

RESOLUTION NO. 217-86 Re: A SUBSTITUTE MOTION TO AMEND THE
REVISED EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
PLANNING POLICY (FAA)

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

RESOLVED, That the Revised Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy (FAA) be amended to add "Further, the superintendent will determine if any school's enrollment is inconsistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education." after the second sentence in Paragraph 2 of B. Six-year Capital Improvements Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 218-86 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE REVISED
LONG-RANGE
FACILITIES PLANNING POLICY (FAA)

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

RESOLVED, That the Revised Long-range Facilities Planning Policy (FAA) be amended to add "It will contain a description of how its recommendations address the goals and objectives of this policy." as the second sentence in II. Definitions and Specifications. C. Capital Budget.

Dr. Cronin rejoined the Board at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 219-86 Re: TENTATIVE APPROVAL OF A REVISED
LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
PLANNING POLICY (FAA)

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Mr. Foubert, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, (Mr. Foubert), Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner abstaining:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education recognizes that its existing Long-range Educational Facilities Planning policy is deficient in that it prescribes times for annual facility plan updates that are not congruent with the capital budget process; is primarily oriented to school closings and consolidations; does not conform to recent State Board of Education regulations concerning school closing processes; and is based on a concept of five-year major revisions and minimal annual updates which recent events have shown to be unrealistic; and

WHEREAS, The Board seeks to develop a policy that:

- o Recognizes that there are likely to be few, if any, school closings over the next 10 years and that enrollment growth and change will stimulate most facility decisions at least

into the early 1990s

- o Recognizes that many facility planning decisions to accommodate growth and change will be implemented through the Six-year Capital Improvements Program and annual capital budgets
- o Eases the burden of facilities decision-making on both the Board of Education and the community by creating a more flexible process to seek solutions which depend on capital projects, relocatable classrooms, boundary changes or other solutions.
- o Modifies the facilities planning process to:
 - a. Identify future facilities problems and encourage communities to participate in developing priorities, concerns and potential solutions prior to any recommendations from the superintendent
 - b. Promote widespread dissemination and understanding of a Board of Education Comprehensive Long-range Master Plan for Educational Facilities which summarizes past facilities actions and projects future enrollments based on those actions
 - c. Result in superintendent recommendations that take cognizance of informed community discussions and input
 - d. Result in Board of Education decisions that will ensure, whenever possible, the availability of facilities as or before they are needed, thereby ensuring equity for the maximum number of students
 - e. Separate the procedures and requirements for school closing/consolidation from that for other facilities decisions

and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education discussed Concepts for a Long-range Facility Planning Policy/Process on February 27, and proposed revisions of the Long-range Educational Facilities Planning Policy on March 11, 24, and April 15; and

WHEREAS, Changes have been made to conform this policy to recommendations from Board members and interested citizens; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education gives tentative approval to the following Long-range Educational Facilities Planing Policy:

TENTATIVE ADOPTED POLICY REVISION

Related Entries: FAA-EA, JEE, JEE-RA

LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

I. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A. Goals

The primary goal of this policy is to provide guidelines that enable the Montgomery County Public Schools to address changing enrollment patterns and to provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost.

A second goal is to promote public understanding of the Board's Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities and the process by which facilities decisions are made, and to encourage communities, local government agencies and municipalities to identify and communicate to the Board and superintendent their priorities and concerns for resolving facilities issues.

B. Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to:

1. Address changing enrollment patterns.
2. Provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost.
3. Provide permanent classrooms to accommodate long-term enrollment trends and to promote continuity and stability of the K-12 program. This requires projections, and when possible advance construction of new classrooms to keep pace with or precede residential development, using relocatables only as temporary measures.
4. Provide services and resources fairly and equitably so that all students, including those in special education, are offered appropriate and high quality educational programs. Provide equal access to programs that are intended to serve students from an entire area or countywide.
5. Evaluate the impact of facility changes on educational programs and on the community.
6. Utilize schools in ways that are consistent with sound educational practice.
7. Organize high schools for grades 9-12, and to the extent possible, create clusters composed of one high school, one

intermediate-level school and several elementary schools, each of which should send all students, including special education students, to the next higher level school in the cluster.

8. Provide opportunities for all students in accordance with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education.

9. Provide space to accommodate regular students and those with special needs with regard to where they live, anticipating and providing for growth of both special and regular students.

10. Provide adequate school space to accommodate future improvements in educational programs and services to the extent these can be anticipated (i.e., all-day kindergarten, prekindergarten, lower pupil-teacher ratios).

11. Recognize that older school buildings must be renovated to continue their use on a cost-effective basis and that modernization to current educational program standards is necessary to maintain program quality for students in older schools. Recognize that capital expenditures promote educational effectiveness and equity, and that quality facilities and programs reap broad community and economic benefits.

12. In building new schools and additions, anticipate the possibility of enrollment declines as well as increases. Consider the proximity of one school to another, capacity and potential for expansion or reduction through modular construction, and future alternative uses of space through joint occupancy and availability of community facilities.

II. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

A. BUILDING CAPACITY is the maximum number of MCPS regular and special needs students that can be accommodated in a building based on current program requirements and staffing ratios in the current operating budget. Space currently used by joint occupants or MCPS programs that could be relocated to other facilities is included in building capacity.

B. BUILDING UTILIZATION is a percentage derived by dividing a school's actual and projected enrollments by its existing or projected building capacity or by its current program capacity.

C. CAPITAL BUDGET is the compilation of recommended school site purchases, new school construction, additions, modernizations, relocatable classrooms, or other capital additions and improvements considered annually by the Board of Education and Montgomery County Council for the following fiscal year. It will contain a description of how its recommendations address the goals and objectives of this policy.

D. CAPITAL PROJECT is a project contained in a capital budget or proposed for one of the subsequent fiscal years in a

Six-year Capital Improvements Program.

E. CIVIC GROUPS are local organizations, including civic associations registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

F. CLUSTER of schools is one high school, and the intermediate-level and elementary schools that send students to it.

G. COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES is prepared by the superintendent each year on or about June 1.

1. For each high school cluster the plan will show:

a) Each school's current and projected total enrollment, current program and building capacities, and utilization for the next six years, and for the 10th and 15th years, based on projections made the previous September, and the changes in enrollment or building capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of its publication;

b) The regular student population residing in the school service area and those who have transferred in from other school attendance areas; minority student enrollment; special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, area gifted and talented, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter I); and

c) Any school that fails to meet one or more of the screening criteria for enrollment, utilization and attendance patterns based on projects for the next six years.

H. COUNTYWIDE ORGANIZATIONS are those with members throughout the county, including such organizations as the League of Women Voters, Allied Civic Group, Montgomery County Civic Federation, etc.

I. CRITERIA AND DESIRED STANDARDS that shall be applied to each school annually are:

1. Minimum enrollment. Minimum enrollments for schools are:

(a) No fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served;

(b) At least 500 regular students in two-grade intermediate schools and 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools; and

(c) At least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school.

2. Desired enrollment. Desired enrollments for schools, provided they have the building capacity to accommodate it, are:

(a) Two or more regular classes per grade in an elementary school;

(b) An average of 250 to 300 regular students or more per grade in middle/intermediate schools; and

(c) An average of 300 to 400 regular students or more per grade in high schools.

3. Utilization. Each school's actual and projected utilization should be between 70 and 90 percent of building capacity. Less than 70 percent denotes underutilization; more than 90 percent denotes overutilization.

J. CURRENT PROGRAM CAPACITY is the number of regular and special education students that can be accommodated in a school based on current program requirements and staffing allocations in the most recently adopted operating budget. Current program capacity also includes current uses of classrooms for other MCPS purposes including elementary classrooms for Head Start, early childhood, and for joint occupants, primarily day care.

K. ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS for each school are prepared under the superintendent's direction annually in September, based on the school's current total enrollment, past enrollment and housing occupancy patterns, information on new housing, and other relevant program and demographic factors. MCPS enrollment forecasts should be consistent with population forecasts of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

L. SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) is an annual document required by Section 5-306 of the Education Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, and Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter.

1. These laws require this document to include:

(a) A statement of the objectives of the capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county;

(b) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule;

(c) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources; and

(d) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized.

2. In addition, the Six-year CIP shall include:

(a) Background information on the methodology of enrollment projections;

(b) Current enrollment figures from all schools, and projections from these for the next six years, plus the 10th and 15th years, and the resulting building utilization. If a school's building capacity and current program capacity are different, both will be shown.

(c) A list of the schools identified in the Comprehensive Master Facilities Plan which fail the criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years; and

(d) The superintendent's recommendations concerning each school which fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards.

M. TOTAL ENROLLMENT is the number of MCPS students in a school who are enrolled in early childhood through grade 12 and special education programs.

III. PROCESS

A. Community priorities and concerns

1. Each spring the superintendent will review all Board of Education facility decisions and capital budget requests and determine the extent to which these are projected to bring each school into compliance with the criteria and desired enrollment standards. For schools that are projected not to comply with these criteria and standards during the next six years, the superintendent will notify in writing:

(a) The area associate superintendent, principal, PTA president, and in secondary schools, the student government association president;

(b) The Montgomery County Council of Parent Teacher Associations (MCCPTA) cluster coordinator and area vice president;

(c) Appropriate local government agencies, municipalities and civic groups. The superintendent will advise these groups that clusters may be discussing possible facilities changes and suggest that, if interested, the organization should contact the appropriate cluster coordinator for involvement.

2. Following the superintendent's notifications, the area associate superintendent will initiate meetings between appropriate school, area, and Department of Educational Facilities Planning and Capital Programming staff and community

representatives convened by MCCPTA cluster coordinators.

3. These and subsequent meetings of citizens convened by cluster coordinators should involve representatives from each cluster school, representatives from adjacent clusters when appropriate, and area office personnel as resources, for the purpose of:

(a) Sharing pertinent information about a school's lack of compliance with criteria and desired standards, focusing primarily on compliance within the next three years;

(b) Discussing feasible school program and facility alternatives that have the potential for enabling each school to meet criteria and desired standards; and

(c) Identifying concerns and priorities for seeking solutions for each cluster school that fails to comply with criteria and desired standards, especially during the next three years.

4. On or before June 1, following County Council action on the Capital Budget, the superintendent will publish the Comprehensive Master Plan for Educational Facilities and make copies available to the public.

5. By July 1, cluster representative should state in writing to the superintendent any solutions, priorities or concerns that the cluster has identified for its schools. By July 15, area associate superintendents will review and comment to the superintendent on cluster reports from the area. The cluster may amend its views by September 15 if school officials notify cluster representatives that a school's fall enrollment differed greatly from earlier projections.

6. Early in October, the superintendent will hold a public work session with the Board of Education to review new school enrollments and projections, and to inform and discuss with the Board cluster priorities and concerns about potential facility solutions.

B. Six-year Capital Improvements Program

1. On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish a proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups, student government associations and other interested groups of its publication, and will send copies of the proposed CIP for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, County Council, County Government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MCR) and Montgomery County Junior Council (MCJC).

2. Using September school enrollments, and revised total enrollment and building utilization projections for the next six years, and the 10th and 15th years, the superintendent will determine if any schools fail to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards during the next six years. Further, the superintendent will determine if any school's enrollment is inconsistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education. For each of these schools, the superintendent will make a recommendation in the Six-year CIP.

3. For each school that fails to meet criteria and desired enrollment standards, the superintendent will recommend:

(a) A project in the next fiscal year's Capital Budget;

(b) A capital project in the subsequent five years that is covered by the Six-year CIP;

(c) A solution such as a boundary change, grade level reorganization, closing/consolidation, or other similar solution which does not necessarily involve a capital project; or

(d) No action, or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors.

4. During the first week of November, the Board will hold a work session at which members may propose alternative solutions.

If any Board-member alternatives are proposed, the superintendent will develop data on them as soon as possible and communicate that data to the Board and to interested citizens.

C. Board of Education Public Hearing

1. On or about the third Monday in November, the Board of Education will hold a public hearing(s) at which municipalities, countywide organizations and communities may express viewpoints concerning the superintendent's recommendations and any Board-member alternatives.

2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak at the hearing should contact the PTA cluster coordinator, who will coordinate all testimony at the hearing on behalf of the cluster schools. Municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. Written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action, or as otherwise determined by the Board.

3. The county executive and County Council may participate with the Board in the parts of these hearings that relate to state-funded capital projects to fulfill State requirements. If State school construction funding lags far behind the county's immediate needs, however, the Board, with the concurrence of the Council and county executive, may submit to the State the list of

capital projects eligible for state funding which all three bodies approved for the current fiscal year.

D. Board Action

On or about the fourth Monday in November, the Board of Education will act on the superintendent's proposed Six-year Capital Improvements Program. If more information is needed on any proposal, or there are issues which cannot be resolved satisfactorily at this time, the Board may defer action until a later date.

E. Deferred Proposals

If the Board has deferred action on any proposals in the superintendent's Six-year CIP, on or about the first Monday in February the superintendent will present these proposals again, or alternatives that have been requested by the Board of proposals that are based on additional discussions with community representatives.

F. Optional Public Hearing

If, in the Board's opinion, any proposals contain substantial changes from those deferred from November, the Board will accept comment and hold a public hearing on these recommendations during the last week of February.

G. Additional Board Facilities Decisions

On or before March 15, the Board of Education will act on any deferred proposals.

IV. SCHOOL CLOSINGS/CONSOLIDATIONS

A. Superintendent's Study and Preliminary Plan

1. In the event that the superintendent determines that it may be advisable to close a school, he shall, in addition to preparing other data required by this policy, present the following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed school closing:

a. Regular student population residing in the service area and those who have transferred from outside the school's attendance area;

b. Minority student enrollment;

c. Special programs (defined as level 3, 4, and 5 special education programs, ESOL, Head Start and Chapter 1);

d. A review of each school's location and site characteristics;

e. Building characteristics, including any modifications for special programs;

f. Needed renovations or additions, including the most recent school plant rating;

g. Operating costs;

h. Feeder patterns; and

i. Percentage of students transported.

2. This data is to be sent to each affected school's principal who will review the data with community representatives. Any discrepancies are to be reported to the superintendent.

3. The superintendent shall apply the screening criteria listed below to each school to determine which, if any, it does not meet, or is projected not to meet, during the next five years. Schools not meeting one or more of the criteria will be examined as a first step toward any kind of change.

4. In addition to closing/consolidation, other changes may be necessary, such as boundary adjustments, building additions or new schools, relocating area and countywide special programs, establishing magnet schools or centers, or clustering schools. Every school potentially affected by a proposed closing will be included in the process of seeking solutions to problems, even if it meets all screening criteria. Any recommendation or action should increase the number of screening criteria which each school meets.

5. The screening criteria and desired standards that shall be applied each year are the following:

a) Minimum enrollment. There should be no fewer than 200 students enrolled in the regular program in an elementary school, regardless of the number of grades served. There should be at least 500 students in two-grade intermediate schools, 600 students in three-grade intermediate schools and at least 1,000 students in the regular program in a high school. Schools that fail to meet these minimum enrollment standards will be identified for further study.

b) Utilization. The actual and projected utilization of a school (the enrollment divided by current enrollment capacity) should be between 70 and 90 percent. Less than 70 percent denotes underutilization; more than 90 percent denotes overutilization. Schools that have utilization below 70 percent or above 90 percent will be identified for further study.

c) Need for modernization or addition. If a school is

in unsatisfactory condition as indicated by a building evaluation, and, therefore, in need of major capital improvements and/or its average age will be more than 25 years during the five-year period of the revision, it will be identified for further study.

d) Majority/minority enrollment. In accordance with the Quality Integrated Education Policy, when a school's majority/minority student population differs from the countywide average by 20 or more percentage points the school will be identified for further study.

e) Attendance patterns. Schools that deviate from the preferred attendance pattern (see I.B.7) will be identified for further study.

6. The superintendent shall study each school potentially affected by a proposed closing that does not meet one or more of the screening criteria above. In studying and recommending solutions to changing enrollment problems, the superintendent shall consider the data and apply the following guidelines:

a) Begin with high schools, moving to intermediate level schools, with elementary schools considered last. High schools in a geographic area may be studied together. Decisions about a school or schools at a higher level become planning parameters for decisions about schools at the next lower level.

b) Consider each screening criterion for every school

c) Consider changes in existing school boundaries or feeder patterns.

d) Consider needs of special students and programs for them in each school and in relation to area and countywide special programs.

e) Consider a variety of options in response to conditions that require change.

f) Consider long-range needs including retention or disposal of future school sites.

g) Allow for phased implementation of the total plan.

h) Reassign the student body to a single school or to the fewest possible schools when a school closing is recommended.

7. The superintendent shall develop a recommendation for each school studied, which may include no change. Recommendations for change should attempt to achieve:

a) Desired enrollments of two or more classes per grade in an elementary school, an average of 250 to 300 students or

more per grade in middle/intermediate schools, and an average of 300 to 400 students or more per grade in high schools, so long as the school has sufficient capacity to accommodate this enrollment.

b) Utilization between 70 and 90 percent of current capacity

c) Prudent capital improvements

d) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education

e) Elimination of split attendance patterns wherever reasonable

f) Prudent operating and capital costs, including bonded indebtedness

g) The greatest number of students being able to walk to school. Those who are bused should be transported the shortest possible distance, except when long distances are required to address racial or ethnic isolation.

h) A solution consistent with the Board policy on Education of Handicapped Children. Accommodation for special programs and students should be provided using the same considerations as for regular programs and students (e.g., stability, adequate facilities, reasonable transportation requirements) and placement of special students in the least restrictive appropriate setting.

i) Facilities that will accommodate the educational program of affected schools, such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, specialized vocational spaces and the impact on existing educational programs. Previous Board-adopted changes affecting students are to be considered, e.g., school consolidations, program relocations, boundary changes, and grade level reorganizations.

j) The impact on affected communities including prior consolidations and closings, existing day care services, community use of schools, and availability of other community resources.

k) The potential of a facility for alternate use. Where appropriate, comparative analyses of the potential for alternative uses should be furnished.

8. By November 1, the superintendent shall present to the Board of Education recommendations concerning any school closing, identifying and examining each problem caused by changing enrollment, and recommended actions. The recommendation should be viable for at least five years. The superintendent's

recommendations should be sent to the Board before being presented to the public.

9. The superintendent shall send copies of his recommendations for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA, MCR, and MCJC. The superintendent shall notify each PTA/PTSA, civic association, student government association, and other school/community organizations that the recommendations are available for review and comment and will be provided upon request.

B. Community Reactions to the Superintendent's Recommendations

The community's role in the process shall be as follows:

1. Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.

2. If an individual or community group wishes to develop an alternative proposal affecting its school and others in the area, it should involve representatives of all school communities affected by the recommendations or make efforts to secure such representation. Any community plans should be sent to the superintendent within two months after the recommendations are distributed.

C. Formal Recommendations/Board Alternatives

1. The superintendent shall develop formal recommendations after considering individual and community reactions and alternatives, and submit them to the Board of Education by February 1.

2. If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent's formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.

D. Hearing Process

1. The Board will hold public hearings or forums to receive and discuss citizens' reactions to the superintendent's formal recommendations and Board proposed alternatives and will determine the allocation of time for speakers at these hearings. The Board, in addition to other means of notifying interested citizens, will advertise the public hearing concerning a school closing in two county newspapers at least two weeks before the hearing date. The notice will include procedures to be followed in making the Board's final decision.

2. Interested citizens and groups wishing to speak should contact the PTA president of their community school who will coordinate testimony on behalf of the school at the hearing. Municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office. All written comments will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action or as otherwise determined by the Board. The Board should complete all hearings and forums during February.

E. Board of Education Action

1. In the event the Board votes to adopt a modification or alternative containing elements that differ substantially from those on which citizens have had an opportunity to comment, the decision shall be tentative and written comments shall be sought and considered prior to final action. Further, the Board reserves its right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if, in its sole discretion, it considers them desirable.

2. In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and each of the criteria for solution. The minutes of the Board meeting will reflect reasons for individual Board members' actions with reference to the criteria.

3. All decisions should be made by the Board no later than March 15.

4. Decisions on school closures shall be made and announced at least 90 days prior to their effective date, but not later than April 30 of any school year, except in emergency circumstances described below.

F. Emergency Circumstances

In the event the Board of Education determines that an emergency circumstance exists, the superintendent will establish a condensed time schedule for making recommendations to the Board, for scheduling hearings, and for Board action. An emergency circumstance is one where the decision to close a school because of unforeseen circumstances cannot be announced at least 90 days prior to its effective date or before April 30 of any school year. For any actions of this type, however, affected communities will be notified and given pertinent information at the earliest possible time. All criteria specified in this policy will apply, although on a time schedule shortened as necessary.

V. FEEDBACK INDICATORS

The Comprehensive Master Plan for Education Facilities that will be published annually in June by the superintendent will reflect all facilities actions taken during the year by the Board of Education, project the enrollment and utilization of each

school, and identify schools which fail to meet screening criteria.

Re: FINAL 1986 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

On behalf of the members of the Board of Education, Dr. Cronin thanked Mrs. Lois Stoner for the work she had done in Annapolis. Mrs. Stoner reported that the Board had taken a position on 52 bills, and of the 13 supported by the Board, five passed and eight failed. Of those bills that failed, the pay schedule bill was one of the biggest disappointments because it was next on SINE DIE. She noted that of the 12 bills opposed by the Board, ten had failed. The two that passed were the teen suicide demonstration program and the state aid for basic current expenses. Both of these had been opposed by the Board on procedural issues.

Mrs. Stoner stressed the importance of the Green Street Coalition because there was no way she could do her job without the assistance of her colleagues. She cited the help provided by Dr. Joseph Shilling, former deputy state superintendent, and the help provided by staff members Ed Masood, Stan Sirotkin, and Al Anderson. In particular, she thanked Mr. Fess for his help on the Board salary bill and Dr. Kenneth Muir. Dr. Muir called attention to the \$1 million error discovered by Mrs. Stoner who had been instrumental in getting this corrected.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 12:05 p.m. to 1:45 to discuss legal issues.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Lila Scott, Seven Locks PTA, appeared before the Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 220-86 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

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

WHEREAS, None of the seven bids received met specifications for Bid 107-86, Protocol Converters for Parallel ASCII Printers; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Bid 107-86 be rejected; and be it further

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as follows:

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACT
119-86	IBM 3380 BD4 Disk Drive IBM Corporation	\$ 37,849 (annual payment)
120-86	Processed Meats A. W. Schmidt and Son, Inc. Carroll County Foods Great Lakes Food Brokers TOTAL	\$ 17,042 8,415 930 \$ 26,387
121-86	Art Tools Chaselle, Inc. Graves Humphreys, Inc. TOTAL	\$111,479 750 \$112,229
162-86	Carpeting J. Frog, Ltd. d/b/a Carpet House GRAND TOTAL	\$ 29,190 \$205,655

RESOLUTION NO. 221-86 Re: LONGVIEW SCHOOL - BOILER REPLACEMENT

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 25, 1986, for boiler replacement at Longview School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Charles W. Lonas & Sons	\$23,300
2. J. E. Hurley Machine & Boiler Works	23,500
3. J. W. Cullop, Inc.	23,900
4. Holman Boiler Repair	27,990
5. M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	28,396
6. James Vito, Inc.	28,441
7. Murray Service Company	29,433
8. American Combustion, Inc.	33,273
9. Combustioneer	33,375

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Charles W. Lonas & Sons, has performed satisfactorily on other boiler projects for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$23,300 be awarded to Charles W. Lonas & Sons to accomplish boiler replacement at Longview School,

in accordance with plans and specifications covering this work dated March 11, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities in conjunction with Morton Wood, Jr., Engineer.

RESOLUTION NO. 222-86 Re: REDLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL (AREA 3) -
REROOFING

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 27, 1986, for the reroofing of Redland Middle School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$349,780
2. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	440,000
2. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	503,950

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed satisfactorily on other MCPS projects; and

WHEREAS, low bid is within staff estimate and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$349,780 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., to accomplish the reroofing project at Redland Middle School, in accordance with plans and specifications entitled, "Redland Middle School Reroofing," dated March 13, 1986, prepared by the Department of School Facilities, Division of Construction.

RESOLUTION NO. 223-86 Re: ASHBURTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 2)
ELEVATOR ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 27, 1986, for an elevator addition at Ashburton Elementary School, as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. C. M. Parker & Co., Inc.	\$108,856
2. Ernest R. Sines, Inc.	119,900
3. Hanlon Construction Co., Inc.	126,900

and

03	Instructional Other	3,295
07	Student Transportation	199
10	Fixed Charges	34

	TOTAL	\$4,561

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and a copy be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 228-86 Re: SUBMISSION OF AN FY 1986 GRANT PROPOSAL
TO INFORM AND TRAIN GRADES 7-12
SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SOCIETY
PROGRAM (STS) TEACHERS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to submit an FY 1986 grant proposal for approximately \$4,000 to the MSDE to conduct a conference on the STS approach for teachers and develop curricular materials, using the interdisciplinary approach to this subject.

RESOLUTION NO. 229-86 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Sandra L. Gaston	School Psychologist	School Psychologist
	Prince George's County BOE	Grade G
	Upper Marlboro, MD	Effective 7-1-86

RESOLUTION NO. 230-86 Re: TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENT FOR THE 1986-1987 SCHOOL YEAR

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

RESOLVED, That the following temporary reassignments for the 1986-1987 school year be approved:

NAME AND PRESENT POSITION	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1986	POSITION EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1987
---------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education submit information as directed by the Montgomery County Council with the following stipulations:

1. This list is not recommended by the Board of Education.
2. The Board's only budget recommendations for FY 1987 are those contained in the budget request agreed upon by the Board of Education on February 11, 1986, totalling \$476,510,120.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That upon request of the County Council, the Board has divided the information to be supplied into the following two groups, totalling \$18.9 million the size of which caused the Board to include items provided for by collective bargaining:

- o Group A, reductions totalling \$12.2 million, which would reduce the Board's request to a total of approximately \$464.3 million.
- o Group B, reductions totalling \$6.7 million, which together with Group A items would reduce the Board's request to a total of \$457.6 million.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board's rationale in developing the list is solely to comply with the law and the Board recognizes that it cannot support such a list because of its obligation to seek the funds necessary for providing appropriate educational opportunities for children and the collective bargaining requirement with the legally recognized employee organizations.

Re: UPDATE ON THE BUDGET PROCESS

Dr. Cronin thanked Mrs. DiFonzo for representing the Board at the education committee meeting. Dr. Cody reported that the committee's agenda consisted of looking at the county executive's denials. In Category 1, Administration, they sustained the executive's cut of about \$800,000 which would now go to the full Council. The committee went half way between the executive's denials and the Board's request for expansion of all day kindergarten. There was discussion of cable television and whether cuts should be made there. Dr. Cody said they also discussing transportation cuts versus the use of Ride On by students and the retired employees' benefit plan. Dr. Pitt added that in Category 1 the committee had argued that the Board's budget was too high, and in Category 2 the committee questioned whether MCPS had sufficient space to put in extra staff. Dr. Cody reported that at the moment the total cut was about \$3 million. Mr. Ewing suggested that the Board needed to think

about the arguments it would make before the full Council. He felt that they needed to be clearer about the purpose of administrators in the terms of their ability to deliver services to students.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing stated that he had given Board members a copy of a memo dated April 15. He said they failed a serious problem because clearly teacher salaries were not keeping pace with inflation, and other jurisdictions were now offering higher starting salaries for teachers. Consequently, Montgomery County would have a difficult time competing for new teachers and holding on to good teachers, and he thought they were facing a serious situation in the near future. He said that another dimension was the willingness of the public to support general increases in teacher salaries. He noted that the public wanted better accountability and a priority given to teacher evaluation. A third dimension had to do with the attractiveness of the teaching profession itself. This was a function of salary levels and the extent to which teachers saw the teaching profession as a profession. Professions were characterized by the opportunity to participate in solving problems and making decisions. He recalled that the Board had made a proposal to raise starting salaries to \$20,000 and adjust other salaries as well. This change would cost about \$2.7 million in the next fiscal year. He believed that the Board through negotiations with MCEA should attempt to achieve an additional 2 percent raise. The total cost of these increases would be \$7.5 million. He felt it was important for the Board to move ahead in the next two years with increases of 8 to 10 percent. It would take this to make Montgomery County an attractive place for teachers. He suggested that they had to look at evaluation and noted the RAND study on this issue showed that school systems with the best record in this area gave this a high priority. It was also important for them to change the way in which they worked with teachers. There was a need to find creative ways to enlist teachers in a professional way in addressing the difficult problems facing the school system. He emphasized that they needed to make salaries much more competitive, assure the public that they were making the school system accountable, and assure that teachers were treated as professionals. All of this involved negotiations, and he recognized this. He said that this was the first time in his nearly ten years on the Board of Education that he had spoke to teacher salaries, but he believed they were nearing a crisis situation.

2. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had attended the NSBA conference earlier this month. She had visited "the classroom of the future," and while it was a commercial for AT&T there were many things in the demonstration that were viable for computer applications in the classroom. She had also attended a session on how to raise minority student achievement, and she believed

that Montgomery County was on the cutting edge of this issue.

3. Mrs. DiFonzo said that she had attended a meeting of maintenance supervisors at Coolfont. She had told them that the Board was aware of what they were doing and of the value of their work. She had complimented them on their work, and one gentleman in the audience remarked that this was the first time in his 21 years of employment that maintenance people had been complimented.

5. Mrs. Praisner reported that she had also attended the NSBA convention and had brought back materials from some of the sessions and also from the delegate assembly. She thought Board members would be interested in seeing how other Boards reported to their communities and got information to the public.

6. Dr. Cronin said that at the NSBA convention he had attended a session on the Frederick County Teacher-plus plan which was a good opportunity for teachers to develop professionally; however, the teachers filed a grievance and the Frederick Board lost. He had also attended a session on new issues in collective bargaining, but he said that Montgomery County was aware of most of these issues. He was still distressed about the adversarial nature of collective bargaining.

7. Dr. Cronin said that home study had died in Annapolis, but they had to start now preparing for next year and for the introduction of that bill again. He suggested that MABE might be able to take the initiative on this and make sure that each local agency had a policy on home study. Mrs. Praisner thought that this might be better done through the superintendents' association.

8. Dr. Cody reported that the executive staff had held a retreat in Woods Inn, West Virginia. He would provide the Board a summary of that meeting. They had discussed long-range planning issues such as the labor supply and demand, area organization, centralization and decentralization, and ways of monitoring progress. They had also reviewed the priorities and discussed whether they had a handle on all of the priorities. He felt that this was a very productive meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 234-86 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 28, 1986

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mrs. DiFonzo, 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 April 28, 1986, 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 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. 235-86 Re: MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of January 27, 1986, be approved as corrected.

RESOLUTION NO. 236-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 11, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 11, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 237-86 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 26, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 238-86 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 1986

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

RESOLVED, That the minutes of March 17, 1986, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 239-86 Re: APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE IX ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that

a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent suggested that the committee be composed of 16 members, namely,

3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' associations

3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council

8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education

1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)

1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations;
and

WHEREAS, Currently there is one community vacancy existing on the committee; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following person, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending June 30, 1988:

Margaret Zierdt

RESOLUTION NO. 240-86 Re: NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK,
APRIL 21-25, 1986

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

WHEREAS, A well-qualified and dedicated staff of secretarial and clerical employees is an integral part of an effective school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is extremely fortunate in having such a staff; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competency and dedication of this group of employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of our school system; and

WHEREAS, The week of April 21 through April 25, 1986, has been designated as National Secretaries' Week; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That National Secretaries' Week be observed by the

school system during the week of April 21 through 25, 1986; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Friday, April 25, 1986, be designated as Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 241-86 Re: B-CC CLUSTER

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent bring to the Board of Education any facilities issues which they might need to consider in implementing the plans of the B-CC Cluster on the short- and long-term basis.

RESOLUTION NO. 242-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 86-01

On motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, (Mr. Foubert), Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd abstaining:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal No. 86-01 be dismissed.

RESOLUTION NO. 243-86 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 86-10

On motion of Dr. Floyd seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, (Mr. Foubert), Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Floyd abstaining:

RESOLVED, That BOE Appeal 86-10 be dismissed.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing commented that the Board had heard a statement by the Seven Locks PTA regarding Avenel Farms, and the superintendent had said he would revisit that issue. Mr. Ewing believed that they needed a decision before school opening in the fall, and he asked whether he needed to make this as a motion or whether the superintendent would bring his recommendation to the Board within a short time frame. Dr. Cody indicated that he would do this very quickly. Mr. Ewing said he would not make a motion if the superintendent was going to bring the Board a recommendation within two weeks.

Re: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION VISIT

Mr. Fess reported the Maryland State Board of Education would be meeting in Montgomery County on April 29 and 30. On Tuesday, April 29, they would be visiting programs in Montgomery County and looking at magnet programs, special education, growth and demographics, vocational/technical education, and support service

areas. He indicated that Prince George's, Frederick, Howard, and Carroll Counties had been invited to participate in these tours.

In addition, the student Board members in Maryland would be holding their own workshop on April 29. There would be a reception for elected officials to meet the State Board as well as a dinner meeting with the Montgomery County Board. On Wednesday, the State Board would be conducting its regular meeting in the Board room.

RESOLUTION NO. 244-86 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY ON ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY

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

RESOLVED, That the proposed policy on academic eligibility be amended be section II.C to substitute "Schools are encouraged to see that students take advantage of such support activities as tutoring programs, mentor and monitoring programs, academic support classes and counseling, study halls after school, outreach programs and/or other programs." for "To help students retain or regain eligibility for extracurricular activities, schools are encourage to develop and make available such support activities...."

Re: A MOTION BY MR. FOUBERT TO AMEND THE PROPOSED POLICY ON ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Foubert to amend the proposed policy on academic eligibility in II.B by substituting "Any student may petition the activity sponsor or athletic director to be reinstated at the midpoint in the marking period if they have evidence of meeting eligibility status" for "Students in grades 7 and 8 may petition the activity sponsor/athletic director to be reinstated at midpoint in the marking period if they have evidence of meeting eligibility status" failed with (Mr. Foubert voting in the affirmative); Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Dr. Floyd, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative.

The Board accepted Mr. Ewing's editorial change of adding the language from the regulation about who makes the decision to Section II. B in the policy.

Re: PROPOSAL FROM MCR ON EXAMINATION REVIEW PERIOD

Miss Jenny Leete, president of MCR, stated that MCR would like a study period before final examinations. She noted that the superintendent's memo indicated that a survey of secondary resource teachers indicated that new material should not be introduced the day before exams and that most teachers did not schedule tests on the day before. She said that overwhelmingly

in MCR general assembly and general discussion meetings students said they were given tests and assignments, and they were pressured. The other argument against this was that principals felt students might choose not to come to school. MCR did not want a seven-period day of study periods. They would like to see this used as a structured time for teachers to review the semester's curriculum or to answer questions.

Mr. Foubert reported that he had spoken to students in every high school in the county about an exam review period. He fully supported the proposal submitted by MCR which included a three-day study period. He noted that one of the reasons for final examinations was to prepare students for college situations. In college they often had a reading or study period which could last up to seven days. The superintendent's memos said that most teachers used the last few days to prepare for the exam and this was the rule and not the exception.

Mr. Foubert would agree that it was not the exception, but he did not believe it was the rule. There were teachers who did review but not all of them. He felt that one day was too short, and he said it sold students short to say that they would not attend school. He had more faith in the students and hoped that the Board would at least pilot a three-day study period for final exams.

Mr. Mark Simon, president of MCEA, stated that he was sympathetic to the issue of student stress. It was a issue dealt with by administrators talking with staff around exam time. He thought that efforts to sensitize teachers to that issue should continue. He also thought that teachers focused on what they were doing with a particular group of students and were not aware of the cumulative impact of what teachers did overall. Mr. Simon said he had several concerns that led him to oppose the proposal. He noted that there was already from the point of view of teachers and students a scarcity of time in the semester particularly in English and social studies. There was a huge volume of material to go through in a very short time. The creation of a final exam week would shorten the amount of time to cover that material. He suggested they had to be very cautious about taking out more time from the limited amount of academic time available. He said that teachers had to be the ones who developed the teaching strategies and the assessment tools. This was part of their professional responsibilities. For example, some teachers built into their teaching strategy a lot of review time, and some teachers did not. When they mandated how teaching was done, they sacrificed the individual strategies developed by teachers.

Mr. Simon reminded them that there was a diversity in the final exam construction circumstances. There were some exams that were countywide and some that were departmental. There were some exams where individual teachers developed the exam and tailored it to their course. He said they had to be careful in mandating things that infringed on the diversity in teaching strategies and

exam circumstances. He agreed that tests and homework should not be given on the last day.

Dr. Joseph Dalton, principal of Wheaton High School, stated that the principals agreed with the teachers on this point. They were trying to be sensitive to the teacher philosophy. He noted that there was not total agreement on the part of principals. Most principals were concerned about instructional time because there were tremendous incursions into the instructional day, and six days a year would be a fairly large chunk if they were talking about no actual new instruction going on. Principals agreed with the idea that long-term assignments should have a deadline several days before the end of the marking period. He said that there needed to be a review, and tests and quizzes could be curtailed. In general, if there were going to be a review period, J/I/M teachers would prefer one day and senior high principals would prefer two days.

Dr. Cronin asked how often schools got together with their faculties to assess the activities of that last week to determine that students were not being overstressed. Dr. Dalton replied that at Wheaton they had not specifically reviewed that week. However, he did not have students coming to him about pressures. Miss Leete reported that Whitman had an exam review period, but three was not a magic number. The point was that students were facing a big rush at the end of the semester. Dr. Dalton commented that principals were afraid that if this was a mandate from the Board that it would have a negative effect on attendance. Dr. Cronin asked if Whitman found this to be a problem. Dr. Jerry Marco, principal of Whitman, replied that they had a two day review and had not found it to be a problem. He said that teachers were rushing to get everything in, and often students found themselves studying for a departmental exam right before the final.

Mr. Ewing was pleased that this issue had come up, but he was not sure how he felt the Board should come out on it. He thought they should have some sort of policy that made it very clear that they did not want teachers giving tests the day before the final or even two or three days before the final. They had not want major homework assignments or term papers due then. He was somewhat reluctant to mandate some number of days for a review. He felt they should encourage schools to do this rather than mandate it. Dr. Cody commented that he was leaning toward this.

He noted that there were several problems with the original recommendations because vocational courses had a project rather than a final. He said that the problem was primarily in English, mathematics, social studies, science, and foreign languages. The amount of time needed could vary from teacher to teacher. He thought they should stay away from any fixed number; therefore, he was thinking of one review period and leaving it up to the school to develop guidelines.

Mrs. DiFonzo believed that a three-day period would be overkill,

and she agreed with Dr. Dalton that a three-day review time would encourage students to not come to school. She did not think they would have this problem if they had a one-day review. She was also sympathetic to the problems of teachers trying to fit everything into one semester. However, she was also sympathetic to students being crammed with two or three chapters in the last couple of days of schools as well as having to face chapter exams. She knew there were teachers who did review, but she also knew of teachers who gave tests the day before the final. She would be willing to support saying that the Board expects schools to provide one or two days for review.

Dr. Cronin said he was hearing an agreement with the pressures that students were feeling. He was also hearing that this should be a discussion among principals, students, and teachers as to what was appropriate in given subject areas to prepare students for the final exam.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed that three days was excessive, but he would not object to a one-day review period in which it would be clear that students were not required to attend school. He did not know what this would do to the 180 day requirement, and it might require extending the school year.

Mrs. Praisner said she would support some kind of review period.

She pointed out that the public schools operated on a daily basis, and she would expect the students to be there on the review day. When she had raised this question, she found a difference in what she was receiving from the school system from what she was hearing from students. She had asked for reactions to a one-day review period, and it seemed to her that Dr. Cody was saying he would direct staff to have that one day. Dr. Cody replied that it would be a minimum of one day for certain subjects. She said that students felt this was not happening. She said it could be a regulation, a memo, or a sharing of the Whitman experience. She hoped that they would not get hung up on the three-day issue. Miss Leete commented that MCR was looking for a strong message from the Board or the superintendent about a review period. Mrs. Praisner asked if the superintendent would do this, and Dr. Cody replied that he would absent the Board taking some other action. He said that he was not sure about the precise language about a review period. It might include language about what might be avoided.

Dr. Floyd stated that he wanted to associate himself with the remarks made by Mr. Ewing. The Board's responsibility was to indicate its expectations in terms of professional performance in providing for some kind of review. He also wanted to associate himself with the remarks made by Mr. Simon regarding professional judgment. He would not vote for this if they said they did not expect students to be in school. Mr. Simon urged the Board to stay away from language like "no new work" because they had to allow for professional judgment.

Mr. Foubert thought that the main purpose of this was to make sure new material would not be introduced on the last day. Mr. Ewing thought they should avoid that phrase, but he thought they could consider what things should not take place. He said that having a final on a Thursday, with a review day on Wednesday, and a test on Tuesday was not a good idea. This flew in the face of their intent to reduce pressure on students just as having a major paper due the day before the final exam was also that kind of pressure.

Dr. Shoenberg asked if they had come to a conclusion on this. He thought they should leave it in the hands of the superintendent. He felt that there was a clear feeling that the last day should be review with no assignments due on that day. Mrs. Praisner suggested saying just "used for review."

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. School Facilities Change Order/Bid Activity Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

President

Secretary

WSC:mlw