

April 26, 1993

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 331-93 Re: FY 1993 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN
THE HEAD START TRANSITION
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect an FY 1993 categorical transfer of \$140,293 within the Head Start Transition Program, funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, through the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
2 Instruc. Salaries	\$ 88,047	
3 Other Instruc. Costs		\$136,943
7 Student Transportation		3,350
10 Fixed Charges	<u>52,246</u>	
Total	\$140,293	\$140,293

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 332-93 Re: FY 1993 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT
FUNDS AND CATEGORICAL TRANSFER
WITHIN THE CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY
EDUCATION PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expand within the FY 1993 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$60,352 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, for the Career and Technology Education program, in the following category:

RESOLUTION NO. 334-93 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS MORE THAN
\$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted 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 as shown for the bids as follows:

84-93	Physical Education Supplies and Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Ace Reconditioners	\$ 1,596
	Aluminum Athletic Equipment Company	3,291
	Anaconda-Kay Sports, Inc.	15,090
	Artistic, Inc.	1,262*
	Bacharach Rasin Company, Inc.	2,139
	Be Fit, Inc.	666*
	Cannon Sports, Inc.	59,388
	Dekan Athletic Equipment Corporation	3,055
	DVF Sporting Goods Company	92,762
	Fitness Concepts	2,815
	Bill Fritz Sports Corporation	74,891
	Gerstung/Gym Thing, Inc.	29,496
	Goal Sporting Goods, Inc.	8,784
	Greb Sports, Inc.	38,950
	Heartline Fitness Industries	171,841
	Lax World, Inc.	1,453
	Longstreth Sporting Goods	8,671*
	Marlow Sports, Inc.	52,080
	McArthur Towels, Inc.	3,057
	Micro-Bio-Medics, Inc.	858
	The Mini-Gym Company	3,195
	O'Catch Sports, Inc.	848*
	Passon's Sports	59,228
	Penn Monto, Inc.	7,295
	Physical Fitness Company of Maryland, Inc.	4,223
	Pioneer Manufacturing	10,663
	Harvey Ratner and Associates	1,400
	George Santelli, Inc.	6,336*
	School Health Supply Company	290
	Sportmaster/Recreation Equipment Unlimited	11,832
	Sports Imports, Inc.	24,965
	Superior Sports Nets	2,875
	Things From Bell, Inc.	3,924
	Tiffin Athletic Mats, Inc.	7,750*
	Triple J. Construction, Inc.	3,075

April 26, 1993

Seneca Valley High School Wood Floor at Rockville High School <u>Low Bidder:</u> Martin Surfacing, Inc.	\$113,412.00
<u>Boiler and Fuel Burner Replacements</u> Cashell and Watkins Mill elementary schools <u>Low Bidder:</u> Adrian L. Mertin, Inc.	116,032.00
<u>Heating, Ventilation, and Air-conditioning Improvements</u> Argyle Middle School <u>Low Bidder:</u> R. M. Thorton, Inc.	252,416.00
<u>Rooftop Air Handling Unit Replacements</u> Thomas S. Wootton High School <u>Low Bidder:</u> H. P. S. Mechanical, Inc.	88,643.00
<u>Boiler and Fuel Burner Replacements</u> Clarksburg Maintenance Depot <u>Low Bidder:</u> G & L Mechanical Services	29,500.00
<u>Exterior Wall Repairs</u> Tilden Holding Facility <u>Low Bidder:</u> N. P. P. Construction, Inc.	19,872.00
<u>Fuel Burner Replacements</u> College Gardens and Farmland elementary schools <u>Low Bidder:</u> G & L Mechanical Services	52,839.00
<u>Electric Light Fixtures and Accessories</u> Bethesda, Clarksburg, and Randolph maintenance depots <u>Low Bidder:</u> C. N. Robinson Lighting	98,793.19
<u>Air-conditioning Units Replacement</u> Farmland Elementary School <u>Low Bidder:</u> Adrien L. Merton, Inc.	41,623.00

RESOLUTION NO. 336-93 Re: LIGHTING IMPROVEMENTS IN VARIOUS
SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids for lighting improvements at various schools were received on April 5, 1993, in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices, with details available in the Department of Facilities Management; and

April 26, 1993

WHEREAS, The low bids are below the cost estimate of \$600,000, the low bidders meeting specifications have completed similar projects successfully, and funds have tentatively been approved by the County Council to cover the cost of the low bids; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contingent upon formal County Council approval of funds in the FY 94 Capital Budget for energy conservation, contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications for the projects and amounts listed below:

<u>Low Bidder</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Steinman Electric Co.	Belmont ES	\$ 33,000
	Diamond ES	38,500
	Fox Chapel ES	<u>37,000</u>
	Sub Total	\$108,500
Brandenburg Electric Company	Fallsmead ES	\$ 42,468
	Stonegate ES	39,330
	Banneker MS	84,650
	Frost MS	65,640
	Ridgeview MS	86,828
	Walter Johnson HS	<u>152,845</u>
	Sub Total	\$471,761
	TOTAL	\$580,261

RESOLUTION NO. 337-93 Re: UNIT VENTILATORS FOR STATE-OWNED RELOCATABLES

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on April 15, 1993, for the replacement of unit ventilators in state-owned modular buildings at Springbrook High School with work to be completed by July 1, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Shapiro & Duncan, Inc.	\$ 85,698
2. Jolles Brothers Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	113,000

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the budget estimate of \$100,000, the low bidder meeting specifications has completed similar projects successfully, and the state and local funds have

April 26, 1993

tentatively been approved to cover the cost of the low bid; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$85,698 contract be awarded to Shapiro & Duncan, Inc., for the purchase and installation of the replacement of unit ventilators in modular buildings at Springbrook High School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of Facilities Management and subject to final action by the County Council on the FY 1994 Capital Budget; and be it further

Resolved, That the contract be forwarded to the State Interagency for School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion.

RESOLUTION NO. 338-93 Re: INSTALLATION OF COMPUTER AND CABLE
TV/TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORKS AT
ASHBURTON, BURTONSVILLE, AND QUINCE
ORCHARD #7 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND
THOMAS W. PYLE AND WHITE OAK MIDDLE
SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids to install computer and cable TV/telecommunication networks at Ashburton, Burtonsville, and Quince Orchard #7 elementary schools and Thomas W. Pyle and White Oak middle schools in conjunction with the facility modernizations were received on April 16, 1993, with work to begin immediately and be completed by July 30, 1993; and

WHEREAS, The low bidders have successfully completed similar projects at various schools, including Fairland, Lois P. Rockwell, and Travilah elementary schools and Walt Whitman High School; and

WHEREAS, The low bids are below the staff estimate of \$80,000 for the five computer network installations and \$60,000 for the five cable TV/telecommunication network installations, and funds are available to award the contracts; now therefore be it

Resolved, That contracts be awarded to the low bidders for the projects and amounts listed below:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Installation of Computer Networks at Ashburton, Burtonsville, and Quince Orchard #7 elementary schools and White Oak Middle School <u>Low Bidder</u> : American Connections International, Inc.	\$56,240

Installation of Computer Networks at
 Thomas W. Pyle Middle School
Low Bidder: Netcom Technologies, Inc.

20,495

Installation of Cable TV Networks at
 Ashburton, Burtonsville, and Quince Orchard #7
 elementary schools and Thomas W. Pyle and White
 Oak middle schools

Low Bidder: Netcom Technologies, Inc.

50,482

RESOLUTION NO. 339-93 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Sims seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez abstaining:

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. 340-93 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Sims seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez abstaining:

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

WHEREAS, Due to the prolong 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:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Phyllis Brown	Office Assistant IV Systemwide Training Unit	20
Reva Muse	Bus Operator Area III - Transportation	10

RESOLUTION NO. 341-92 Re: DEATH OF MRS. EVELYN M. LEVIN,
CLASSROOM TEACHER ON UNUSUAL AND
IMPERATIVE REASONS LEAVE FROM
WELLER ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Sims seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez abstaining:

WHEREAS, The death on March 21, 1993, of Mrs. Evelyn M. Levin, a classroom teacher on Unusual and Imperative Reasons Leave from Weller Road Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Levin was an outstanding teacher who was highly respected by her colleagues, students, and parents; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Levin's abilities to motivate students to become interested in learning and achieving success made her an asset to Montgomery County Public Schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Evelyn M. Levin 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. Levin's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 342-93 Re: DEATH OF MRS. RENAY L. MALDEN,
CLASSROOM TEACHER AT BURNING TREE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Sims seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Ms. Gutierrez abstaining:

WHEREAS, The death on February 26, 1993, of Mrs. Renay L. Malden, a classroom teacher at Burning Tree Elementary School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Malden was an outstanding teacher who was highly respected by her colleagues and community; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Malden was always willing to be helpful with the total school needs, and her caring for others made her a wonderful asset to the school system; now therefore be it

committee would come in with their spending affordability mark and adding items from any wish list would mean a reduction in someone else's budget. She had expressed the Board's concern that the next cuts would affect the classroom.

5. Mr. Ewing commented that it was important for the Board to communicate the significance of other reductions targeted by the Council. In particular, the proposal for reducing the funding for the Department of Educational Accountability was extremely ill-advised. He did not think there could be a responsible and effective administration of the school system without a capability of substantial size to assist the Board and community in understanding how effectively programs were being implemented.

While it was important to put money in the classroom, there was a core of administrative support which they could not do without.

He felt that they had one of the best assessment groups in the country, and he thought it critical that this be continued and even expanded. Mrs. Fanconi believed they were making headway in getting the Council to understand how the positions were used in the central office. She thought the Council recognized the Board's need to have the flexibility to use positions where they had needs. She said that Mr. Leggett had voted not to bring the whole \$4.2 before the full Council because he only wanted \$3.2 with a half million coming out of EYE. She was surprised because she thought he would have been supportive of the entire budget. Therefore, it was important for the Board to make the Council understand what was at stake if they continued to cut the Board's budget. They had taken \$135 million in cuts over three years at the same time they had added 12,000 students.

6. Mr. Sims echoed Mr. Ewing's comments about the Department of Educational Accountability and its value to MCPS. He had seen the results of their work on class rank and without the hard work of DEA the Board would not have made its decision which put MCPS on the cutting edge. DEA was a very valuable department, and any cut to it would be ill-advised.

7. Mr. Sims congratulated Alison Brodt, Aaron Klein, Kim Shaffer, and Danielle Cantor, the new officers of the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils.

8. Mr. Sims thanked Dr. Villani, Dr. Sullivan, Ms. Gutierrez, and Ming Lo, the SGA president at Blair, for appearing on Student Voices and Views in a discussion of multicultural education.

9. Dr. Cheung thanked Mrs. Fanconi for acting on his behalf last week when he was out of town. She did an outstanding job.

RESOLUTION NO. 344-93 Re: CLOSED SESSION - MAY 11, 1993

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on May 11, 1993, at 9 a.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, to discuss personnel matters, pending litigation, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such portion of its meeting shall continue in closed session at noon until the completion of business.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

On March 22, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct a closed session on April 14, 1993, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, April 14, 1993, from 9 a.m. to 10 a.m., from 12:25 p.m. to 1:35 p.m., and from 6:55 p.m. to 8 p.m. The meetings took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the E.E.O.C. report, the supporting services classification study, negotiations with MCEA, spending affordability, a settlement with the Falls Church construction company, and appeals.

In attendance at the closed sessions were: Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Jeff Crew, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Katheryn Gemberling, Wes Girling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Armando Gutierrez, Dick Hawes, Marie Heck, Bob Knott, Oliver Lancaster, Elfreda Massie, Philip Rohr, Jonathan Sims, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, Joseph Villani, William Wilder, and Mary Lou Wood.

Re: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC
COMMENTS PROCEDURES

On April 14, 1993, Mrs. Fanconi moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education change its procedure for sign-ups for Public Comments at regularly scheduled Board meetings by having citizens call in to the Board Office between 3 and 5 p.m. on Monday prior to regularly scheduled Board meetings with the first eight callers being told their number in line and all others being told to submit written testimony.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO POSTPONE
CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC COMMENTS
PROCEDURES (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Ewing to postpone consideration of the proposed resolution on Public Comments procedures and explore other options failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the negative.

RESOLUTION NO. 345-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC COMMENTS
PROCEDURES

On motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Abrams, Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mrs. Fanconi, Mrs. Gordon, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Public Comments procedures be amended by adding the following Resolved clause:

Resolved, That the new sign-up procedure be in effect until October 25, 1993, at which time it could be re-evaluated for continuation; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 346-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC COMMENTS
PROCEDURES

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. Sims voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi and Mrs. Gordon voting in the negative; Mr. Abrams abstaining:

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Public Comments

procedures be amended by adding the following Resolved clause:

Resolved, That the Board expand the time for Public Comments from 15 to 30 minutes; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 347-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC COMMENTS
PROCEDURES

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Public Comments procedures be amended by adding the following Resolved clauses:

Resolved, That the Board instruct its staff to inform civic and community groups of the availability of the time to address the Board as well as the new procedures; and be it further

Resolved, That the new procedures for Public Comments take effect after notification to the community.

RESOLUTION NO. 348-93 Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS PROCEDURES

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education change its procedure for sign-ups for Public Comments at regularly scheduled Board meetings by having citizens call in to the Board Office between 3 and 5 p.m. on Monday prior to regularly scheduled Board meetings with the first 15 callers being told their number in line and all others being told to submit written testimony; and be it further

Resolved, That the new sign-up procedure be in effect until October 25, 1993, at which time it could be re-evaluated for continuation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board expand the time for Public Comments from 15 to 30 minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board instruct its staff to inform civic and community groups of the availability of the time to address the Board as well as the new procedures; and be it further

Resolved, That the new procedures for Public Comments take effect after notification to the community.

RESOLUTION NO. 349-93 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-2

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-2, to dismiss the appeal.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Sims moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education investigate the possibility of making the Student Member of the Board Student Advisory Committee a standing advisory committee to the Board of Education.

Re: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING AND
GUIDANCE

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, reported that not only was the Counseling and Guidance Committee unique because it was the first in Maryland, it also was unique because it was chaired by a student.

Ms. Kathy McGuire, supervisor of the Guidance Unit, introduced Ms. Anice Schervish, chair of the committee. Ms. Schervish stated that she was a junior in the International Baccalaureate Program at Richard Montgomery High School. She introduced Ms. Jane Turner, Mrs. Jane Turner, and Ms. Mary Allen.

Ms. Schervish reported that this year in response to some of the concerns the Board addressed last year the committee decided to have a speaker at every meeting to address current interests and school needs. They found the speakers to be very informative and interesting. For example, the committee was shocked to find out that there were more homeless students in Montgomery County than in the District of Columbia. The committee would welcome Board suggestions for future topics.

This year the committee established four subcommittees. Their most exciting challenge was the first Counselor Recognition Award. Awards were presented to Ms. Judy Madden of Wheaton Woods ES, Ms. Bernice Ryder of Baker MS, Dr. Roger Davis of Wheaton High School, and Ms. Vila Montiel. The second subcommittee was involved with the revision of the GAC handbook. The third subcommittee planned two workshops for counselors and GACs. The spring workshop in April 1992 dealt with peer mediation and conflict resolution. The fall workshop on November 1992 focused on peer pressure and coping mechanisms. The fourth subcommittee was involved in preparing the annual report and received the annual GAC program reviews to assist in the preparation of the annual report.

Ms. Schervish recalled that last year the Board was interested in

the role a counselor played in the EMT/ARD process. They had found that in most schools at all levels the many tasks of the process were shared by the members of the team which might include the counselor, the principal, the special education coordinator, the speech pathologist, and other staff. Even though the responsibilities were divided up, each member still had a considerable amount of paperwork. The role of the elementary counselor was becoming increasingly significant in society because social trends were affecting students at a much younger age. This year elementary school counselors provided group counseling on issues such as divorce and separation, drug and alcohol abuse, unemployment, and interpersonal issues. These counselors were continually looking for more creative ways to assist students.

Ms. Schervish commented that the problems of elementary school students often followed them to the middle schools. The number of students requiring counseling for personal issues was increasing. The middle school counselors were responding with mentoring programs, counseling groups, and peer counseling. The numbers of students with personal problems were even greater in high school. Last year 1,400 students received counseling for issues involving divorce and separation, and 400 plus students received counseling for suicide threats. There were currently 69 group counseling programs in MCPS. One of the groups was the sexual assault survivors programs which was a seven-week program for high school girls, and next year they hoped to expand the program to include boys.

The guidance departments in high schools also advertised educational opportunities and counseled nearly 3,000 students about scholarship competitions and summer enrichment programs. Because of the demands on high school counselors, it was vital to them to have sufficient clerical support. This was also important for middle school and elementary school counselors. The committee's first recommendation was to implement lower counselor student ratios. As funding permitted, the Board should consider lowering the 300:1 counselor ratio at the secondary level and fully implement the guidelines at the elementary level of a full-time counselor for schools with 300 or more students and an additional .5 for schools with 900 students. A future goal for elementary guidance would be to establish a lower counselor/student ratio for schools with more than 800 students.

Ms. Schervish reported that in addition to counseling students, counselors were required to sit on committees, participate in the EMT/ARD process, and do paperwork.

Ms. Sharon Turner stated that their second recommendation was to maintain material resources to support the guidance program. These materials were used in group guidance and responsive counseling as teaching tools and permanent references. Guidance materials must be updated constantly to reflect changes in

society such as violence, substance abuse, academic difficulties, etc.

Ms. Jane Turner said their third recommendation was to provide additional clerical support for all schools. This additional support was needed to maintain student files, access student data, maintain and update transcripts, record standardized test scores, and collect and distribute appropriate EMT/ARD forms and records. At the elementary school level, there were no guidance secretaries; therefore, the counselors did this work. At the middle school level, it would be helpful to have a part-time person to help.

Ms. Mary Allen stated that their fourth recommendation was to maintain support for counselors to attend professional workshops.

The needs of students preparing for the 21st century demand that counselors keep abreast of counseling information and counseling strategies. Years ago, words like latchkey, homeless, and headhunter were not used frequently in counseling offices. Presently MCPS counselors attended workshops, and twice a year all counselors attending a workshop dealing with a subject of general interest to all students. For example, they had a workshop on the counselor and the law. Today 21 counselors were attending a counselor/college admissions workshop.

Ms. Schervish reported that their fifth recommendation was to provide schools with additional psychologists and pupil personnel workers. The ratio of psychologists and PPWs to students left little time for being a consultant to schools and for helping to resolve major issues affecting the lives of students. Right now they had 14 psychologists or 2468:1, and these psychologists were picking up functions formally handled by curriculum specialists and supervisors. Four years ago MCPS had 100,000 students and 26 PPWs. For FY 1994 there would be 114,000 students and still only 26 PPWs. The committee realized the fiscal constraints on the Board, but they urged the Board to consider implementing the recommendations.

Mrs. Brenneman recalled that their 1992 report talked about paperwork, and at that time the superintendent thought the committee on the reduction of paperwork should be reconvened. She asked whether there was any way to reduce paperwork. If they had more clerical staff, would this help the guidance counselors spend more time with students? Ms. Schervish replied that a lot of the paperwork was testing and typing, and clerical personnel could help with this. If there were more clerical personnel, counselors would have more time to work with students.

Ms. McGuire reported that in their structured visits this year they looked at the paperwork and the role of the counselor in the EMT. They discovered the EMT was a shared responsibility, with legal forms being filled out by the counselors, the principal,

and the special education resource teachers. This impact was not just on the counselors because the principal and the special education resource teachers had roles to play.

Ms. Gutierrez asked about the level of automation available to counselors because last year Mrs. Hobbs was concerned about having printers in the counseling rooms. She also inquired about access to SIMS. Ms. Schervish replied that there was access, but SIMS required time to input that information. Ms. McGuire added that in the SIMS schools they had done counselor training, and they were beginning to do more data collection and to learn how they could use SIMS for that data collection. Ms. Gutierrez asked about the printers, and Ms. McGuire replied that they still needed printers at the middle school. These printers would be attached to the mainframe for student schedules. In regard to materials, they had been looking at the middle school level to put in a program called, "Career Choices," which used the Apple computer. It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that they were looking for data entry and clerical support. Ms. Schervish said they still needed material resources for group counseling. Some elementary schools had gotten together to buy these materials, but there were problems in scheduling the use of these kits.

Ms. Sharon Turner commented that a lot of materials needed to be updated. In the high school career center, they had software to help students do college searches and financial aid searches, and this information changed constantly requiring updates of the software. In the tenth grade the Harrington/O'Shea interest inventory was given and needed to be reordered to be given again.

Ms. Gutierrez knew that Herm Davis did provide an update of the software on financial aid, and it was a free service provided to every high school in Montgomery County.

Ms. Gutierrez asked the committee to consider what would be the role of counselors in implementing the sexual harassment policy.

For example, what training, materials, documentation, and follow-up would they need. She also asked about preventive measures they could do in counseling.

Mrs. Fanconi commended the committee for their work and expressed her pleasure at seeing a student as the chairperson. She inquired about the reason for the recommendation of adding a .5 counselor for schools over 900. She hoped that the Board would be able to address the psychologist and PPW issue in the coming year. Ms. McGuire replied that they presently had two schools with more than one counselor. Whetstone had 1.2 and Rolling Terrace had a 1.5. When they exceeded the 800 number, one counselor would spend 35 to 45 percent of their time in classroom guidance and 40 to 55 percent doing responsive counseling. They would spend 5 to 10 percent in planning and needed time for program support. However, they could not meet all of those demands, and classroom guidance suffered. In these cases, a

counselor was not able to do individual counseling and worked with students in groups. A full-time counselor in a school of 400 would be able to get into every classroom for an extended period of time.

Mr. Sims congratulated Ms. Schervish. He said that SIMS was a MAC-based system, and they had PC terminals for data entry. He asked whether the MACs could assume the roles of the PC terminals. Dr. Villani explained that they had two systems. The terminals were used at the secondary schools to enter data into the mainframe. The mainframe sorted that data and fed it back to SIMS. He did not know whether they could use the MACs to enter the data, because the terminals at the secondary level were not PCs but rather dumb terminals. Ms. McGuire added that they were looking to see what could be downloaded so that the counselors did not have to do data entry. Mr. Sims asked whether a special person was required to do data entry because of the confidentiality of the material. Ms. McGuire replied that the data entry would have to be done by school personnel rather than volunteers.

Mr. Sims noted that in March they had had a discussion on conflict resolution and peer mediation. Sligo and Whitman had successful peer mediation programs which were very different. Other schools had programs tailored around the needs of their students, and he wondered if they had discussed this. Ms. McGuire replied that they would be making a presentation to the Board on peer mediation. They trained on the basic concepts of peer mediation, but each school developed their own model. Mr. Sims asked about accountability beyond that school. Ms. McGuire replied that her staff of four had been working with schools to get programs set up. She hoped that within the next five years every school would have a program. Dr. Vance suggested that they hold this discussion until the May 5 presentation when they could have more specifics.

Dr. Cheung asked if counselors at the secondary level were helping students to develop a portfolio similar to a résumé. He suggested that they needed to look at building records of performance starting at grade nine. This was an extension of his interest in building automated student records which would decrease paperwork. He said it would be nice if each counselor had a notebook computer to talk into to reduce paperwork and clerical help. Ms. McGuire commented that counselors were ready for computers if the Board could provide them. She had been working with Maryland Employment and for work-bound students they would be able to send disks twice a week with job opportunities in a seven-state radius. However, MCPS did not have space on computers in the career centers to receive this information.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that the Board would be looking at a technology plan, and she hoped the plan would include places where they needed to add computers to reduce paperwork and increase productivity. Ms. Gutierrez asked the superintendent if he could provide specifics of the more immediate needs for printers and increased computer capabilities. She was concerned about the counseling services to the Limited English Proficient students and their parents. She hoped that the committee would put this on their agenda and do an assessment of how well MCPS was doing this and what additional services were needed. In the Hispanic community there was a concern about the parents not understanding the rules of MCPS particularly regarding weapons. Ms. Schervish replied that in some PTSA newsletters announcements were being printed in English and Spanish. She shared the concern expressed by Ms. Gutierrez.

Dr. Vance suggested that the committee do some outreach. The reality was that the Board did not control the purse strings, and there was a possibility of a \$4 million reduction in the Board's budget. If this happened, the Board would have to look at schools and services including ratios for psychologists, counselors, and PPWs. He suggested that they talk to the Council and share their report with them.

Dr. Cheung thanked the committee for their report.

Re: POLICY ON QUALITY INTEGRATED
EDUCATION

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Mrs. Gordon seconded the following:

Resolved, That the following policy on Quality Integrated Education be put on the table:

Quality Integrated Education

A. PURPOSE

1. The Board of Education's primary responsibility is to provide the opportunity for each student to obtain a high quality education and to encourage each student to work toward that objective to the maximum of his or her abilities.
2. Another important goal of the Board is to ensure that all students and staff have experiences and develop greater skills and increased sensitivity in working with others of diverse backgrounds so that they may function well as members of our pluralistic democratic society. The Board will continue to adhere to its commitment to racial and ethnic diversity in staffing

in all schools.

3. This policy statement sets forth a design for achieving the combination of these two related goals -- quality education and integrated education -- while operating the schools as economically as possible.
4. The Board of Education is committed to the proposition that education is most effective in a diverse, integrated setting, and that therefore a major purpose of this policy is to provide a framework for actions designed to promote diversity so that the isolation of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups is avoided and the full benefits of integration are achieved.

B. ISSUE

The student population in the Montgomery County Public Schools has become increasingly diverse, as the proportion of non-white students has increased. Further, the numbers of students who require specialized assistance because they lack English or adequate educational preparation have increased dramatically. The school system must respond to the needs of these children, and must do so in a setting which does not isolate them, stereotype them, or fail to educate them effectively. This education of these students is a great challenge, one to which the school system must respond with creativity, with determination and with carefully crafted educational strategies that will meet every student's need for success. The integrated settings in which this must occur must not be left to chance, but must be created and supported by MCPS.

Quality educational opportunities for children cannot be dependent on either racial or ethnic backgrounds or on family, or on socioeconomic status. Intensive support is necessary, however, for students whose opportunities have been limited by background or experience. Providing a quality education where there is evidence of educational disadvantage requires additional effort on the part of the school system.

Among the many factors influencing students' academic achievement, some are more directly under the control of the school system and others are more directly related to family and community conditions. The latter may include parental support for education and learning, economic resources, individual talents, community demographic conditions affecting mobility, employment opportunities, or cultural resources. The factors more directly under control of the schools include varieties of teaching strategies, application of appropriate classroom technologies, staff

training, staff preparation, professional renewal, classroom support personnel, and other administrative and material resources.

Integrated schooling has inherent educational value from the standpoint of education's role in a democratic society. The survival and vigor of democracy depends upon an educated citizenry with shared concerns about the welfare of society, its members, and the democratic principles that govern it. Diversity brings different viewpoints and experiences to classroom discussions and thereby enhances the educational process. It also fosters racial and cultural understanding which is particularly important in a racially and culturally diverse society such as ours. In addition, research shows that integrated education expands postsecondary opportunities for diverse populations.

This school system is fortunate to have the pluralism brought by the African American, American Indian, Asian American, Hispanic, and White communities in our county and by the multi-ethnic groups within each. Some factors contributing to this diversity in the schools are under the control of the administration and other, more powerful, factors are due to community demographic conditions. The school system's diversity reflects the increasing pluralism of the U.S. society and emphasizes the broader need for international awareness and cooperation. Diversity is thus a valuable resource for teaching students to become citizens in a multi-racial/multi-ethnic world.

Therefore, a policy that supports quality education for integration of all students will have a positive effect on our students who will live and work together in a culturally diverse society.

C. POSITION

1. Supporting Academic Achievement

a) Identifying Schools

The method for identification of schools most in need of support to improve academic achievement and for allocating supplementary resources to support quality education involves the following factors:

- (1) Educational load
 - a) Free and Reduced Meals (FARMS)
 - b) Students older than grade age
 - c) Internal mobility
 - d) External mobility

- e) Students with limited English proficiency
- f) Other factors which may affect learning

(2) Academic Achievement Levels

Staff will utilize the following indicators of academic achievement levels and may use others as it examines the levels of academic achievement in schools throughout the county:

Montgomery County Public Schools Criterion Referenced Tests, MSPAP results, and the percentage of students who qualify for Algebra I in ninth grade.

(3) Analysis of schools

Staff will analyze school needs based on educational load and achievement levels, among other appropriate factors

b) Strengthening Schools

Based on the analysis described above, the need for action will be identified and recommended to the Board, and appropriate resources should be allocated to assist those schools in delivering educational services that reinforce the academic opportunities for students there.

2. Supporting Diversity

a) Identifying Schools

Staff will assess annually the "diversity profile" of each school, which should take into account the following factors:

(1) Composition

The extent to which the school differs from the school system's overall composition with respect to each of the four major racial/ethnic groups

(2) Rate of Change

The rate of change in those four racial/ethnic compositions within the school over the past several years, using four years

as the initial factor

(3) Analysis of Schools

Based on the diversity profile and such other factors as are appropriate, the staff will prioritize the school's need for administrative attention based on these factors.

b) Strengthening Schools

(1) The Board of Education is committed to taking reasonable measures to enhance the diversity of the student enrollments within each school. Such measures include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Monitoring and regulating interschool transfer requests from parents
- (b) Planning for balanced school populations when facility space needs require change in service areas, including consideration of socioeconomic diversity
- (c) Considering acquisition of school sites that have potential to maintain or improve diversity, including socioeconomic diversity
- (d) Pairing, clustering, and creating consortia of schools
- (e) Implementing magnet and special programs

(2) The Board of Education will direct the superintendent to take measures to implement program strategies for increasing the opportunities for students to develop multicultural understanding and appreciation through the interaction with others of different races and ethnic groups. Such program alternatives can include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Curricular or extracurricular offerings
- (b) Joint school activities
- (c) Other activities designed to help

students function in a multi-racial/multi-ethnic society.

- (3) The Board of Education will direct the superintendent to implement one or more of such remedies in schools whose profiles warrant a need for increased diversity or for preserving diversity in the student body

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

The Board of Education is committed to providing quality educational opportunities for all students regardless of background characteristics by providing an educational environment that enhances their educational success. The Board of Education is also committed to the provision of integrated settings for education that promote understanding of diversity, tolerance, and fair play, so that the tenets of a democratic society are reinforced by what students experience in school. Further, the Board of Education expects that the result of this policy will be that resources are allocated to meet the challenges of educating a diverse population with steadily greater success.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. The superintendent will recommend to the Board of Education, as appropriate, actions that implement this policy and his recommendations will be based on these three factors below:
 - a) Staff will examine annually the various factors that correlate with achievement levels that represent a school's educational load.
 - b) Staff will assess annually the diversity profile of each school.
 - c) Based on the diversity profile and other factors that are appropriate, staff will prioritize the school's need for administrative attention.
2. The Board will advise the Montgomery County Planning Board, County Council, county executive, and other appropriate state, county, and municipal agencies of any governmental policies or practices which have or could have a beneficial or adverse impact on maintaining quality integrated education in the schools. The public schools alone cannot assure quality integrated education for all students. Other agencies, both public and private, must assume

leadership to bring about greater opportunities for all persons to become part of our community fabric.

3. The Board commits itself to seek concerted action by all state, county, and municipal agencies and groups to help achieve the goals of this policy. It calls upon all citizens to join it in urging other agencies to work toward achieving quality integrated education in all public schools.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. The superintendent will present the Board of Education with an annual report that defines each school's educational load and diversity profile, reports progress toward achieving the desired outcomes of this policy, and contains appropriate recommendations for further actions designed to achieve those outcomes.
2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Dr. Cheung indicated that if the Board did not take action on the policy this evening they had the evening of Monday, May 17, for final action.

Dr. Vance stated that he had reviewed much of the testimony and comments they had received. As he looked through the testimony, it seemed to him that what was missing was the context in which the Board was compelled to discuss this. In 1976, MCPS was 85 percent white and 9 percent African American. Today it was 59 percent white, a drop of nearly one third, and the African American percentage had doubled to 18 percent. In 1976, when he came to the school system and when desegregation plans were first implemented, only nine schools had non-white populations of 40 percent or more. Today that 40 percent is the system-wide average. In 1976, the school system was essentially a bi-racial district. Today the mix was considerably different with rapidly growing percentages of Hispanic and Asian American students. He was saying this to set the context for the revised policy and its new terminology of diversity profiles and educational load. From his perspective, this was an exciting moment in the history of the school system when they could see changes taking place and when they could have an extremely positive impact on shaping these changes. He knew that in the years to come they would be back before the Board with more changes because the only thing they knew about the future was that it would be different and characterized by diversity.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that for some school systems, particularly in the South, when the white population decreased, African American population increased because white students were going to private schools. That was not occurring in Montgomery County.

What they were seeing was a reflection of the changes in their community, and the private school population has remained constant at about 20 percent for the last several years.

Mr. Ewing recalled that a number of people had taken issue with the term "isolation" and thought it was not clear. Isolate meant to set apart from others, to place alone. The verb "separate" is to set or put apart sections or groups. He used the word "separate" because there were school systems that were separate and said to be equal. This was found to be unconstitutional after Brown vs. Board of Education. He thought that isolation and separation in that sense were the same and were clear in the law. Brown vs. Board of Education stated that even if the resources were equal, separate was not equal. Typically in American schools those schools with isolated students had fewer resources. While they would never do that in Montgomery County, there was still a risk. Isolated students were often from families not as well educated or articulate. Therefore, they did not easily influence the outcomes of educational decisions and resource allocations. The Topeka schools were a major target of Brown vs. Board of Education, but the schools in Kansas were not by law segregated, but the students were isolated.

Mr. Ewing said that one of the reasons for this policy was to ensure that they took all reasonable precautions to make certain they did not allow isolation/separation to occur. Not because they were frightened by court suits, but because that sort of separation was destructive of effective education and human development. In a practical sense, it may not always be possible to assure some ideal distribution of students in a given class or a given school, but the nature of the policy was to say that this was their goal to move as close as possible to that objective. The Board had an obligation to explore its options and take appropriate actions to ensure that the separation did not occur.

That had been their rule, and it was their rule now. Over the years attorneys had told the Board this was what it needed to do.

Mr. Ewing commented that it was important for the Board to commit itself because they needed to continue to examine the issue. The problem was that it was easy for a great many people to ignore the problem in the hope that it would take care of itself in some fashion. The Board had to continue to pay attention and make sure the community was paying attention.

Mr. Ewing said there was a question on whether they meant classroom isolation or school isolation and what the percentages were. He said the answer was the presumption must always be that schools must not isolate or separate in either way, and that the

obligation was with a school system, with a school, and with a classroom teacher to explain that if there is isolation how it came to be and why it came to be and what the options are to reduce or eliminate it.

Mr. Ewing remarked that they had also heard that black colleges had been very successful, but they were not a black college. They were a suburban school district educating children K through 12. They were an urbanizing county, and urban school systems had gone steadily downhill in the last 30 to 40 years. Today urban school systems were educating students in increasingly separate settings, and they were far more unequal than they were 30 to 40 years ago. Did they believe it could never happen in Montgomery County? He had doubts that it could happen because he had great faith in the people of Montgomery County. At the same time, the policy was intended to put them on guard against that happening.

Mr. Ewing said that in the testimony there was impatience with the categories of students and a desire to see Montgomery County and the nation in terms of color-blindness. The trouble with that was they were not a color-blind society. In many ways, society was gripped by past and present racism and its consequences. Racism would not be addressed by ignoring it. The policy was designed to address that. He believed they had made progress educationally and socially, particularly in Montgomery County. However, he thought that nationally they had backslid in the education of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asian Americans. In Montgomery County they continued to make progress, but they had to call attention frequently to the need to continue to focus on this issue. There were real problems, and they had the threat of lack of resources for the future. As resources declined and as challenges increased, they could find themselves on the downhill spiral experienced by other urbanizing systems. He hoped that the Board would address itself to this policy in the spirit of making sure they had a bulwark against indifference to the consequences of ignoring this issue. The policy was an opportunity for them to take another step forward and change the way they looked at this issue without abandoning their prior commitments.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested that they spend their time discussing questions raised at the hearing. She also asked that Dr. Rohr explain why they had to take action on the QIE policy prior to considering the long-range facilities policy. Dr. Rohr replied that the long-range policy was based in part on the QIE policy and directed the superintendent and staff in working with the community on new schools and boundary changes. The Board would receive the policy in late May, take tentative action in June, have a public hearing in September, and take final action in late September prior to the adoption of the FY 1995 CIP.

While he had not attended the hearing, Dr. Cheung had read the

testimony and found people to be sincere and thoughtful. The majority did agree with the draft policy but suggested editorial changes. Others wanted to see the regulations and procedures which would be developed by staff after the Board approved the policy. Mrs. Fanconi said she agreed that many comments were editorial, but there was a real concern in the community about how the policy was going to be used. The community did not want the policy instituted until it was clear how the policy would be used. She would like to start with a discussion of how the baseline rate would be established and what deviation would indicate educational load and how many factors needed to be present to qualify a school for having an excessive educational load.

Dr. Mary Helen Smith reported that Dr. John Larson would explain how educational load would be used and Mr. Bruce Crispell would speak to the diversity profile. Ms. Gutierrez reported that a lot of the public was not aware of the presentations the Board had received. The challenge to the Board was to see how those concepts could be clarified within the policy.

Dr. Larson stated that the committee had prepared a sketch on how the concept would be implemented. It was a guide to action using educational load to allocate supplementary resources. They would first identify the correlates of school achievement and conditions in the school and community which appear related to the school's achievement level. These included free and reduced meals, internal mobility, external mobility, census data, and ESOL. They had dropped "older than grade age" because they found the proportion of students older than grade age had not changed from 1988 to 1992. It was no longer a correlate because of the changed promotion and retention policies, and older than grade age no longer signified what it used to.

It appeared to Mr. Abrams that educational load was socioeconomic and was a color-blind evaluation tool. Dr. Larson replied that it did bring in socioeconomic factors because the literature told them the conditions were related. The index did not involve any measures of color. It might relate to racial composition of schools as time went by, but it did not derive from the definition of these items. Identifying correlates of school achievement would be an on-going procedure, and from that they would compose a single index with the high correlates being heavily weighted in that composite. The schools would receive their educational load score, and then they would be rank ordered.

Dr. Larson stated that the committee felt it would be relevant to distinguish among schools with the highest education load factors, those schools which are showing achievement higher than might be expected, the schools scoring close to what would be expected, and those schools below the level of what they would

expect. These three categories might require different categories of supplementary funds. With respect to staffing, they would not propose that schools high in education load were deprived of staff even though they might be above the expected level of achievement. In looking at schools doing well, they might want to help the staff train themselves and others to spread promising practices. For schools under the expected level of achievement, there would be additional training.

Mr. Abrams pointed out that no training component was listed under "close to expected achievement," and there had been arguments that the average student was being neglected. He asked whether it could be read as following a similar analogy or was it that training was included in another category. Dr. Smith explained that with training they were trying to differentiate between looking at those schools with high load and high achievement. They wanted to train that staff to distill the practices that were successful, and they wanted to disseminate these beginning with the schools that were high and below expected achievement. The School Improvement Training Unit would be aware of this and using this as they helped schools develop school improvement management plans which included staff development.

Mrs. Brenneman thought the question had been raised in testimony about whether victory would be declared and the school left. For example, how long did the resources stay with the school or were the resources shifted. Dr. Larson replied that the cycle of activities would be subject to constant study, and at this point they did not have an answer to cut offs or the addition of funds. Dr. Smith added that the educational load would not change, but the results should. The schools with high loads needed attention that was different in many instances from schools without a high load. In other places and at other times, resources were put in and pulled out once the school achieved well instead of looking at the factors the school was working with in order to be able to have achievement above their expected level.

Mr. Abrams commented that the focus of the discussion had been on the ranking of the school educational load and assuming that was static. Then they looked at performance outcomes, but the reality was this would differ. They would have schools moving in and out on the educational load factor as well. He asked whether the same kind of distribution would be present where their educational load factors brought them into a different category as well. Schools might move in and out of socioeconomic, and there would be variations of performance at different levels of socioeconomic profiles. In addition, other things would lead them toward resource allocations. Dr. Smith replied that this would be a constant review process and dissemination of what they had learned. It would be an iterative process that went on all year.

Dr. Larson said he had another slide to illustrate what they had sketched out. On the slide they had shown an education load composite computed for spring 1992 on the elementary schools. They ranged up to 70 percent down toward zero. He had used the CRTs, and this showed the correlation line they had found in the past. For the purposes of this slide, they had estimated the number of schools currently receiving QIE resources which was about 35 elementary schools. They moved down the scale until they reached about 35 schools which established their cut score.

The slide also indicated the expected achievement level. They had identified schools with high levels of achievement at the same level of load as others. For example, one school was way above the line and other schools were markedly below the line. They would use this information to make better distribution of resources. There would be no baseline of education load fixed beyond which a school was entitled to X-dollars on a pro-rated basis. This was a plan of action and a guide for procedures to describe what was out there and to locate the schools that might need more help.

Mr. Crispell showed the Board an example of a boundary change a year ago. They showed the enrollment level that would result from the recommendation compared to the capacity of the school, and they also showed the current situation with the recommended situation. They also showed current minority percentage and the new minority percentage based on the recommendation. With the new process they would show the current and new levels in each of the race and ethnic groups and provide the countywide average for each group. They would have to look at the current situation in the schools being relieved by a boundary change to get a sense of each racial and ethnic group present. With the diversity profile they were stressing movement toward or away from the countywide average. The significance of those numbers and the movement would still be a judgment call, but they would be looking at options that balanced the race and ethnic groups given the context of the current composition of the school.

Mr. Abrams asked how difficult it would be to add socioeconomic considerations to the format. Mr. Crispell replied that in terms of secondary boundary changes they had been providing information on the effect on the free and reduced meal participation level. Mr. Abrams commented that the educational load data could be broken down to the census block data. He asked why there wasn't some sort of consistency of the two. Mr. Crispell replied that the educational load and the diversity profile were two separate indicators. The educational load did not fit in as did the diversity factor; however, the input variables going into educational load were factors that the Board considered for continuance in the long-range policy. Mr. Abrams was concerned about a very narrow definition of diversity, and he was asked whether they could include socioeconomic as one of the diversity

factors. Mr. Crispell replied that they probably were agreeing, but they were using different terms. The diversity concept had been tied to race and ethnic profile in the QIE policy. Mr. Abrams understood that, but he thought it might be erroneous and that they should be pursuing a broadened definition of diversity to include socioeconomic. Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that the long-range planning policy did include socioeconomic and mobility factors.

Dr. Smith explained that when they looked at data on boundary decisions they currently received FARMS data as well as mobility rates. As they got more sophisticated with the census data, they would be able to provide the information Mr. Abrams was suggesting. It was not part of the diversity profile in QIE, but they could provide it in the long-range facilities policy. Mr. Abrams asked if they could move to a more relevant diversity profile. Dr. Smith reported that after earlier discussions they ended up staying with the four racial and ethnic groups. In terms of the long-range facilities policy, Mr. Crispell said it would contain language about balancing school enrollment and would include all the factors generally referred to as diversity.

In reference to Mrs. Brenneman's question on transfers, Dr. Smith stated that currently they had a policy which allowed for as much flexibility as possible using the current QIE policy with minority enrollment as a guideline as well as utilization of the building itself. Looking at the four separate racial and ethnic groups, the decisions would be made separately rather than on majority/minority ratios. They were currently making some decisions by grade level in buildings. The more data they had, the better decisions they would make.

It seemed to Ms. Gutierrez that they were trying to limit the focus on those things that would indicate segregation. Dr. Maree Sneed stated that she would state it in another way. The Board would be trying to promote racial and ethnic diversity which was the flip side.

Ms. Judy Bresler commented that the policy was a policy statement in a broad sense in terms of promoting diversity and looking at factors influencing educational achievement as a way of allocating resources because of the two-pronged focus: quality education and integrated education. These were intertwined in terms of the education the county wanted to offer. The implementation of the concepts set forth in this policy played out in a number of other ways. One of the ways was through the transfer policy, and one of the ways was through the long-range educational facilities planning policy. The concern she had in looking at a more detailed measure of evaluating socioeconomic diversity as a part of this policy was that right now this became the guiding principles for the transfer policy. While it was easy to look at an individual child and his or her relationship

to race, this same kind of thing did not go with socioeconomics.

The Board came to the consensus of mentioning it as a statement of policy and have the definition and implementation of it through the long-range policy where they were dealing with blocks and groups of populations rather than the individual child.

Mr. Abrams remarked that the alternative of dealing with that was to limit the application of the transfer aspects within QIE to the racial and ethnic diversity, but they would still have QIE when they were talking of a broader definition of diversity. It seemed to Ms. Bresler that they would want the source document to be the broader one and have the application documents to be more narrow. It could be included here and be limited through the wording of the policy.

In regard to boundaries, Mrs. Gordon stated that under the current QIE policy they did not deliberately establish a school 20 percent or below the county average. She asked if they had looked at how educational load would play out. For example, they would not want to establish a new school with a significantly high educational load. Mr. Crispell replied that they would discuss this issue with the long-range policy. It was their thinking that educational load would not be used as minority balance was. They would not be evaluating a boundary change comparing current educational load and new, for example. They would in a sense capture those characteristics because they did talk about socioeconomics, census data, etc. Mrs. Gordon hoped that some direction would be given to communities that they did not want to establish schools with high educational loads.

Mrs. Gordon asked whether they would changed recent boundary changes if they had used the new criteria. Mr. Crispell explained that they had already been using these factors in terms of socioeconomics. What was new would be the representation of the four race/ethnic groups.

Mr. Ewing asked staff to respond to questions raised by Mrs. Steinberg in the Blair Cluster testimony. There was one important question - who implements, who monitors, and who reports with regard to the policy. Mrs. Fanconi thought they should have answers in writing when they returned to this topic.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether they would be looking at the last three year averages. Mr. Crispell replied that they would have a technical problem with elementary school boundary changes. They did not have a history of neighborhoods over the years, and they were not tracking race/ethnic composition in every neighborhood.

The lowest level for this data would be the elementary school service area, but at the secondary level they would have more information on rate of change.

Dr. Cheung thanked staff for their explanations and discussion.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Procedures for Supporting Community Sponsored Events
2. Challenge Grant Waiver

RESOLUTION NO. 350-93 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw