

APPROVED
4-2005

Rockville, Maryland
January 26, 2005

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, January 26, 2005, at 7:35 p.m.

Present: Mrs. Patricia B. O'Neill, President
in the Chair
Mr. Steve Abrams
Ms. Sharon W. Cox
Ms. Valerie Ervin
Dr. Charles Haughey
Mrs. Nancy Navarro
Mr. Gabriel Romero
Mr. Sagar Sanghvi, Student Board Member
Dr. Jerry Weast, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: None

RESOLUTION NO. 28-05 Re: **CLOSED SESSION**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Dr. Haughey seconded by Ms. Cox, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct a closed session on January 26, 2005, in Room 120 from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. to receive legal advice as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(7) of the *State Government Article*; and be it further

Resolved, That this portion of the meeting continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 29-05 Re: **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Ms. Cox, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for January 26, 2005

Re: **WORK SESSION ON THE SUPERINTENDENT'S
RECOMMENDED FY 2006 OPERATING BUDGET**

Mrs. O'Neill announced that after the work sessions, the Board would take final action on Tuesday, February 8. The review of the budget will be done section by section as outlined in the table of contents for each budget chapter. She urged staff to point out pertinent issues that may be of concern to the Board. Board members were free to ask questions and request that staff provide pricing information on specific issues.

Dr. Weast outlined the operating budget, emphasizing the areas in which the system had had success through the Strategic Plan and the focus on expansion of those initiatives. Board members made general comments on their support for the Strategic Plan, the budget formation process, and the initiatives.

Ms. Cox asked about the difference in the number of positions in Table 1 and whether or not that reflected flexibility and the ability to support change. She asked for the information on the five added administrative positions. Dr. Spatz explained that FY 2005 Operating Budget started with 631 administrative positions, and at the present time under the FY2005 budget there are 636 positions. The five created positions were done through adjustments in salary accounts with Board approval. Those positions are for (1) the downcounty consortium, (2) special education, (3) the project in organizational development, (4) a position in the deputy superintendent's office, and (5) the reorganization of shared accountability. Mr. Abrams wanted the changes broken out by school-based positions and non-school-based positions from the FY 2005 approved budget to the FY 2005 current budget. Mr. Bowers referred the Board to Table 5 for more detail.

Re: **K-12 INSTRUCTION**

Staff gave a brief overview of the budget focusing on the expansion of successful programs based on the Strategic Plan.

Ms. Ervin asked what the budget was for the Ruth Rales Reading Tutorial Initiative. Mr. Fulton stated that staff would provide the information.

Ms. Ervin inquired about the expansion of reading, writing, and math interventions (\$300,000) and the initiative to advance early success in reading, writing, and math (\$272,838). Are these the same programs? Mr. Fulton responded that they are the same projects, and Mr. Bowers explained that the differences between the two figures were fringe benefits.

Ms. Cox wanted to know if the residency verification process was a success, and whether or not there was a savings. Mr. Bowers explained that there are no additional resources since the funding is already in the budget. It is difficult to ascertain success because of the

variability of enrollment. Mr. Porter noted that residency verification will continue, and the staff is improving the process.

Mr. Sanghvi wanted to know if the costs per pupil would increase when the system had more uniform textbooks. Dr. Weast explained that it will cost more, and there will be more funds expended with the middle school reform because of new textbooks and assessments. Mr. Fulton remarked that the curriculum rollout has funds for textbooks.

Mr. Abrams asked if there would be a placeholder in the budget to fund the County Council's study on technology training for women. Mr. Bowers replied that it has not been put in the budget pending the outcome of the study.

Mrs. Navarro inquired which schools would receive the Middle Years Program. Mr. Fulton replied that the investigation year is at Francis Scott Key Middle School, and the schools moving forward with implementation are Newport Mill and Silver Spring International middle schools.

Mr. Abrams wanted to know what other relationships MCPS had with colleges and universities for student programs in addition to the Montgomery College Institute.

**Re: OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
OF SCHOOLS**

Staff gave a brief overview of the budget focusing on the expansion of successful programs based on the Strategic Plan.

There were no Board questions.

**Re: OFFICE OF CURRICULUM AND
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

Staff gave a brief overview of the budget focusing on the expansion of successful programs based on the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Abrams asked what was being done about the new writing requirements for the SAT. Mr. Fulton replied that those requirements are important in the development of the new curriculum with a six-point rubric. Dr. Weast noted that this writing portion will be graded by people, which may produce variability in the initial years.

Mr. Sanghvi was pleased with the student participation in the SATs, and he asked if there were interventions for the ACT. Mr. Fulton replied that MCPS has focused only on the SAT.

Mrs. Navarro was interested in the family/community partnerships, and she asked about translation services. Mr. Fulton explained that translators are hired for parent meetings through contractual funds.

Mr. Abrams asked staff to provide a list of the major budgeted and non-budgeted grants, when they sunset, and the program impact.

Mr. Romero noted that Spanish-speaking parents have difficulty with written material even if it is in their own language. Is that the only type of communication? Mr. Fulton explained that staff is exploring different ways to communicate, such as videos. Also, there is a need to look at the level of the language that is translated.

Ms. Ervin inquired about the length of the \$3.6-million grant for the Reading First initiative. Mr. Fulton replied that the grant is for three years, and MCPS is in the third year. Ms. Ervin asked about the success of that grant initiative. Dr. Weast stated that the initiative seems to be aligned with MCPS curriculum.

Ms. Ervin noted the interesting outcomes for gifted/talented education and academic achievement for all student populations. Mr. Fulton thought the rigor in all schools should provide access for all students.

Ms. Ervin hoped that the budget would reflect the unions and non-government organizations in the language about partnerships, consultation, and collaboration.

Ms. Cox noted that performance measures are connected through different departments. She appreciated the emphasis on feedback as to the effectiveness of the curriculum from staff and parents. She remarked that the policy requires a review of a curricular area every five years, and that should be reflected in the budget language.

Ms. Cox noticed the monitoring of the implementation of the Gifted and Talented Policy in six clusters. She thought it would be helpful if the Policy Committee received a trend report.

On the performance measure for the career development programs, Ms. Cox noted the language on "low-performing" programs. Mr. Fulton said that was an editorial mistake and that under the Perkins Act low-performing programs should be eliminated.

Ms. Cox asked what the percentage relates to in the performance measure to implement project reports and monitor benchmarks in the Department of Instructional Programs. Mr. Fulton replied that it is a way to monitor projects to make sure they are completed in a timely manner. Percentages refer to project update reports. It was agreed that the language will be clarified.

Under Family and Community Partnerships, Ms. Cox saw that there was an expansion for the Comer and Hopkins schools. Mr. Fulton replied that there is no more funding for the expansion of Comer Schools beyond the two schools. Ms. Cox commented that community outreach must be enhanced to allow all stakeholders to participate more fully in system initiatives and activities. Mr. Fulton replied that databases of interested community members are being developed for systemwide use. Ms. Cox added that the performance measure did not address quality. Dr. Spatz said that the department had been reorganized in the Office of Curriculum and Instruction this year, and the department has not had a chance to fully implement its mission. Ms. Cox asked what was planned for the \$160,000 in contractual funds. Mr. Fulton explained that covered the Comer Schools for \$50,000 and the Call Center.

Mrs. O'Neill inquired about the cost of the Advanced Placement Exam and students who are unable to pay. Dr. Weast replied that there is a sliding scale, and the school system helps students cover the costs in certain circumstances.

Mrs. O'Neill asked about parent specialists and how those positions are distributed through the budget. Mr. Fulton replied that those positions are based in the Division of Family and Community Partnerships, and there are a few positions for ESOL and Title I.

Mr. Romero wanted to know what contractual services support is provided in the budgets of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and the Division of Family and Community Partnerships.

Mrs. Navarro commented that she applauded the decision not to expand Comer Schools until the results have been analyzed. She pointed out that one of the partners that can help the school system are non-government agencies.

RESOLUTION NO. 30-05

Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Abrams seconded by Mr. Sanghvi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting of January 26, 2005, at 9:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

JDW:gr