



being temporarily absent:

WHEREAS, State Superintendent Nancy S. Grasmick has announced May 12, 1993, as the eighth annual "Salute to School Food and Nutrition Service Personnel"; and

WHEREAS, The school cafeteria and the service provided by its personnel to students, faculty, and other staff are an integral part of the operations of Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The more than 11 million meals that are served annually to Montgomery County school children under the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs are only partial testimony of the valuable contribution made by school food services personnel each year; and

WHEREAS, School food and nutrition service personnel deserve to be recognized for their dedication and continuing commitment to feeding students and offering a variety of nutrition services to the community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education does hereby recognize a selected group of food and nutrition service personnel in honor of the eighth annual "Salute to School Food and Nutrition Service Personnel" in Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be included in the minutes of this meeting.

Re: FOOD SERVICE HONOREES

The Board and superintendent recognized the following employees:

Frances E. Bishop of Greencastle Elementary School, Alice P. Blorstad of Springbrook High School; Elizabeth C. Broadus of Brookhaven Elementary School, Betty J. Herr of Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School; Wanda Lowman of Lakewood Elementary School, Deanna March of Watkins Mill High School, Martha Robert of Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School, and Florence Wright of Richard Montgomery High School.

RESOLUTION NO. 355-93      Re: ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

WHEREAS, The county executive and the County Council president by joint proclamation on April 16, 1993, designated May 1993 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of this month is to recognize Americans of Asian/Pacific descent and their continued and invaluable contributions to this county; and

WHEREAS, The heritage of Asian/Pacific Americans enhances the diversity and richness of the student body and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, Asian/Pacific American students and staff contribute to the success of the Montgomery County Public Schools through their participation in all aspects of education; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the superintendent, staff, and students of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education hereby declare the month of May 1993 to be observed in MCPS as "Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month."

RESOLUTION NO. 356-93      Re:    SUPPORTING SERVICES RECOGNITION DAY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish MCPS Supporting Services Recognition Day and issue a proclamation requesting schools and offices to recognize their supporting services employees.

Re:    SUCCESS FOR EVERY STUDENT PLAN:  
      OUTCOMES AND STANDARDS UPDATE

Mrs. Gemberling reported that this was a follow-up to their August meeting on standards and outcomes. Ms. Eoline Cary and Mr. Steve Seleznow, the co-chairs of the work group, would discuss the update. Mrs. Gemberling indicated that the work group had been able to warn her of some concerns. The executive staff made a decision that the overall infrastructure for school system assessment was not going to be adequate. She said that MSPAP was mandated for grades 3, 5, and 8 in May, and they had decided that it was not enough to use just this testing program.

They wanted to take the off testing years in the elementary and middle schools and supplement the state testing with MCPS CRT testing. This meant an annual test, of some sort, for students grades 2 through 8. They would have annual reports for parents, staff, and the public on individual student performance, school and systemwide progress, and comparative data with other LEAs. They had decided to field test in 4, 6, and 7 in the spring, which they did. Based on the field testing, they were to do the standards setting this winter and have formal testing grades 4, 6, and 7 this spring and begin to develop a grade 2 test.

Since that time, Mrs. Gemberling had found that the Maryland State Department of Education would not provide individual student results. Therefore, they would not have individual student reports for grades 3, 5, and 8. They knew that parents wanted more frequent reports, and MCPS would only have reports

for 4, 6, and 7.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that last time they had talked to the Board about setting very high proficiency standards. There was concern about what performance might appear to be initially because not all schools would meet the standards right away. If they could not meet the standards right away, staff felt they should be able to demonstrate progress toward the standards and demonstrate individual student improvement. This had not been in the original design. They also wanted assessment, curriculum, and instruction to be in synchronization. As the outcomes group reviewed the standards, there were significant concerns raised regarding the appropriateness of the reading/language arts test.

Given those factors, Mrs. Gemberling stated that they looked at what they needed in a comprehensive assessment program. They needed an assessment infrastructure. They wanted clear outcomes for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. They needed standards for student competency, school and systemwide achievement, and demonstrating progress and improvement. They also wanted annual individual assessment of student achievement for staff and parents. They felt they had to have an annual report of school and systemwide achievement for the public in general as well as comparative data based on other LEAs. They also wanted comparative data with national group. Finally, they felt they had to have a process in place to maintain a dynamic assessment to reflect curricular and instructional changes. They were recommending a Council on Standards to operate and function similar to the Council on Instruction.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that the work group had contacted national assessment groups and had found no one test that was doing everything. Therefore, MCPS had to put together a comprehensive assessment plan. They could not change the state's 3, 5, and 8 testing, but it did give them comparative data with other LEAs. They were recommending a comprehensive CRT program in math and reading/language arts based on the MCPS Program of Studies, Grades 2 through 8. They were recommending the testing be done in June similar to the final exam concept in senior high.

Every student would be tested every year on the MCPS curriculum; however, they were looking at grades 4, 6, and 7 to work with testing companies on the development of assessment measures based on national standards. This would give them comparisons nationally.

In mathematics, they were going forward with the formal testing that they had planned to do this year. There would be reports to parents on individual student progress, reports back to staff, and public reports. This June, they would have voluntary field testing of the math assessments for grades 3, 5, and 8. This fall and winter standards would be set for grade levels as well

as a standard for improvement. Next June they would test grades 3 through 8, and they would develop a second grade test. The external test with the national standards would be field tested this spring. In June they would share some of the sample questions from these assessments.

In regard to reading/language arts, Mrs. Gemberling reported that they would not be testing this spring because the assessment needed revision. They were working with two outside agencies, and they would be field testing in the fall. In June they would have testing in reading in grades 3 through 8. The external test would be determined at a later time.

Ms. Cary reported that the group had met regularly and had taken on the task to determine standards and outcomes. An outcome was what students should know and be able to do. This was clearly defined in mathematics and reading. The standard was the level or degree of performance or achievement that was judged to be acceptable. The group had to set standards. First, they set a proficient standard wherein a child attaining that standard would be demonstrating a high level of proficiency. The CRT was designed to be an on-going diagnostic tool, not an accountability measure. It was a difficult task to change the thrust of the CRTs. A goal was what they aimed to achieve, and their goal was that all schools would achieve that standard in five years.

Ms. Cary stated that the group had finally come to agreement on the standards. The Board had a summary of their recommendations. The first was that standards should be viewed as only a measure of student and school performance. Their next task would be to look at portfolios and other means of assessing student and school performance. They were looking at achievement of the standards with the school improvement process. They decided to look at the data and then set benchmarks. They knew that not everyone was going to reach the standard at the same time; however, they needed to recognize the schools making significant growth toward that achievement. They were looking at instituting annual testing. Their last recommendation was that MCPS consider establishing a Council on Standards made up of parents, students, teachers, administrators, and community members.

Mr. Seleznow commented that one of the challenges they faced was how to take a complicated process and make it user friendly. They decided on a growth strip which would be marked to show growth on a yearly basis. He showed the Board a mock up of the numerical scale and demonstrated how the chart would be filled in. This would show how a child compared with other students in the county.

Mr. Seleznow said that one of the important issues for the committee was setting a high standard and knowing that many schools and students would not meet the standard initially. They went back and analyzed many years of test results. He showed the

Board a prototype of a report showing individual grade standards for a student. The next step was to establish goals for school performance across all regular education schools in MCPS. This was set at a level where 75 percent of all students taking the test would meet the individual student standard. This was not an on-grade-level standard. It was a standard of proficiency which was set higher. Over time, they might want to adjust that to 80 or 85 percent. Looking at previous data, he indicated that most schools would not make this standard. Then they established another goal for the school system of having 100 percent of the schools with 75 to 100 percent of their students meeting the standard.

Mr. Seleznow stated that a parent would be able to see a child performing above the standards. There would be user friendly language to explain what this meant, and over time the parent would have a chart showing all growth for the child for the years he or she was in MCPS. This would be valuable for parents to measure growth and for schools to be able to analyze the results and develop strategies to improve. Lastly, they felt the standard setting process was a community process. They believed they needed to expand the arena and institutionalize the process.

They did need parents, students, teachers, administrators, community people, and university experts to come together in a formal council to look at standards for MCPS.

Mrs. Brenneman understood the standard for schools and asked about the standard for the individual child. Mr. Seleznow replied that this would be the individual score. Mrs. Brenneman asked for the goal if her child started out above the standard. Mr. Seleznow replied that any student meeting or exceeding the standard should be challenged to continue to perform at that high level. Mrs. Brenneman reported that she heard the comment that they were teaching to the middle. She asked what they did for the child achieving above the standard to challenge that child to do better. They might have a class with many high achievers already attaining that level. She asked whether the goal was to raise the child 20 percentage points if that child started out above the standard. Mr. Seleznow indicated that the committee had discussed this. One of the key components they had not developed was the growth standard. They planned to establish a standard for growth they wanted students to achieve. They would want schools to have an incentive to push beyond and go to higher levels to show more growth.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that this got to the question of consumer confidence because parents were saying MCPS was not differentiating for their children. She said that she was looking forward to their next step and report. Ms. Cary commented that the classroom teacher would have annual data on each child. The teacher would know where the child was and where individual goals would be set. The teacher would not let the

child sit back just because he or she achieved the standard. She had looked at where her own school was, and she thought they were going to have to work very hard to attain the standard. Mr. Seleznow reported that this was a dynamic process, and they might come back a year from now with a different proposal because of patterns that were emerging. Mrs. Gemberling added that one of the real advantages of the reporting process was that a student would have to show continuous improvement.

Mr. Sims thought that as parents became more familiar with the process they would become more interested in their child's achievement. The school system had to do all it could to facilitate that. He asked what the response had been to the voluntary field testing. Mrs. Gemberling explained a school would volunteer and would receive the individual student results that could be used for planning. The school was also involved in providing the committee with input for standards and data. Mr. Seleznow added that some schools wanted to do this but had to look at testing already in their schools for Chapter 1 and CTBS.

Mr. Sims commented that whenever he looked at assessments he realized the benefit, but he was always concerned about the number of hours spent teaching versus the number of hours spent testing. He asked how their hours of testing compared to other school districts around the Washington area. Mrs. Gemberling replied that it was no more than the school systems that had chosen to do a norm-referenced testing as their supplement to MSPAP. It was not as extensive time-wise as the state testing. Mr. Sims thought it was important to plug this data into the SIMS system, and Ms. Cary replied that it was being done. Mr. Sims asked whether these scores would find their way onto the state report card. Mrs. Gemberling said they planned to make this information available to the community, but the state report card was generated by the state, but they did permit local standards and additional information from locals. MCPS planned to incorporate the CRT testing.

Mrs. Gordon was pleased to see they were going to annual testing because the true measure of individual student success was how that child achieved and grew each year. She was also pleased that there seemed to be a real commitment to reporting progress to parents. She hoped there would be a lot of in-depth explanation of what was being tested, what the scores meant, and what the growth was. She said they were looking at September for some of the testing, and she thought that concentrating all of the testing into May and June especially for students taking the state test would be a lot of testing. It was difficult anyway to keep the continuity of the school instructional program going as the school year came to an end. She hoped they would explore other time lines.

Mrs. Gordon asked about the exemptions for ESOL and special

education students. Mr. Seleznow explained that the exemptions would follow the current exemptions on the CRTs. The plan would focus on regular education and students who had been in MCPS for two years. They would be looking at special education and ESOL students with respect to these standards, and the expectation would be that schools would work to make sure these students were meeting the standards. The committee was recommending that the accountability standards focus on regular education students first. Mrs. Gordon asked that the Board be provided with the criteria for exempting students from the CRTs.

Mrs. Fanconi was pleased to hear all the hard work going into this exciting and challenging task. It appeared to her there were a number of things they were going to have to do differently that current employees would have to take on beyond what they were doing now in a time of shrinking resources. Teachers would have to give new tests, and she would like someone to address how this would be graded over the summer to get that back to teachers for the fall. It seemed to her that had a fiscal impact. They had talked about training principals on the analysis and interpretation of the results, and this would be an additional burden on principals.

Mrs. Fanconi recalled that at the state level they talked about the percentage of children not meeting the standards currently. She asked where the standard was in relation to where MCPS was now. Mr. Seleznow replied that this year they would see where the schools and students fell with respect to the standard. This year would give them the baseline. In analyzing tests from 1984, they did some simulations applying the new standards. He recalled that most schools did not meet the 75 percent standard.

In terms of individual performance, it was anywhere from 40 percent to as high as 60 percent meeting the standards. Mrs. Fanconi supported the concept but was concerned about the community and family perception if the results were poor. For example, there was an increase in child abuse reports after report cards came out. Dr. Vance replied that results were poor, he would have no hesitancy to build into the budget the resource level necessary to assist them in overcoming this.

Mrs. Fanconi believed that by having very few exemptions MSPAP was looking at how they improved the outcomes for all students. She strongly supported having very few exemptions and improving the outcomes for the special populations in MCPS. She asked how the 75 percent would affect schools with large percentages of special populations. Mr. Seleznow replied that they had a very diverse county, and one of the challenges in setting a county standard was facing that issue. There were some schools with more challenges than other schools, and it would be more difficult for them to meet the standard because of those challenges. For that reason, the committee strongly recommended the growth standard. For example, a fifth grade would take the

test and perform two years below the standard. The following year in sixth grade the school would put in interventions, and that same cohort of students might not meet the sixth grade standard but might meet the fifth grade standard. The school would be able to document two years of progress in one year. MCPS would have an opportunity to recognize that school as meeting a growth standard. Mrs. Fanconi felt that schools with special classes would be penalized if they decided not to exempt many children. Ms. Cary replied that this was not her understanding. They would have a different way of looking at the data. For example, the schools with a center for highly gifted would be at the upper end. Therefore, they would look at the data in different ways.

Dr. Leroy Tompkins, coordinator of testing, understood the concern about the number of exemptions. The school standards were based on regular education students who had been enrolled two or more years. Although some students might be exempted from the test, the schools with centers for the handicapped would be allowed to assess those children. When those children were included in the standards and those schools with large populations would be penalized, there would be a tendency for schools to try to exempt as many of those children as possible. By developing a standard to include only those children in regular education who have been in the school system for two or more years, it would encourage testing those children.

Ms. Gutierrez commended the committee on their efforts. She recalled that they had had the CAT as a basis for standards, and they had been without that for two or three years. Although there were problems with the CAT, it did provide them with an assessment of how MCPS was doing as a system. She pointed out that the new system was not the end-all and be-all of MCPS performance. This was not intended to represent what the instructional program did or what the curriculum did. They had to make sure this was well understood. She also liked the fact they were looking at other assessment measures including portfolios.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the group had a written report behind the summary of their recommendations. Mrs. Gemberling replied that when the recommendations came in, documentation had been provided. Ms. Gutierrez was concerned that the standards were limited to regular students for two or more years, and she would be looking for that piece of information. She hoped that ESOL students would not be excluded. They should see how they stood with the instructional program and how they were teaching students. She asked for more information on resources for schools. She said there was a concern on the make up of the committee. She would like to see greater input from teachers because they had only six teachers out of 28 members. She suggested that it would be valuable to expand the input from

teachers.

Mr. Ewing stated that he was pleased with the concept of setting standards based on annual testing. He commented that he may have been around too long because it seemed to him that they were in a race in which the finish line appeared and then was removed further down the road. They had been working on this for ten years, and he was concerned about that. He was concerned about the lengthening period of time during which they had not had a standardized way of looking at student performance and growth. He thought they should be seeking a comprehensive system of measurement of student and school performance on a frequent basis. They should see this plan as an element of it.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about the exemptions. He thought it was important to speak in the SES policy about the inclusion of students with disabilities. If these standards were not appropriate for students with disabilities and other special needs, they needed to commit themselves to the development of other methods of measuring the progress of those students. He needed to know how this was developed. He needed to know much more about the assumptions going into this process, about the data used and how they were used, the calculations that were made, and the plans for expanding this. Unless he had this information, he could not be an advocate for this plan.

Mr. Ewing noted that the paper said that standards were only one measure. He was disturbed by that language because it was dismissive. He knew they did not mean this. It was important for them as they developed a comprehensive system of measuring performance to be able to say just how important standards were in a comprehensive program of student performance measurement. They needed to keep talking about what else they would include in that program. The school system needed to deal with the larger issue.

As far as the standards being dynamic, Mr. Ewing thought this was contradictory. If standards changed all the time, they would not be standards. However, they could argue that the initial standards would be tentative or developmental and would be finalized. He also thought there was a great danger in setting the standard too high initially. The danger would be they would conclude that because not many students reached the standard, it should be lowered. This would be a public relations disaster. It might be better to say they would set the standard at X-position and could expect substantial numbers of students to reach it, but they did not expect that all of them or even half of them would reach it initially. If too low and all students met it, they would have another public relations problem on their hands. He thought they had to be out front on the entire issue and say they did not know about the standards because the population had changed and they were engaged in a developmental

process where adjustments would have to be made based on experience. He hoped that the Board would get a good solid picture on how they arrived at what the standards were to be.

Dr. Cheung remarked when they talked about SIMS they were getting closer to an automated student record portfolio. He saw their standards looking at the area of math, reading, and language arts. When they tried to compare schools and students, there are other skills and knowledge they were not testing. This needed to be made clear to the public. He, too, did not think there should be exemptions because they needed information on all students. He would be interested in knowing how the scale was developed because he liked it very much. He thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: CLOSED SESSION

Dr. Cheung reported that the Board had met in closed session at lunchtime on administrative matters.

Re: FY 1994 OPERATING BUDGET

Dr. Cheung reported that yesterday the County Council had taken tentative action on the Board's FY 1994 Operating Budget. The Council approved a reduction of \$714,000 in transportation, cable television, and educational accountability. The Council deferred action on three potential cuts and placed them on a wish list for later consideration of items from all agencies. These included \$1.6 million from extended year employment (EYE), \$500,000 in changes to the new hire rate for teachers, and \$1.4 million in general reductions including the recommended improvements for the gifted and talented program. If the Council eliminated these three items, there would be a significant and immediate impact on the instructional programs in the schools. The Council recognized there was no more room for additional cuts in any other area except instruction at the school building level. The total amount in jeopardy was \$4.2 million. This was not a trivial reduction because the Board had already reduced next year's budget by \$8.5 million. An additional reduction would have a serious and significant impact on important and necessary services. The Board still believed the Council should fully fund the budget as recommended by the county executive, and the Board would fight to protect the school system from further cuts.



	Collins Electronics, Inc.	921*
	Fairway Electronics Company	126
	Harco Electronics, Inc.	10,251
	Kelvin Electronics, Inc.	13,315
	Mark Electronics Supply, Inc.	3,535
	Mid Atlantic Cable Connector	452
	Mouser Electronics	1,339
	Norfolk Wire and Electronics	2,090
	PGC Scientific Corporation	282*
	Sears Industrial Sales	85
	Total	<u>\$ 47,868</u>
97-93	LAN Equipment	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Data Systems Marketing Corporation	\$180,135
	Texel Corporation Business Communication Services	<u>12,655</u>
	Total	<u>\$192,790</u>
99-93	Library Furniture	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	ATD-American Company	\$ 644
	Baltimore Stationery Company	16,032
	Douron, Inc.	146,624
	Glover Equipment, Inc.	1,968
	The Highsmith Company	741
	The Library Store, Ltd.	<u>7,623*</u>
	Total	<u>\$173,632</u>
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$507,441

\*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 358-93 Re: CAPITAL PROJECTS TO BE CLOSED  
EFFECTIVE JUNE 30, 1993

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education annually closes capital projects and transfer the unencumbered balances to the appropriate accounts; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Facilities Management has reviewed capital projects that may be closed effective June 30, 1993, providing for the capitalization of \$42,589,170.41; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to close, effective June 30, 1993, capital construction projects listed below and to transfer the local unencumbered balances totaling

\$893.39, subject to final audit, to the local Unliquidated Surplus Account (balance before transfer \$158,776.75):

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Balance</u>
207-08	Beall Elementary School	\$385.04
335-01	Briggs Chaney Middle School	349.63
419-09	Burning Tree Elementary School	92.54
772-11	Viers Mill Elementary School	8.77
778-12	Sligo Middle School	<u>57.41</u>
	Total	\$893.39

and be it further

Resolved, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 359-93      Re:    REROOFING - BELMONT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids were received on April 8, 1993, for the reroofing at Belmont Elementary School which will begin on June 16, 1993, and be completed by September 1, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. R. D. Bean, Inc.	\$170,800
2. Virginia Roofing Corporation	172,380
3. John H. Cole & Sons Co., Inc.	187,100
4. J. E. Wood Sons Co., Inc.	189,075
5. Korb Roofers, Inc.	192,600
6. Rayco Roof Service, Inc.	193,759

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, R. D. Bean, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully at various schools, including Damascus and Stonegate elementary schools and Parkland Middle School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the revised staff estimate of \$180,000; and

WHEREAS, The State Interagency Committee for Public School Construction will fund 50 percent of the eligible work for Belmont Elementary School as part of the state systemic renovation program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$170,800 contract be awarded to R. D. Bean, Inc., for reroofing Belmont Elementary 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 Committee for School Construction for approval to reimburse Montgomery County Public Schools for the state eligible portion for Belmont Elementary School.

RESOLUTION NO. 360-93      Re:    ACCEPTANCE OF GALWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on April 30, 1993, the addition to Galway Elementary School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 361-93      Re:    FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE EVENT-BASED SCIENCE PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend an FY 1993 supplemental appropriation of \$326,224 from the National Science Foundation (NSF), for the second year of the Event-Based Science program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	2.0	\$203,168
3 Other Instructional Costs		91,392
10 Fixed Charges	—	<u>31,664</u>
Total	2.0	\$326,224

- \*1.0 Project specialist (E)
- \*1.0 Secretary (Grade 11)

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 transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 362-93      Re:    FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION  
FOR THE TOBACCO PREVENTION PROGRAM

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

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1993 supplemental appropriation of \$78,401 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), for the Tobacco Prevention Program, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$ 7,161
3 Other Instructional Costs	70,524
10 Fixed Charges	<u>716</u>

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 transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

Re:    PRESENTATION OF REBATE CHECK FROM  
WASHINGTON GAS

Dr. Vance and Dr. Cheung received a rebate check in the amount of \$84,500.00 from Washington Gas for the installation of high efficiency boilers at modernized schools.

\*Mrs. Brenneman rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 363-93      Re:    PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 364-93      Re:    PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignment be approved:

<u>Name</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Mary Ann Hayes	Classroom Teacher Carderock Springs ES	Instructional Assistant Location to be determined Will maintain salary status To retire 7-1-94

Re: POLICY ON THE EDUCATION OF STUDENTS  
WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

WHEREAS, On August 4, 1992, the Board of Education adopted a resolution requesting that the superintendent develop a proposal for Board policy concerning inclusion; and

WHEREAS, On October 26, 1992, the Board of Education adopted a resolution asking the superintendent to give a presentation on the laws for students with disabilities and how MCPS meets the requirements of the law and provide a recommendation on how a policy might be used in addition to the law; and

WHEREAS, On January 25, 1993, the Board of Education discussed a policy analysis on Educational Services to Students with Disabilities; and

WHEREAS, On January 25, 1993, the Board of Education discussed a portion of the draft revision of Policy IOB, Education of Students with Disabilities; and

WHEREAS, On March 18, 1993, the Board of Education tentatively adopted a draft policy on the education of students with disabilities and sent the draft policy out for public comment; and

WHEREAS, On April 22, 1993, the Board of Education held a public hearing on the draft policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take action on the draft policy on the education of students with disabilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following revised Policy IOB, Education of Students with Disabilities:

Related Entries: ABC, ABC-RA, EHA, IEA, IEB, IED, IEF, JOA-RA  
Responsible Office: Deputy Superintendent for Instruction

### Education of Students With Disabilities

#### A. PURPOSE

1. To affirm the expectation that appropriate early intervention and pre-referral strategies have been implemented in the general education setting prior to considering a student for identification as disabled.
2. To ensure that in the Montgomery County Public Schools, all children, from birth through age 20, and who are disabled, regardless of the severity of the disability, and who are in need of special education and related services shall be identified, assessed, and provided a free, appropriate public education consistent with state regulations and Federal and state laws.
3. To commit Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) to provide an educational program that prepares students with disabilities for self-sufficient and productive lives as full participating members of our society to the maximum extent possible
4. To commit MCPS to the task of creating a climate of acceptance and respect for individuals with disabilities among staff and students
5. To affirm the Board of Education's strong commitment to the genuine participation of students with disabilities with peers without disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, including academic, social, non-academic, and extracurricular activities
6. To affirm the expectation that both general and special education personnel are accountable for the education of students with disabilities
7. To establish guidelines for working toward these objectives, and for all necessary activities to comply with federal and state mandates

#### B. ISSUE

In accordance with changes to federal laws and state regulations regarding the education of individuals with disabilities, MCPS policy should ensure that services for these individuals focus on:

Consideration of the student as an individual student with unique needs and capabilities as reflected in the substitution of the phrase "student with disabilities" for "handicapped student"

Collaboration among general and special educators, families, state and local agencies, and the community

The development of educational programs and transition services/supports that prepare individuals with disabilities for success in post-secondary education, post-school employment, and community participation

#### C. POSITION

1. The Board acknowledges that the development of effective programs for all students depends not only upon adequate budgetary provisions, but also upon the energy, concern, and leadership demonstrated at all levels.
2. The Board of Education is committed to the education of all students, including those with disabilities, and will make free and appropriate educational programs and related services available to students with disabilities from birth through age 20.
3. Programs and services for students with disabilities will be of the same quality as those available to all other students in MCPS.
4. Programs and services for students with disabilities will be provided in compliance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations including, but not limited to requirements governing: notification, consent, the educational assessment process, independent educational evaluation, appointment of a parent surrogate, confidentiality of educational records, extended school year services, least restrictive environment, due process procedures, staffing ratios, timelines, the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) process, related services, development and implementation of the individualized educational program (IEP) or the individual family services plan (IFSP) for children from birth through two years of age, services for private/parochial students with disabilities, and transition planning.
5. Parents or guardians will be informed of procedures for obtaining informed parental consent before evaluation and placement of students and for parent or guardian

participation in the IEP/IFSP review process.

6. Parents or guardians have the right to inspect, review, copy, and challenge any educational records relating to their children and to be advised of the types and locations of such records. Staff will be prepared to help parents or guardians understand the records. If needed, staff will receive additional training to be prepared to respond to parents for such help.
7. Student/staff ratios will be commensurate with the needs of the different levels of service provided. The Board of Education supports staffing ratios that are appropriate to the individualized needs of children, to the extent feasible, even if they are smaller than maximum staffing ratios permitted by the MSDE.
8. The Board affirms that the education of students with disabilities is a shared responsibility of special and general education, and that each school shall be accountable for the education of all students, including students with disabilities.
9. When a student is placed in a non-MCPS setting, in accordance with Maryland State Department of Education requirements, MCPS personnel will monitor the services delivered to the student to assure that participating schools meet MCPS standards and provide appropriate educational services to the student.
10. The Board recognizes the importance and value of family involvement, including participation in individual program planning and the educational decision-making process, for the education of all students, including those with disabilities.
11. All MCPS educational programs and services, including those for students with disabilities, will focus on the establishment of clearly defined outcomes of schooling including, but not limited to, preparation for post-secondary education, post-school employment, and community participation.
12. The Board recognizes that the education of students with disabilities is a complex task that necessitates cooperation among general and special educators, state and local public agencies and private services providers to provide a full continuum of services and a range of services to meet student needs.
13. The Board recognizes that efforts must be made to overcome attitudinal and physical barriers in order to

ensure equal opportunity for the genuine participation of individuals with disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, as well as their acceptance as respected participants in educational, work, and community settings.

D. DESIRED OUTCOME(S)

1. An education that encourages students with disabilities to develop their full potential, that prepares students with disabilities for independent living, and an effective transition to further education, work, and/or community participation, to the maximum extent possible
2. An opportunity for students with disabilities to develop community ties by attending the schools they would attend if not disabled
3. The acceptance of individuals with disabilities as genuine participants in educational, work, and community settings
4. Partnerships that support collaborative relationships among families, schools, communities, government agencies, and the business sector to provide appropriate educational services and support for individuals with disabilities
5. Collaboration among general educators, special educators, and parents to develop a better understanding of students' educational needs and how they can be addressed through accommodations, curricular modifications, and alternative educational strategies in the general education program
6. The genuine participation of students with disabilities with their peers without disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, including academic, social, non-academic, and extracurricular activities, as appropriate to the needs of each student

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. There will be an ongoing and systematic effort to identify all students with disabilities who may be in need of special education services.
2. MCPS will take steps to ensure that appropriate early intervention and pre-referral strategies have been implemented in the general education setting prior to considering a student for identification as disabled.

3. Measures will be taken to encourage and facilitate the active and informed participation of parents or guardians of students with disabilities in all aspects of the educational decision-making process.
4. Each school will have an Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) team, chaired by an administrator or designee whose responsibility will be to make decisions related to evaluation, eligibility, and review for special education and related services.
5. Appropriate educational assessments and other pertinent information will be used to determine whether a student is in need of special education services and to develop an IEP/IFSP for each student with a disability.
6. A written IEP/IFSP encompassing strengths, needs, goals, objectives, program assignment, related services, percent of time in general education, accommodations and supports necessary for participation in general education, a transition plan for students 16 years or older (14 years or older, as necessary), and timelines for reviewing progress will be developed for each student with a disability.
7. All needs must be identified in order to determine the individual goals, objectives, and services to be provided. Plans will be developed jointly by parents, teacher(s), specialists responsible for the implementation of the IEP/IFSP, and an administrator. Parents or staff members may invite other persons to participate in the IEP/IFSP development. Pertinent information about teaching strategies and materials will be included in the plan. Supervisory personnel will periodically review IEPs/IFSPs to monitor general plan development and implementation.
8. A continuum of alternative placements that includes instruction in general education classes, with supplementary aids and services as needed, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions will be available in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
9. All placement decisions will be based upon the student's individual needs and will be made in accordance with state and federal requirements. The major requirement is that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment which is defined in COMAR (15A.02.(3)(a)(b)) to mean:

- a) To the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities, including students in public and private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with students who are not disabled; and
  - b) Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of students with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.
10. School staff will provide supplementary aids and services and reasonable accommodations to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities as specified in the student's IEP/IFSP.
  11. Instruction of students with disabilities will be provided through coordinated academic, functional, vocational, and community-based curricula and will follow the MCPS Program of Studies, adapted to accommodate student learning styles, where necessary.
  12. Curricula and special education instructional materials that reflect appropriate learning outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities will be developed and maintained.
  13. Staff development will be provided as appropriate to all MCPS personnel and will include:
    - a) In-service training for special education staff in working effectively with students with disabilities in various settings and in collaboration with general education staff.
    - b) In-service training programs for general educators, administrators, and support personnel to acquire a basic understanding of disabilities and their effect on children and their families. Emphasis will be placed on exemplary instructional practices for working effectively with the child and adapting instruction to promote success in all settings.
    - c) Training in technological innovations resulting in new educational strategies and materials will be provided for general and special education personnel, as appropriate.

14. Programs will be developed to increase the understanding of individuals with disabilities among the student body of MCPS and to provide mutually beneficial interactions between students with and without disabilities. Planning will be done cooperatively with MCPS, community agencies, parents, and students.
15. Students with disabilities will be provided an opportunity to participate in appropriate extracurricular activities that are generally available to all MCPS students in the community. Together with other community agencies, MCPS will continue to develop specialized extracurricular activities when regularly provided extracurricular programs do not meet existing needs.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. The superintendent will report specific progress on the implementation and monitoring of this policy to the Board of Education at least annually, or more frequently, as directed by the Board of Education. These reports will include views of parent/community representatives.
2. The Office of Special and Alternative Education will collaborate with the Department of Educational Accountability for internal and external data collection/analysis and evaluation activities and will report findings to the superintendent and the Board of Education.
3. The comprehensive plan for services and programs for students with disabilities will be updated annually, with opportunity for public comment, revised as needed, and reported to the Board of Education and the Maryland State Department of Education. Budget implications will be reported to the Board of Education, as appropriate.
4. MCPS shall from time to time survey parents about how well the needs of their children are being met by the special education program in which their students participate.
5. All regulations developed in support of this policy will be sent to the Board as information items.
6. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.



Re: A MOTION BY MRS. FANCONI TO AMEND  
THE PROPOSED POLICY ON EDUCATION OF  
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Fanconi to amend the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities by moving items C. 5, 6, and 7 to Section E. Implementation Strategies failed with Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. Fanconi voting in the affirmative; Mr. Abrams, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mr. Sims voting in the negative.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED POLICY ON EDUCATION OF  
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Abrams moved and Mr. Sims seconded the following:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding "for the individual needs of the student" after "least restrictive environment" in C.4.

Mr. Abrams suggested that they hold his motion in reserve.

It was agreed that in C.7 the word "levels" would change to "intensities".

RESOLUTION NO. 358-93      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding "and its entire staff" after "school" in C.8.

RESOLUTION NO. 359-93      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by substituting "a full continuum of alternative placements" for "a full continuum of services" in C.12.

RESOLUTION NO. 360-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding "by all MCPS staff" after "must be made" in C.13.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED POLICY ON EDUCATION OF  
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to amend the proposed policy on Education with Students with Disabilities by adding ", when appropriate" after "disabled" in D.2 failed for lack of a second.

RESOLUTION NO. 371-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by substituting the following for E. 2:

2.    Appropriate early intervention and pre-referral strategies will be implemented for at risk students in the general education setting without the need to initiate or complete procedures for formal identification of students with disabilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 372-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding the following to E.3:

Due process procedures as detailed in federal and state laws and regulations and local policies will be used.

RESOLUTION NO. 373-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH

## DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding "as appropriate" after "participation in general education" in E.6.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED POLICY ON EDUCATION OF  
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding a new E.4 as follows:

4. MCPS shall establish and maintain an administrative structure in which all offices and organizations charged with development and delivery of educational services shall have appropriate shared responsibility for the education of every student including students with disabilities. The administrative structure shall be designed to provide clear delineation of mission, authority, responsibility, and accountability.

Re: A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO TABLE MR.  
EWING'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT (FAILED)

A motion by Mr. Abrams to table Mr. Ewing's proposed amendment failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Ewing suggested that they return to this proposed amendment after they had reviewed the entire policy.

RESOLUTION NO. 374-93      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding "educational" after "all" in E.7 to read "All educational needs must be identified...."

RESOLUTION NO. 375-93      Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by substituting the following for E.9.:

9. All placement decisions will be based upon the student's individual needs as detailed in the IEP/IFSP and will be made in accordance with state and federal requirements. Students with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education in a setting that will enable them to make progress in achieving the goals specified in their IEP/IFSP. Students with disabilities will be educated in the least restrictive environment, where appropriate, defined on an individual basis, and taking into account the following, as referenced in COMAR (13A.05.02.B.(3)(a)(b)):

RESOLUTION NO. 376-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding a new E.13. d) as follows:

- d) In-service training for general educators, special educators, administrators, and support personnel on the processes and procedures for decision making about the provision of service to students with disabilities.

Re:    A MOTION BY MR. ABRAMS TO AMEND THE  
PROPOSED POLICY ON EDUCATION OF  
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Abrams moved and Mr. Sims seconded the following:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended by adding a new E.16 as follows:

16. MCPS in collaboration with appropriate advisory committees to the superintendent and the Board will explore and develop alternative resolution mechanisms including, but not limited to, present and informal mediation options.

RESOLUTION NO. 377-93      Re:    TABLING OF MR. ABRAMS' PROPOSED  
AMENDMENT



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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended in C.4 by adding "where appropriate, defined on an individual basis;" after "least restrictive environment" and changing commas to semicolons.

RESOLUTION NO. 381-93      Re:    AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED POLICY  
ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
DISABILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on Education of Students with Disabilities be amended to add a new E. 4 as follows:

4.    MCPS shall establish and maintain an administrative structure in which all offices charged with development and delivery of educational services shall have appropriate shared responsibility for the education of every student, including students with disabilities, and shall be designed to provide clear delineation of mission, authority, responsibility and accountability.

RESOLUTION NO. 382-93      Re:    POLICY ON EDUCATION OF STUDENTS  
WITH DISABILITIES

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

WHEREAS, On August 4, 1992, the Board of Education adopted a resolution requesting that the superintendent develop a proposal for Board policy concerning inclusion; and

WHEREAS, On October 26, 1992, the Board of Education adopted a resolution asking the superintendent to give a presentation on the laws for students with disabilities and how MCPS meets the requirements of the law and provide a recommendation on how a policy might be used in addition to the law; and

WHEREAS, On January 25, 1993, the Board of Education discussed a policy analysis on Educational Services to Students with

Disabilities; and

WHEREAS, On January 25, 1993, the Board of Education discussed a portion of the draft revision of Policy IOB, Education of Students with Disabilities; and

WHEREAS, On March 18, 1993, the Board of Education tentatively adopted a draft policy on the education of students with disabilities and sent the draft policy out for public comment; and

WHEREAS, On April 22, 1993, the Board of Education held a public hearing on the draft policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education take action on the draft policy on the education of students with disabilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following revised Policy IOB, Education of Students with Disabilities:

Related Entries: ABC, ABC-RA, EHA, IEA, IEB, IED, IEF, JOA-RA  
Responsible Office: Deputy Superintendent for Instruction

#### Education of Students With Disabilities

##### A. PURPOSE

1. To ensure that in the Montgomery County Public Schools, all children, from birth through age 20, and who are disabled, regardless of the severity of the disability, and who are in need of special education and related services shall be identified, assessed, and provided a free, appropriate public education consistent with state regulations and Federal and state laws.
2. To affirm the expectation that formal identification or determination of disabilities should not be a prerequisite to implementation of appropriate early intervention or pre-referral strategies and to encourage MCPS to respond promptly to implications that any student may be at risk regardless of whether disabilities are suspected or known.
3. To commit Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) to provide an educational program that prepares students with disabilities for self-sufficient and productive lives as full participating members of our society to the maximum extent possible
4. To commit MCPS to the task of creating a climate of acceptance and respect for individuals with

disabilities among staff and students

5. To affirm the Board of Education's strong commitment to the genuine participation of students with disabilities with peers without disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, including academic, social, non-academic, and extracurricular activities
6. To affirm the expectation that both general and special education personnel are accountable for the education of students with disabilities
7. To establish guidelines for working toward these objectives, and for all necessary activities to comply with federal and state mandates

B. ISSUE

In accordance with changes to federal laws and state regulations regarding the education of individuals with disabilities, MCPS policy should ensure that services for these individuals focus on:

Consideration of the student as an individual student with unique needs and capabilities as reflected in the substitution of the phrase "student with disabilities" for "handicapped student"

Collaboration among general and special educators, families, state and local agencies, and the community

The development of educational programs and transition services/supports that prepare individuals with disabilities for success in post-secondary education, post-school employment, and community participation

C. POSITION

1. The development of effective programs for all students depends upon the energy, the concern, the dedication, and leadership demonstrated at all levels of the school system as well as upon adequate budgetary provisions.
2. The Board of Education is committed to the education of all students, including those with disabilities, and will make free and appropriate educational programs and related services available to students with disabilities from birth through age 20.
3. Programs and services for students with disabilities will be of the same quality as those available to all

other students in MCPS.

4. Programs and services for students with disabilities will be provided in compliance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations including, but not limited to requirements governing: notification; consent; the educational assessment process; independent educational evaluation; appointment of a parent surrogate; confidentiality of educational records; extended school year services; least restrictive environment, where appropriate, defined on an individual basis; due process procedures; staffing ratios; timelines; the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) process; related services; development and implementation of the individualized educational program (IEP) or the individual family services plan (IFSP) for children from birth through two years of age; services for private/parochial students with disabilities; and transition planning.
5. Parents or guardians will be informed of procedures for obtaining informed parental consent before evaluation and placement of students and for parent or guardian participation in the IEP/IFSP review process.
6. Parents or guardians have the right to inspect, review, copy, and challenge any educational records relating to their children and to be advised of the types and locations of such records. Staff will be prepared to help parents or guardians understand the records. If needed, staff will receive additional training to be prepared to respond to parents for such help.
7. Student/staff ratios will be commensurate with the needs of the different intensities of service provided. The Board of Education supports staffing ratios that are appropriate to the individualized needs of children, to the extent feasible, even if they are smaller than maximum staffing ratios permitted by the MSDE.
8. The Board affirms that the education of students with disabilities is a shared responsibility of special and general education, and that each school and its entire staff shall be accountable for the education of all students, including students with disabilities.
9. When a student is placed in a non-MCPS setting, in accordance with Maryland State Department of Education requirements, MCPS personnel will monitor the services delivered to the student to assure that participating schools meet MCPS standards and provide appropriate

educational services to the student.

10. The Board recognizes the importance and value of family involvement, including participation in individual program planning and the educational decision-making process, for the education of all students, including those with disabilities.
11. All MCPS educational programs and services, including those for students with disabilities, will focus on the establishment of clearly defined outcomes of schooling including, but not limited to, preparation for post-secondary education, post-school employment, and community participation.
12. The Board recognizes that the education of students with disabilities is a complex task that necessitates cooperation among general and special educators, state and local public agencies and private services providers to provide a full continuum of alternative placements and a range of services to meet student needs.
13. The Board recognizes that efforts must be made by all MCPS staff to overcome attitudinal and physical barriers in order to ensure equal opportunity for the genuine participation of individuals with disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, as well as their acceptance as respected participants in educational, work, and community settings.

D. DESIRED OUTCOME(S)

1. An education that encourages students with disabilities to develop their full potential, that prepares students with disabilities for independent living, and an effective transition to further education, work, and/or community participation, to the maximum extent possible
2. An opportunity for students with disabilities to develop community ties by attending the schools they would attend if not disabled
3. The acceptance of individuals with disabilities as genuine participants in educational, work, and community settings
4. Partnerships that support collaborative relationships among families, schools, communities, government agencies, and the business sector to provide appropriate educational services and support for individuals with disabilities

5. Collaboration among general educators, special educators, and parents to develop a better understanding of students' educational needs and how they can be addressed through accommodations, curricular modifications, and alternative educational strategies in the general education program
6. The genuine participation of students with disabilities with their peers without disabilities in all aspects of MCPS, including academic, social, non-academic, and extracurricular activities, as appropriate to the needs of each student

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. There will be an ongoing and systematic effort to identify all students with disabilities who may be in need of special education services.
2. Appropriate early intervention and pre-referral strategies will be implemented for at risk students in the general education setting without the need to initiate or complete procedures for formal identification of students with disabilities.
3. Measures will be taken to encourage and facilitate the active and informed participation of parents or guardians of students with disabilities in all aspects of the educational decision-making process. Due process procedures as detailed in federal and state laws and regulations and local policies will be used.
4. MCPS shall establish and maintain an administrative structure in which all offices charged with development and delivery of educational services shall have appropriate shared responsibility for the education of every student, including students with disabilities, and shall be designed to provide clear delineation of mission, authority, responsibility, and accountability.
5. Each school will have an Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) team, chaired by an administrator or designee whose responsibility will be to make decisions related to evaluation, eligibility, and review for special education and related services.
6. Appropriate educational assessments and other pertinent information will be used to determine whether a student is in need of special education services and to develop an IEP/IFSP for each student with a disability.

7. A written IEP/IFSP encompassing strengths, needs, goals, objectives, program assignment, related services, percent of time in general education, accommodations and supports necessary for participation in general education as appropriate, a transition plan for students 16 years or older (14 years or older, as necessary), and timelines for reviewing progress will be developed for each student with a disability.
8. All educational needs must be identified in order to determine the individual goals, objectives, and services to be provided. Plans will be developed jointly by parents, teacher(s), specialists responsible for the implementation of the IEP/IFSP, and an administrator. Parents or staff members may invite other persons to participate in the IEP/IFSP development. Pertinent information about teaching strategies and materials will be included in the plan. Supervisory personnel will periodically review IEPs and IFSPs to monitor general plan development and implementation.
9. A continuum of alternative placements that includes instruction in general education classes, with supplementary aids and services as needed, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions will be available in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
10. All placement decisions will be based upon the student's individual needs as detailed in the IEP/IFSP and will be made in accordance with state and federal requirements. Students with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education in a setting that will enable them to make progress in achieving the goals specified in their IEP/IFSP. Students with disabilities will be educated in the least restrictive environment, where appropriate, defined on an individual basis, and taking into account the following, as referenced in COMAR (13A.05.02.B.(3)(a)(b)):
  - a) To the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities, including students in public and private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with students who are not disabled; and
  - b) Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of students with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such

that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

11. School staff will provide supplementary aids and services and reasonable accommodations to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities as specified in the student's IEP/IFSP.
12. Instruction of students with disabilities will be provided through coordinated academic, functional, vocational, and community-based curricula and will follow the MCPS Program of Studies, adapted to accommodate student learning styles, where necessary.
13. Curricula and special education instructional materials that reflect appropriate learning outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities will be developed and maintained.
14. Staff development will be provided as appropriate to all MCPS personnel and will include:
  - a) In-service training for special education staff in working effectively with students with disabilities in various settings and in collaboration with general education staff.
  - b) In-service training programs for general educators, administrators, and support personnel to acquire a basic understanding of disabilities and their effect on children and their families. Emphasis will be placed on exemplary instructional practices for working effectively with the child and adapting instruction to promote success in all settings.
  - c) Training in technological innovations resulting in new educational strategies and materials will be provided for general and special education personnel, as appropriate.
  - d) In-service training for general educators, special educators, administrators, and support personnel on the processes and procedures for decision making about the provision of service to students with disabilities.
15. Programs will be developed to increase the understanding of individuals with disabilities among the student body of MCPS and to provide mutually beneficial interactions between students with and

without disabilities. Planning will be done cooperatively with MCPS, community agencies, parents, and students.

16. Students with disabilities will be provided an opportunity to participate in appropriate extracurricular activities that are generally available to all MCPS students in the community. Together with other community agencies, MCPS will continue to develop specialized extracurricular activities when regularly provided extracurricular programs do not meet existing needs.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. The superintendent will report specific progress on the implementation and monitoring of this policy, including appropriate indicators or measures of student achievement, to the Board of Education at least annually, or more frequently, as directed by the Board of Education. These reports will include views of parent/community representatives.
2. The Office of Special and Alternative Education will collaborate with the Department of Educational Accountability for internal and external data collection/analysis and evaluation activities and will report findings to the superintendent and the Board of Education.
3. The comprehensive plan for services and programs for students with disabilities will be updated annually, with opportunity for public comment, revised as needed, and reported to the Board of Education and the Maryland State Department of Education. Budget implications will be reported to the Board of Education, as appropriate.
4. MCPS shall survey parents about how well the needs of their children are being met by the special education program in which their students participate. The process for the survey shall be the same as that utilized in the SES process.
5. All regulations developed in support of this policy will be sent to the Board as information items.
6. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Re: SUPERINTENDENT'S RESPONSE TO THE



different recommendation in terms of location of some of these than is now his recommendation, he ought to be free to come forward with that. It does not affect the position, but I would not want this to be thought of as absolutely final."

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Sims welcomed Ms. Carrie Baker to the table for her first all-day Board meeting. He looked forward to working with her on the transition, and he thought that Carrie would be a terrific addition to the Board.
2. Ms. Gutierrez expressed her strong support for the efforts on-going by the different high schools and parents to promote an alcohol-free environment for prom nights. She recognized the efforts of Gail Ewing, Council member, to provide opportunities for students to celebrate their graduation in a very safe way.
3. Mr. Ewing asked that the monthly financial report be discussed by the Board at its June 10 meeting. Dr. Cheung and Dr. Vance agreed that it would be scheduled for discussion.
4. Mr. Ewing reported that one of the most effective advocates for students with disabilities died last week. Cory Moore would have been pleased that the Board finally adopted the policy on the education of students with disabilities. He thought that the county, the state, and the nation had lost a real leader.
5. Mrs. Fanconi recognized the Youth Works project at Lakeforest Mall. She read a letter sent by the Gaithersburg cluster coordinators on the efforts of Lakeforest Mall to support education and schools in the Gaithersburg area. She would be sending a letter thanking the Mall for their contributions.
6. Mr. Ewing asked the superintendent to keep the Board apprised of the construction status of Forest Knolls and Oakland Terrace elementary schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 385-93      Re: CLOSED SESSION - MAY 24, 1993

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

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 24, 1993, at 7 p.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 until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 386-93 Re: MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 1993

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the minutes of March 22, 1993, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 387-93 Re: MINUTES OF APRIL 20 AND 22, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of April 20 (as corrected) and April 22, 1993, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

On April 14, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct a closed session on April 26, 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 Monday, April 26, 1993, from 7:30 p.m. to 7:55 p.m. and from 11 p.m. to 12:10 a.m. The meetings took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss the monthly personnel report, an appeal and negotiations. Actions taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

In attendance at the closed sessions were: Stephen Abrams, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Tom Reinert, Philip Rohr, Jon Sims, Paul Vance, Joseph Villani, Bud Westall, and Mary Lou Wood.

Re: STUDENT MEMBER ON THE BOARD STUDENT

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish a standing Student Advisory Committee for the Student Member with the following guidelines:

The charge for this committee will be to, "advise the Student Member on issues of concern to students throughout Montgomery County."

The committee will report directly to the Board of Education annually; such a report should be scheduled toward the end of the Student Member's term, and a written report should accompany any testimony.

This committee will serve as a Board Advisory Committee indefinitely, or until the Board chooses to dissolve it.

RESOLUTION NO. 388-93      Re:    POSTPONEMENT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION  
ON STUDENT MEMBER OF THE BOARD  
STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution on Student Member of the Board Student Advisory Committee be postponed to the Board meeting of May 24, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 389-93      Re:    APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ETHICS  
PANEL

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted Resolution No. 162-84 which appointed three members to the Ethics Panel; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Alan Rosenthal has completed two three-year terms of office and has indicated that he does not wish to be reappointed; now therefore be it

Resolved, That George Mendelson be appointed to serve on the Ethics Panel for a three-year term, from May 12, 1993, through May 30, 1996.

Re:    NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Sims moved and Mr. Abrams seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education discuss SAS day and its future role in MCPS.

2. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to review and discuss its own expectations about what ought to be in school improvement plans given that such plans were critical to the success of the Success for Every Student Plan and the new policy on the education of students with disabilities.

3. Mr. Abrams moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

Resolved, That the Board of Education at its earliest possible convenience schedule a session to discuss informal mediation proceedings for the special education placement program; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent contact the National Association of State School Boards and other national organizations to see what their recommendations might be.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. SAS Day in MCPS
4. Monthly Financial Report
5. Minority-Female-Disabled Owner (MFD) Business, Third Quarter FY 93 Procurement Report

RESOLUTION NO. 390-93      Re:    ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:50 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw