylor, and Michael Richman. Dr. Floyd requested more information on the interdisciplinary connection.

Dr. Haney replied that the magnet was organized around a team concept. Interdisciplinary connections were a must because they might overburden the students. For example, they had asked that probability and statistics be taught early in the seminar course because it supported both mathematics and physics. In the physics lab, the students would collect data, analyze the data using statistical techniques, and do the statistical analysis in the computer class which meant reinforcement in three different classes. They were looking for common areas they could teach once and use in other classes. Dr. Cody explained that typically science

was taught in the organization of chemistry, biology, and physics and yet new developments in science cut across the disciplines. They would have a bridge among the science fields themselves.

* Miss Duby joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that they were dealing with people who were real and 14 years old, and he wondered how they were taking care of the pressures on them and their needs to also play. Mr. Gainous replied that they were concerned about that and in their school visits every one of the principals raised that question. He had explained the condensing of the assignments so that they could give quality rather than quantity because they did not want to burn these students out. They also educated the other departments in the school as to what to expect from these students. For example, a child might be gifted in math and science but not necessarily in English. They were trying to build in some support to give students some relief from pressures. Dr. Cronin asked whether there was a problem with fear of failure and putting students back into the regular school environment by changing the sequences of some courses. Dr. Haney replied that they were careful in selecting teachers who were competent in their subject field as well as being nurturers. If a child were having trouble, the teacher would work with that child to help them adjust. However, if a student did have to leave midyear there would be a serious difference between the magnet science courses and the program in the home school.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked about "an excursion topic in math." Miss Joy Odom, mathematics supervisor, replied that they had the math program up through three years, and they knew that the junior and senior year would have various topics. For lack of a better word, they used "excursion through mathematics." Mrs. DiFonzo inquired about media resources for research projects or whether they were going to develop a partnership with business and universities. Dr. Wilhoite replied that Blair did have an excellent science and math collection currently. They were making some additions, but rather than going the hard cover route, they would have access to data bases. They hoped to have a media center with a media specialist well trained in telecommunications.

Mr. Ewing thought that the interdisciplinary connections were one of the most exciting things about the program. He said that this concept had application to the rest of their school program. He believed they needed to capture that knowledge and transfer this. Dr. Wilhoite agreed that the program would be a lighthouse for the future of instruction, and they planned to do this.

Mrs. DiFonzo said she would be interested in their following up in a few years on students who had high capabilities but were not achieving. She would be interested in learning how accurate the professional judgment was in admitting these students to the program. Dr. Wilhoite replied that this could be built into the evaluation of the program.

Re: Recommended Policy Revision:
Designated Clusters and Impacted
Schools Policy

Dr. Wilhoite reported that parents had indicated that as they made decisions about private schools and day-care they needed to make these decisions earlier. Parents had asked to be able to respond to magnet programs sooner so that youngsters who were considering something other than public schools would know which public school they would have access to if they transferred.

Dr. Cronin asked whether in certain programs there was testing that needed to be done and whether this recommendation accommodated that. Dr. Wilhoite replied that it did. Dr. Cronin said they had to be a little more specific about late transfers and be more firm with the final date. Dr. Cody explained that in the case of magnet schools they were trying to persuade people to go there, and if making decisions earlier would increase the number of students going there they were in favor of this change.

Mr. Ewing said it was his understanding that this was limited to the designated clusters and impacted schools. He liked the provision on page 2 of the cover memo which talked about holding transfer requests which negatively impacted racial balance to see if they could find a way to grant them. He knew that they had done this informally, but this communicated it to those who were applying. He thought that this improved fairness and would probably reduce appeals.

Mrs. Slye thought that the revised time format was a good idea. However, she wanted to know why the lottery system was chosen as opposed to time of application. Dr. Cody replied that it was better than the other alternatives. In some programs with special needs, they could decide on the basis of which child needed the program most on an academic basis. In this case they were talking about the purposes of enhancing the racial balance of a school. They had students who would equally satisfy that goal; therefore, how did they decide. He had reservations about lotteries in other instances, but in this case no one was being denied an education. It seemed to Mrs. Slye that in those programs viewed as most sought after the lottery might be viewed as somewhat arbitrary.

Dr. Cronin asked whether the various affected schools had been informed of this proposed change. Dr. Wilhoite replied that communities were aware of this and supported the change. Dr. Pitt added that it had not been distributed throughout the system, and Dr. Cronin asked that this be distributed officially to the PTA.

Mr. Ewing noted that racial balance was not repeated as an element of the policy. Dr. Cody replied that the process had never been a formal policy of the Board of Education. Mr. Ewing asked whether they should not consider including this.

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is committed to strengthening magnet school programs to achieve the goals of quality integrated education; and

WHEREAS, The magnet program at East Silver Spring can offer a more distinct program to attract voluntary transfers and provide a primary program emphasis congruent with its intermediate school (Piney Branch) with the addition of Math and Science to its current magnet program designation of Continuous Progress; and

WHEREAS, The magnet program at Highland View can offer a more distinct program to attract voluntary transfers and better serve its home school population with the Academy Program; and

WHEREAS, The modified Spanish immersion program at Oak View has enrolled a significant number of students in its pilot phase and will best serve students beginning in kindergarten through grade six; now therefore be it

Resolved, That:

1. East Silver Spring's magnet program designation become Continuous Progress/Math/Science for grades K-3;
2. Highland View's magnet program designation become the Academy Program for grades K-6; and
3. Oak View's language immersion magnet include both modified Spanish immersion and French immersion for grades K-6.

Re: Monthly Financial Report

Mr. Ewing asked whether they would have to take formal action to deal with the projected deficit. Dr. Pitt explained that it was their best guess that they would be okay because of the favorable situation in transportation and Category 8, and at present they did not feel any stringent action was necessary. He hoped the Category 10 deficit would not increase further.

Dr. Cronin asked about the \$50,000 deficit in legal fees. Dr. Shaffner explained that Boards had consistently underbudgeted for legal fees. On March 12, staff would have a report on legal services. He said that they would be overexpended this year by several hundred thousand dollars. The level for legal services remained about \$400,000 a year, and most of that was for legal services for defense. Very little litigation was instituted by the Board.

Re: Board Member Comments

1. Mrs. DiFonzo stated that she had attended a meeting at Parkland where the community was rewarding the staff for the outstanding job they had done in preparing students to take the Maryland Functional Tests. In regard to the math test, pretest indicators gave them the expectation that 4.1 percent of the minority students would pass the test. Through efforts on the part of the staff, 100 percent of the minority students passed the test. She was told that these students had been tested on the second day of school in the seventh grade, and the feeling was that these students were not prepared because of what was not being done at the elementary level. She suggested that they take a look at the elementary math curriculum and see whether teachers were adequately prepared to teach math. Dr. Cody commented that he would agree, but he pointed out that these were ninth grade students who had been at the school for several years. He reported that there was a review of the math curriculum which was due in the spring. Mrs. DiFonzo said the staff had talked about the tremendous amount of work they had to do in remediation just to bring the students up to where they should be at the seventh grade level. In order to do this they had dropped efforts in higher order intellectual skills. Dr. Cody explained that one of the reasons for the success of the school system in the reading area was because over the years the responsibility for dealing with the Maryland Functional Reading Test was taken on by everyone so that students finishing the elementary schools did better. They were at the point where over 95 percent of the students passed that test the first time.

2. Mr. Ewing said he wanted to make a comment that a week or so ago he thought did not have to be made. It had to do with the comments that Mr. Rovner had made with regard to the plans of the school system for an additional high school up-county. He had been prepared to ignore the initial remarks, but on subsequent inquiry Mr. Rovner had reinforced his original remarks. The initial remark was that people in Montgomery Village were engaged in an effort to build a preppy all-white high school there. His second remark was to say that was what he meant to say, and he followed up by saying that if he were black and lived in Rockville he would wonder about building another high school up-county while his own school was going down the drain. Mr. Ewing did not know where Mr. Rovner got his information about the intent of the Board or the intent of that community. It was an uninformed comment, plus it inferred motives to people with whom he had not talked. He was imputing to the Montgomery Village people that somehow or other they were unwilling to go to school with blacks. He had implicated the Board of Education in that kind of motivation as well. What he did not remember was that the Board talked very long when it was making the decision about whether or not to build that high school and where to put it about the social and racial balance issue related to its location and its feeder area. The Board was careful to say that it intended that that school should not be a school which was in any way limited to a certain racial, social, or economic group of just one kind. For this reason they did not set boundaries for the school. He had yet to hear anyone from Montgomery Village say that they did not want anyone but white children to go to that school. He thought that Mr. Rovner's second remark was destructive because

it ran the risk of setting races and neighborhoods against one another in totally unacceptable ways. He thought this was an irresponsible appeal to racist feeling and a destructive comment on the decision-making process. He had the right to disagree with the Board on the necessity for another high school, but Mr. Ewing believed this was a totally unacceptable way to go about that. Mr. Ewing said these remarks could have been ignored except the county executive had said the whole controversy was silly and Daryl Shaw defended Mr. Rovner. Mr. Ewing was shocked with Dr. Shaw's remarks. He felt that Mr. Rovner had made a serious error, the county executive failed to recognize how important an error it was, and that Dr. Shaw had made a serious error in defending him. Mr. Ewing believed that if Mr. Rovner could not change his views he should keep his mouth shut.

Resolution No. 103-85 Re: Executive Session - February 25,
1985

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Article 76A, Section 11(a) of the Annotated Code of Maryland to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on February 25, 1985, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals, to consult with legal counsel, and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement protecting particular proceedings or matters from public disclosure as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

Resolution No. 104-85 Re: Minutes of November 26, 1984

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of November 26, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 105-85 Re: Minutes of December 12, 1984

On motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of December 12, 1984, be approved.

Resolution No. 106-85

Re: Minutes of December 18, 1984

On motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the minutes of December 18, 1984, be approved.

Re: Executive Session

The Board met in executive session from 12:05 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. on personnel matters. *Dr. Shoenberg joined the meeting during executive session, and Mrs. Praisner rejoined the meeting.

Re: Board/Press/Visitor Conference

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Mr. Phil Kratovil, World Vision, Get Hungry Program
2. Mrs. Stephen Brush
3. Mrs. Nancy Dacek, MCCPTA
4. Mrs. Carole Huberman
5. Mrs. Ann Rose, MCCPTA Budget Chairman

Resolution No. 107-85

Re: Personnel Monthly Report

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

Resolution No. 108-85

Re: Extension of Sick Leave

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The employees listed below have suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employees' accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated:

Name	Position and Location	No. of Days
Beverly, James	Bus Operator Area 1	5
Brown, Stanley	Building Service Worker	30

Cooper, Mary	Gaithersburg JHS Special Education Bus Attendant Area 2	30
Dubinsky, Claire	Classroom Teacher Long-term Leave from Redland MS	30
Lynch, Clement	Bus Operator Area 2	17
Tucker, James	Building Service Worker Poolesville HS	25
White, Richard	Building Service Worker Long-term Leave from Diamond ES	30

Resolution No. 108-85 Re: Personnel Reassignment

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

Name	From	To
Pearl K. Levine	Administrative School Secretary Magruder High School 12 H L 3	Secretary Area 1 Administrative Office Effective January 28, 1985 Will maintain present salary until July 1, 1987

Resolution No. 110-85 Re: Death of Mrs. Elizabeth B.
Hipsley, Office Assistant I,
Division of Career Programs

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on January 20, 1985, of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Hipsley, an Office Assistant I in the Division of Career Programs, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Hipsley had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty-one years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Hipsley was a reliable and responsible employee, always willing to give of her time and energy to ease the work load of others in the division during busy times; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Hipsley and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Hipsley's family.

Resolution No. 111-85

Re: Death of Mrs. Pearl R. Schutzman,
Classroom Teacher, Oakland Terrace
Elementary School

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on January 12, 1985, of Mrs. Pearly R. Schutzman, a classroom teacher at Oakland Terrace Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Schutzman had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for over twenty years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Schutzman was a teacher who had a great deal of respect for her students and peers, and she had a very positive attitude toward all tasks and exhibited a sense of dedication and humor that was outstanding; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Pearl R. Schutzman and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Schutzman's family.

Resolution No. 112-85

Re: Personnel Appointments

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following personnel appointments be approved:

Appointment	Present Position	As
William E. Henry	Public Information Officer Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools Savannah, Georgia	Director Dept. of Information Effective 3/25/85 Grade P
Michael E. Glascoe	Asst. Principal B-CC High School	Admin. Asst. to the Deputy/Gen. Admin. Effective 3/1/85 Grade N
Marion L. Bell	Principal Seneca Valley H.S.	Director Dept. of Human Relations Effective 3/13/85 Grade Q

Re: A Study of the Guidance Program and its

Management in the Montgomery
County Public Schools
Staff Response to Board's
Counseling and Guidance Committee
Report Response on Peer Counseling

Dr. Shoenberg expressed the Board's appreciation to the Department of Educational Accountability for a very useful report and noted that the Board had already taken some budgetary action to implement some parts of the report. Dr. Steve Frankel, director of the Department of Educational Accountability, introduced Dr. Mary Ebert, statistical specialist. He reported that by Board action in the budget virtually all of the major recommendations in the study had been implemented. Key was redefining the guidance counselor's role at the senior high school level. Dr. Pitt said that a number of people would be following through on the study. One of their concerns was special education, and this would be the focus of a study group. Dr. Shoenberg commented that while many Board members were interested in guidance it was Mrs. Praisner's persistence that led them to this report.

Mrs. Praisner was pleased to see that they had a document which started them in the right direction. She was anxious to get them moving on competencies for guidance for students. She hoped they would receive responses from different people in the community and staff, especially the counselors association. She thought there were issues they needed to focus on in the future, one of which was the whole question of student expectations and delivery of counseling services. She wanted to remove as many of the paper and pencil chores as possible, but she found it hard to differentiate between helping students with their schedules and working with them to ascertain what courses students should be taking. There was the element of why the student needed the course changed and what the problem was. She hoped that when they focused on the role of the counselor they would talk about what would be given up when certain functions were removed. The one major question was the placement of counseling services in Dr. Martin's office which she supported. They still needed to address the whole question of pupil services. She was also struck by the differences in how counselors used their time. She was not concerned about that as long as they knew what counselors should be doing and counselors were evaluated on that. She noted that they did not ask all principals to spend their time in the same way. She was not alarmed by variations from school to school as long as they were certain that certain competencies were being met and services were being provided.

Dr. Cronin felt that one of the most misunderstood positions in the system was that of counselor. He said that given the private nature of a lot of consultations, he wondered whether they had systems nationally that would evaluate counselors. Dr. Frankel replied that they did not look for any national systems, but there were certain expectations that would be readily observable. For example, when one looked at the senior high school data, one came away with the impression that a successful high school counselor almost had to

prospect. They could not just sit in their offices. In regard to the report, they had suggested not involving counselors when a student changed from one period to another. This could be done by a clerk, but it would not be official until a counselor had a chance to see it. In regard to evaluating counselors, Dr. Ebert did not feel they should look at technique or style. They tried to rely on the comments of other people and feedback as to their perception of the services that they had received from counselors. She said some of the more interesting data came from students asking them if they did anything differently after talking with a counselor.

Dr. Cronin said they had commented that a counselor must go out of the office, but he had found one person who had spent almost 50 percent of his time on paperwork and management. This seemed to belie the fact that they had an effective system for evaluation. He asked whether much of the paperwork could be taken over by a registrar or attendance officer. Dr. Frankel replied that they looked at time. In one area of the report they had only one sentence on the role of data processing in that area. There was no question that automated help would help significantly. They first wanted to see if the part-time help given by the Board could do a big part of the job. They thought with some job redefinition and automated support, the part-time money might be enough. If it was not enough, they would consider going toward a position associated with the registrar's office.

Dr. Floyd stated that they had had some discussions at the Board table on this subject which allowed the Board to decide what to put in the tentative budget. However, they had one more step of approval down the street, and they could not spend the money until that occurred.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about their continuing assessment of the effectiveness of the program. One dimension of that was the extent to which students themselves regard the program as meeting their needs. The Board had received a survey of graduating seniors of the class of 1983 in which students were asked their judgments about counseling, career awareness, and help in college selection. These findings were not very positive. There were low ratings in terms of help with career awareness and college selection. While these students had no basis for comparison with what was happening in other school systems, the judgments were fairly negative. He hoped that staff would take this information into account. He also noted that there were substantial differences in race and sex with white males being particularly negative about counselors. He thought there were questions that did need to be addressed and lots of issues that needed to be pursued. If they wanted to have a good program, they had to find out why there was such a huge variation from school to school regarding the perceptions of students. It seemed to him there was a lot to be understood about how effectively the program could be delivered.

Dr. Joy Frechtling remarked that the follow-up study of high school graduates was consistent with the study's finding that something was

wrong at the senior high school level. It was not just students. Everyone was saying that something was not the way they wanted it to be. Dr. Frankel reported that they had been asking questions about counseling for years, and the ratings for senior high school counselors were the lowest for any group.

Dr. Shoenberg stated that his job at the University involved the supervision of a number of offices providing counseling services of various kinds. He said that at the point when students sought help from counselors they might be looking for an answer, and what the guidance counselor ought to be supplying was not answers but questions. People who got questions with the object of getting them to make up their own minds tended to be somewhat dissatisfied. He said that sometimes when counselors were doing their jobs properly they created something that appeared on a pencil and paper survey as dissatisfaction. He recognized that seeing students in connection with very routine functions created the opportunity for interaction; however, those situations appeared fairly rare. The question they should ask was whether the comparatively small percentage of cases in which guidance counselors carried out certain routine functions were worth the time spent. It was his feeling that it was not worth it, and that they would get a higher level of satisfaction if the counselors could concentrate on dealing in a thorough way with those situations that did require professional services. Of course, this could create a situation where a student did not see a guidance counselor because that student did not have any problems. He was sure the counselors would be happy if they could concentrate their services on situations for which they were professionally trained. He recalled that a former Board member used to complain about inadequate counseling in regard to colleges. However, every survey done at the University of Maryland showed that college counseling ranked very low on the part of all students, not just Montgomery County. He did not see any reason why they should expect from a counselor in a high school the same level of services one got from a college counseling service costing hundreds of dollars. He did think that high school counselors ought to know more about about institutions other than the ones Montgomery County students most frequently attended. Dr. Frankel hoped that they would have materials which would guide counselors to existing resources or provide them with a uniform level of information.

Mrs. DiFonzo called attention to page nine and half-time counselors spending little time with adjunct duties and spending more time with students almost seemed to be making a case for half-time counselors. If they were full-time, these counselors were hung up on paperwork and adjunct duties. She also commented that there was mention of the amount of time counselors spent with eighth and ninth grade students on their four-year program. She would be interested in knowing what kind of quality time was spent helping the student rather than filling out forms. Dr. Ebert replied this varied from school to school, and they did not focus on how satisfied students and parents were with the four-year plans.

Miss Duby shared the feelings of the Board that they were going in

the right direction, but she still had a lot of concern. She was not at all surprised that the satisfaction ratings were so low because she had been hearing that for a long time. She was surprised that the satisfaction ratings were as high as they were at the JIM school level. She hoped that they did not totally gloss over everything except for the senior high school program. She was hearing the same concerns from seventh and eighth graders, but their problems were not as critical because they were in a smaller environment. While they were going ahead with long-term plans, she thought there were some problems that needed to be dealt with quickly. There were still students who did not believe that discussions with guidance counselors were confidential. There were other students who did not believe they could talk to counselors other than the one they were assigned to. She said that when they had a report stating that counselors were spending 14 percent of their time in individual conferences that was a real problem. She said that Dr. Shoenberg had talked about inherent conflicts in what counselors should be doing, and one part of the problem was that they were missing the average student. Students going to college and students with problems were seeing counselors, but she thought that counselors were there for dealing with more than either end of the spectrum. She hoped that the curricula would be addressing this, and she hoped when they wrote this they would incorporate student expectations. She thought they needed time for professional sharing and staff development. They also needed to look at the career technician and how that person worked with the guidance counselors. She assumed they would talk about that when they discussed organization and pupil personnel. She remarked that no matter what they did, counseling and guidance people had a definite image problem in the schools. She thought they had to be proactive about addressing the feelings of students toward counseling services.

Dr. Cronin noted that counselors spent 16 to 19 percent of their time on nonwork activities which might make it hard to sell budget items on counselors. Dr. Mary Ebert, statistical specialist, explained that nonwork activity did include lunchtime or breaks during the day. Dr. Cody added that for a typical work day this was a fairly low percentage. Dr. Cronin asked about the person who spent 1 percent of the day on nonwork activities, and Dr. Ebert replied that there were counselors who did not eat lunch. She explained that these observations were random, and counselors were observed for three days in a row.

Dr. Frankel hoped that the study did not come across as being too negative toward any group of counselors because they had never received such a high degree of openness and cooperation in any of their studies. He said that the recommendation to go to some kind of an area staffing came out of a strong counselor feeling, particularly at the senior high levels, that they needed someone outside of their own school because they felt subject to the whims of individual administrators. He noted that there was an error in the report about looking to the vocational education people for a possible position which should have been deleted from the report.

Dr. Shoenberg thought there was a level of dissatisfaction on the part of teachers, parents, and students because they had never been very clear about exactly what they expected counselors to do. One of the great virtues of the planning effort was to define that role within some reasonable limits. People would know what they had a right to expect and what they could not expect. He called attention to an item in the guidance advisory committee report regarding a review of the mental health referral policy to include counselors and pupil personnel workers. That raised the question of the role of the counselor in certain kinds of serious emotional problems. Was it to deal with that problem, first aid, or something in between? He agreed that they did need to look at this policy.

Dr. Pitt hoped that the study would look at the needs of the people served by the guidance counselors at various levels. He thought some of the satisfaction had to do with the relationships that people at different age groups had with adults and their ability to communicate and relate. He believed it was easier for a younger person to develop a relationship with an adult than for a person who considered himself a young adult.

Mrs. Praisner said there seemed to be a difference of opinion as to whether the clerical support was a constant need or seasonal. She hoped that there would be an evaluation of whether the part-time funds met this need. She would anticipate that the Board would have a great deal of discussion about the different roles and expectations that people had about counselors. She hoped that they would get to this discussion soon. She recalled that last year when they talked about minigrants these included some funds for counseling. She asked for some idea on what the effects of the minigrants had been on counseling funds. She also requested information on counselors attending the College Boards meeting and about how many did take advantage of leave provisions to attend. She also asked for next steps on this process.

In regard to peer counseling, Miss Duby hoped that next year during budget season someone would follow through on this. She also hoped that in the meantime they could provide administrative and moral support for the people who were going ahead with this program. She said that peer counseling was a worthwhile program for the school system to endorse and support.

Re: Report on Weighted Grades

Dr. Cody stated that the report was clear and to the point. The report recommended a move toward weighted rank in class but not weighted grades. Dr. Joy Frechtling commented that the report could not answer all the questions having to do with weighted grades. For example, they could not say anything about how many students were denied access to an institution because of unweighted grades. The report was the best interpretation they could make of the relative case for doing some sort of weighting. She said they were comfortable with the recommendations they were making because the evidence did point in the direction of some sort of change.

Dr. Frankel stated that they were very careful in looking at the question of potential harm. They could not find any evidence that any damage would be done to minority students or any damage to students who did not participate in honors classes. The only people affected by weighted grades were the people in the second to sixth deciles. They could not find any evidence that going to a system of weighted rank in class would harm anyone, but it would benefit students aiming for elite institutions. He called attention to the letter from the MIT admissions officer.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether they had specific recommendations on the weighting they ought to use for rank in class. Dr. Frechtling replied that there were many variations in weighting and there were arguments in favor of various schemes. She thought a group would have to sit down and work through this.

Mr. Ewing thought the recommendation for weighted rank was a very good one. He also thought the suggestion on page 14 that they should compute this also for the senior year was also a good suggestion. However, he was confused about the statement at the bottom of page 13. Dr. Frechtling explained that one of the arguments in opposition to any kind of weighting was that the student working very hard in the regular class and receiving an A deserved as much credit as a student placed in a higher achieving class and working hard for that A. The argument she was trying to make was that MCPS felt that not all students who could be in honors courses were currently placed in those nor were they currently being challenged enough to go into honors courses. The argument for an appropriate effort in an appropriate placement did not seem to be supported by some of the other statements they were making.

Miss Duby commented that she understood the reason for the recommendation of just weighted rank because that addressed the primary concern which was that colleges could not recompute class rank. It seemed by weighting the class rank they were addressing that problem; however, she asked whether they were not creating other problems by weighting class rank and not the GPA. She wondered how clear the information would be to a university if they saw a student with such a grade point average being first in their class and maybe getting a transcript from another student with a higher GPA and a lower rank. Dr. Cody replied that colleges used the information in different ways because different schools used different grade inflation so rank in class was a separate measure. Dr. Frankel explained that they could put information on the transcript explaining rank in class as used by MCPS. Dr. Frechtling added that when she talked with various colleges she did not get the impression that this would be unusual or pose a problem. It was their feeling they could handle this as long as there was clear explanation.

Miss Duby felt that they should go with the weighted class rank. She thought they should weight AP and honors courses equally, and she thought it should be a one point rank. She suggested that this be figured at the end of the junior year because she did not see

many benefits to extending it. Students had to send in midyear reports and final reports to the schools to which they were accepted. Most colleges wanted this information early in the senior year. She suggested that if they were serious about this it should be implemented for next year's senior class.

Mrs. Praisner said she had a question about the definition of advanced level courses and whether they were talking about students doing more accelerated work or the third level. Dr. Frechtling explained that they considered a course worthy of an extra point if it were in the honors program, advanced placement, advanced level, and honors. Mrs. Praisner commented that everyone was talking about different things, and Dr. Frankel explained that they used different methods in the simulations and it did not have any effect. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that in Fairfax the weighting was applied to AP classes and there were few of these. Therefore, the advantage was minimal. She noted that they had asked schools about weighted data and asked about the definition. Dr. Frechtling replied that schools were asked specifically for weighted grades and weighted rank in class. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the most competitive schools reported that 58 percent provided weighted data, but there was a difference among local school systems. When they got to the highly competitive schools, almost as many said they did not know as those that did know. Dr. Frankel explained that the admissions officers had told them that they were at the mercy of the local school when it came to having the student's rank in terms of academic ability and academic potential. He thought that these people not knowing was supportive of going toward the ranking.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she had heard the sentiments from Board members, and she thought that weighted rank in class was probably as far as she might be willing to go. She still had some concerns dealing with where they were with their honors programs. She would probably have no difficulty at all if they were talking about AP classes. She was concerned about the consistency in honors classes from school to school and enrollment options for students from school to school. She had not been convinced about the fairness argument for college acceptance. She wanted to have confidence in the honors classes that students were taking, and she was still concerned about making sure the courses were significantly different and also that the students wanting to take them could take them which got to the issue of scheduling problems.

Dr. Cronin said that the rank issue for senior year was important because there was a feeling among seniors that once the grades were sent that it was coast time. The other issue was whether there was sufficient uniformity of courses in all the high schools. He wanted more information on the statement that the impact of weighting was greater on females than on males. Females showed a greater tendency to move down in rank than males. Dr. Frechtling replied that they had reported this because that was what the data showed. However, they did not fully understand this because the honors data did not show this. She thought that the AP issue and the senior year issue were tied together because most students took AP courses in their

senior year. If they were not going to do some sort of refiguring during the senior year, they would be eliminating the majority of the AP courses.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the changes might be greater when the senior year grades were worked in plus these students had only one year of honors courses. She wondered whether there would be a difference if there were three years of honors classes. Dr. Frechtling replied that they did not know. They had only included one year because this was the time the honors program had been in effect. She did not think they would have a greater impact on minority students had they included the senior year because it related to who took what courses.

Dr. Cronin asked whether there was a 50/50 male/female split in honors and AP courses. Dr. Frankel replied that there was. He pointed out that as long as an honors course in a given school was significantly more challenging it did not make any difference because all they were doing was ranking in that school. Mrs. Praisner noted that they still have to consider scheduling problems.

Dr. Shoenberg asked whether there would be no effect on people in the first decile to move downward. Dr. Frechtling replied that there was some effect, but the effect was greater in the other deciles because these students could move in two directions. Dr. Shoenberg asked whether it would be fair to say that the majority of people in the first decile were there regardless of what courses they took. For example, were they taking honors courses and getting A's in those. Dr. Frechtling replied that for the vast majority there was very little effect. Dr. Shoenberg asked about the degree to which the most competitive college took students below the first decile. Dr. Frechtling replied that they did not know. Dr. Frankel added that if they did go to weighted rankings the statistics would not stay the same because it would serve as an incentive to get more students in the first two deciles into more honors courses.

Dr. Shoenberg said he would underline Mrs. Praisner's concern about what were the courses they ought to weight more heavily. He said that he would not feel comfortable weighing heavily all courses they called honors courses because a number of them were courses for which a non-honors course did not exist. He assumed that the next step would be a recommendation from the superintendent that the Board could discuss.

Mr. Ewing hoped that the people who had been most outspoken in their desire for weighted grades would read the first page of the report, because it made very clear that based on data they had they would never be able to say that any particular student was disadvantaged should they not go to weighted grades or weighted rank in class. He thought they should consider weighted rank in class, but weighting grades distorted grades. He would also ask parents to read the data which suggested that the more competitive schools were saying that they took grades into account and rank in class into account along with a lot of other things. Decisions were made on an individual

basis; therefore, one of these was not going to determine their decision. No school was going to tell a student why he or she was or was not accepted.

Dr. Floyd commented that he had read the study with a great deal of interest because he had received a lot of phone calls and letters about this subject. The evidence of an adverse effect of not having weighted grades was not conclusive. It was clear that Montgomery County seemed to be out of step with neighboring counties on this issue and somewhat out of step with the national trend. There was a good deal of perception out there that by not having weighted grades or weighted ranking this was a disadvantage. Yet the data seemed to show that it did not hurt or help anyone to have such a system. They were left with the question of whether it would encourage more students to take honors and advanced placement courses, but no one really knew.

Dr. Cody agreed that staff would come forward with a recommendation at the next opportunity.

Resolution No. 113-85 Re: Removing Proposed Resolution on
Child Care from the table

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Floyd, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That Mrs. Praisner's proposed resolution on child care be removed from the table.

WHEREAS, The issue of child care has become one of increasing importance in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Several task forces and committees have made recommendations for action in this area; and

WHEREAS, The county government has proposed that it assume the leadership role in establishing a county policy; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools has been asked to assist in this endeavor; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment increases in some areas of the county and Board efforts to reduce class size and increase all-day kindergarten and Head Start will have an affect on space available; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Public Schools offers its services as a partner in this endeavor; and be it further

Resolved, That Montgomery County Public Schools will offer its support to the county government in the following areas:

1. the use of surplus space in operating schools by child care programs under the auspices of the Board of Education's

- joint occupancy policy
- 2. the use of transportation services as identified in administrative procedures
- 3. the availability of the school system's expertise to promote child care by:
 - . identifying needs through the use of MCPS student population projections
 - . sharing expertise with child care providers
- 4. the assessment of MCPS curriculum needs related to child care and the latch key child
- 5. the encouragement of principals and PTA members to explore child care issues
- 6. the identification of potential sites--both at operating and future school sites--for use for child care programs

Resolution No. 114-85 Re: Amendments to the Proposed
Resolution on Child Care

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the following amendments be made to the proposed resolution on child care:

- 1. change "affect" to "effect" last WHEREAS
- 2. add "to the extent that school facilities may permit" in first Resolved clause
- 3. change second Resolved clause to read: "...will cooperate in the following areas to the extent they can:"

Resolution No. 115-85 Re: Child Care Issues

On motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The issue of child care has become one of increasing importance in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, Several task forces and committees have made recommendations for action in this area; and

WHEREAS, The county government has proposed that it assume the leadership role in establishing a county policy; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools has been asked to assist in this endeavor; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment increases in some areas of the county and Board efforts to reduce class size and increase all-day kindergarten and Head Start will have an effect on space available; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Public Schools offers its services as a partner in this endeavor to the extent that school

facilities may permit; and be it further

Resolved, That Montgomery County Public Schools will cooperate in the following areas to the extent it can:

1. the use of surplus space in operating schools by child care programs under the auspices of the Board of Education's joint occupancy policy
2. the use of transportation services as identified in administrative procedures
3. the availability of the school system's expertise to promote child care by:
 - . identifying needs through the use of MCPS student population projections
 - . sharing expertise with child care providers
4. the assessment of MCPS curriculum needs related to child care and the latch key child
5. the encouragement of principals and PTA members to explore child care issues
6. the identification of potential sites--both at operating and future school sites--for use for child care programs

Re: Interim Report of the Area 2 Task
Force

Dr. Shoenberg thanked the task force for its efforts in getting together a preliminary report. Mrs. Ginny Miller stated that this was a very preliminary report because the committee had had only four weeks. Most of their concerns had to do with teaching staff and transportation. In line with the Board's resolution on Area 2, they would be looking at demographics and attendance patterns but would not be making recommendations by school name. In regard to bus transportation, she reported that she had received lots of telephone calls about the proposals to change opening times. Some of the proposed changes made a two hour span between an elementary and a high school starting time.

Dr. Pitt explained that the Board and County Council asked the staff to look at the transportation window. A plan was developed, but this was purely an attempt to see what could be done. They recognized that no one was happy with the proposals; however, they were asked to develop a plan to see whether it was worth increasing the transportation window. Dr. Cody added that a comparative analysis of Montgomery County, Fairfax, and Prince George's showed that Montgomery County transported fewer children per day per bus. The other districts had a wider window and ran the buses for four runs rather than three.

Mrs. Vicki Bowers said that the program subcommittee had discussed some of the concerns held by members of the committee. They had prepared a questionnaire for PTA presidents, principals, and students. They were looking at class size, homework, the programs themselves, testing, the ESOL program, the vocational program, and the special education program. They wanted to look at magnet

programs, all-day kindergarten, the role of the Area 2 office, and materials and equipment. They were also asking about parent involvement and had one question about the one thing that would improve education in that particular school. They would be spending the next month interviewing all these people.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that the Area 3 Task Force had addressed itself to problems it thought were special to Area 3. However, a number of issues they had raised did not seem to be Area 2 issues but rather general concerns. Other items did seem to have special reference to Area 2. He was not sure to what degree it was their intention to find out how Area 2 felt about issues that were countywide issues. Mrs. Bowers replied that part of the problem was that the memo from the Board was very ambiguous; therefore, they set about defining for themselves what the Board meant. She agreed that a lot of the things they were addressing were countywide issues. In a number of schools the question of homework was brought up because there seemed to be high expectations for Area 2 elementary school students.

Mrs. Slye commented that there had been concern about Area 2 schools in relation to each other in program opportunities. She doubted that that the group intended to consider the homework policy issue other than a narrow description of what was usual and reasonable.

Mrs. Bowers stated that there were differences among schools in regard to honors courses. There was a perception that some schools out there were much better than others and that schools with large vocational programs were not schools where you sent your academic student.

Dr. Floyd did not think the memorandum was necessarily vague. It talked about program opportunities and enumerated them, but it did not say "limited to." He thought the committee could look at other things if the specific items were covered. Dr. Shoenberg thought that the memo as a reflection of some kind of parallel to Area 3 might be ambiguous; however, they might not see this task force as performing a parallel function. Mrs. Miller pointed out that they did not have the same problems as Area 3.

Mr. Ewing explained that it was the intent of the Board to ask Area 2 to look at the program and a variety of related issues in terms of their view of what needed to be done to improve it. The Board did that knowing that while the policies were the same for the county as a whole, the practices might vary considerably. If the practices varied, they needed to know what people would recommend to the Board about changing the policy, the practice, or both. It was also true that things impact differently in different schools as well as in areas. He thought their report was right on target in that regard. He also thought the questionnaire was very comprehensive. Mrs. Miller reported that they had two more questionnaires, one was on transportation through the high school cluster coordinators and the other on attendance patterns.

Dr. Cronin reported that yesterday at the Council education committee an issue came up that the committee should know about. The question was raised about adding on to Rosemary Hills when they had space in adjacent elementary schools.

They had explained that there was a history to this and next year they would look at underutilization and boundary changes. There was no way they were going to go back into Rosemary Hills, North Chevy Chase, and Chevy Chase. Mr. Ewing hoped it was the Board's intent to be clear they made a set of commitments in 1983 in regard to those and they were not going to tamper with those -- period.

Mrs. Praisner thought the task force had done a yeoman's job in a short period of time of identifying issues of importance. She had one caveat from her years of experience on volunteer committees. She was a little concerned about the quantity of surveys going into schools at different times. They did not want to irritate the people from whom they needed information. As she looked at the questions, she thought the area office might have some of the information. She was also concerned about the amount of materials that volunteers could go through. Mrs. Miller indicated that they had asked Dr. Shekletski to send a letter to the principals stating that the Area 2 Task Force would be communicating with them. Mrs. Bowers commented that they would check with the Area 2 office about information that might already be available to them. Dr. Cronin asked whether they could take the actual questionnaire to the Area 2 office and ask if they had materials. Mrs. Bowers replied that they had already done some of that and would be receiving data from the office. Dr. Pitt hoped that the task force would use the services of the Area 2 Office, and he hoped that the office would have an opportunity to react to the data obtained by the task force. Mrs. Bowers explained that they were trying to build understanding in Area 2. Mrs. Marlene Bolze said that she was chairman of the staffing subcommittee, and they had been gathering information. She praised Mrs. Connie Mitchell and Dr. Shekletski for the assistance they had provided. She said they were originally going to look at oversized classes, but as they gathered information they decided they were going to look at classes themselves and see whether there was a trend. She noted that there was a feeling in Area 2 that they did have larger numbers.

Mrs. Miller thanked the Area 2 Office for their assistance. They were very concerned about their underenrolled classes. She was pleased that the Board would be addressing Area 2 schools this summer. Dr. Shoenberg thanked the task force for their preliminary report.

Resolution No. 116-85

Re: An Amendment to the FY 1986
Operating Budget Class Size

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Slye being temporarily absent (Miss Duby voting in the

Resolution No. 120-85

Re: FY 1986 Operating Budget

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Miss Duby being absent):

Resolved, That the FY 1986 Operating Budget be adopted in the amount of \$438,953,893.

Resolution No. 121-85

Re: Area Offices

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Miss Duby being absent):

Resolved, That the Board of Education place on a future agenda a discussion of the role and function of the area offices with a report by the superintendent.

Re: Items of Information

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Survey of Graduating Seniors: Class of 1983
4. Evaluation of ESOL/Bilingual Program: Phase II, an Analysis of the High School Program of Services
5. Statistical Profiles 1984-85
6. Recommendation for Approval of New Curriculum - Landscaping/Nursery Management (for future consideration)

Re: Adjournment

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw