

**Minutes - Student Impact Committee**  
**Monday, January 14, 2008, 7:00-9:00 p.m.**  
**Gatehouse Room #1610**

**Attendees:** Mahri Aste, Robin Carroll, Roger Cryan, Mark Emery, Judy Harbeck, Lory Monaco-Stevenson, Phyllis Payne, Peter Steinberg, Patricia Velkoff, Carol Vennergrund

**Guest Attendee:** Rhonda Dumont, member Community Impact Committee of TTF

**Absent:** Mary Ann Bosley, Jay Brigleb, Stephanie Cox, Carlos Galicia, Jill Hecht, Christina Kim, Beanca Nicholson, John Vdovjak, Doug Wright

Members signed in and handouts were distributed, including:

- Agenda
- Law on deployed parents in the armed services
- Swim & Dive Scheduling documents provided by Rhonda Dumont
- Academics report revision into CIC format provided by Robin Carroll

Patricia agreed to take minutes and distribute them by email for review and approval.

The question of whether to compile a single inclusive bibliography or separate bibliographies by subject area was discussed, with subject area bibliographies chosen.

The use of the CIC grid format, provided by Marie Reinsdorf, was agreed upon and will be used by all three Committees of TTF.

Several decision points were discussed with the following outcomes:

1. Because of overlap, it was agreed that SIC would allow CIC to address the issues of Daycare, SACC, and Family impacts; of these concerns, SIC would continue to address only the issue of student employment. Peter agreed contact CIC to let them know of this division of labor. Carol agreed to develop an evaluation of the impact of various bell schedules on student employment.
2. Before-school athletic practices were discussed, with an attempt to clarify what to recommend. It was noted that, following their bell schedule change, Arlington County had allowed only before-school wrestling but then discontinued it; all other Arlington County school-based sports continued to be scheduled after school. Loudoun County practices are both before and after school. Various members knew of clubs and teacher meetings that happen now before school. The suggestion was made that we include language to the effect that once bell schedule changes are implemented, schools should not rely on morning sports practices as an alternative to after-school sports practices.
3. We discussed how to include in our Report those groups that are disadvantaged and/or under-represented on the Task Force (e.g., low SES, ESL, racial and ethnic minorities, and the like). Limitations in TTF member diversity were noted. Some members felt that we could make intelligent guesses about impacts on these groups based on experiences in our own diverse local communities. Some felt that changes would have both positive and negative effects on disadvantaged groups, as they would on all subgroups of the county. Others felt that those with greater economic resources would be able to adjust more easily than those with more limited economic resources. Citing early publications from the Minnesota studies (articles available on the website), concerns were raised about whether urban students would be more likely than suburban students to stop participating in after-school activities and getting after-school help. Other members corrected this impression, citing later publications from the Minnesota studies reporting no significant differences between the urban and suburban student outcomes. It was generally agreed that the School Board is responsible for evaluating these impacts once Task Force recommendations have been made, and that TTF should recommend that a survey be taken. It was agreed that wording would be included in our Report recognizing the issue and the need for further evaluation.

4. The inclusion of language about weighing other fiscal priorities was debated, specifically, the statement from the Preliminary Report: “Neither SIC nor TTF has had the time to evaluate how our recommendations **fit into** competing educational priorities as defined by the state Constitution, the Board of Education, and the FCPS School Board.” Some members felt that such an evaluation was beyond the scope of our work. Others felt the statement was unnecessary because the School Board would inevitably evaluate our recommendations in relation to competing priorities. Some members felt that the statement’s inclusion pointed to factual limitations that should not be ignored. A vote of 5 to 4 recommended inclusion of this statement.
5. The Committee debated how much detail to provide in our Report for the five bell schedule options. Some recommended that we focus on our preferred schedule, Option C. Others felt that we needed to discuss our thinking on each of the five bell schedules to assist the School Board and the community in understanding the thinking behind our recommendations. Each subcommittee will write-up their subject area(s). Members agreed to the following Report structure:
  - a. List what our Committee considered to be important factors (Judy will write this)
  - b. Review the parameters, focusing on student impacts (Judy will write this)
  - c. Discuss our preferred Option C based on all Areas of Impact, including positives, concerns, and proposed work-arounds
  - d. Provide charts in CIC format evaluating each bell schedule – this may not be discussed in full during the presentation but would be part of the Written Report

Rhonda Dumont provided copies of scheduling materials relevant to Swim & Dive. She felt that any HS bell schedule change would negatively impact the school swim programs. Judy felt that families of swimmers would adjust to the change and that student participation would not change significantly.

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Submitted by: Patricia Velkoff