

MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE

November 16, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. with the following Board members and Board staff present: Shirley Brandman (chair), Chris Barclay, Pat O'Neill, Alan Xie, Judy Docca, Michael Durso, Suzann King (staff assistant), and Glenda Rose (recorder).

Other staff present: Stephanie Williams, Harriet Potosky, Suzanne Merchlinsky, Brian Edwards, Robin Confino, Bruce Crispell, Jim Song, Moriah Martin, Carole Goodman, Ann Kamenstein, Sally Davis, Lori-Christina Webb, Wayne Whigham, Carol Blum, Marty Creel, Ursula Hermann, Brenda Wilks, Nivea Cordova-Berrios, Karen Woodson, Diane Mohr, Betsy Brown, and Jeannie Franklin.

Others present: Judy Bresler.

COMMITTEE MINUTES

The minutes from the June 1, 2010, meeting were approved as presented.

REVIEW OF POLICY ACG, ACCESS TO SERVICES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES BY INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND POLICY GBH, EMPLOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

After reviewing Policies ACG and GBH, Mrs. Goodman explained that staff is recommending that the Policy GBH be rescinded after relevant portions of that policy are incorporated into Policy ACG. If the incorporations and suggested changes are adopted, the revised Policy ACG would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and ADA Amendment Act of 2009 (ADAAA) as well as align with other policies. Staff presented a crosswalk of both policies to outline the provisions that were retained and deleted. After reviewing the materials and making some edits, the committee expressed concern that the tone and message of the revised policy did not convey the same meaning as expressed in the original policy.

ACTION: Staff will review the deletions of purpose and commitments in Policy GBH and reinstate some of those statements in Policy ACG to convey a balance of tone and commitment. Since there is no deadline associated with these policies, the edited version will be brought back to the committee.

POLICY IED, FRAMEWORK AND STRUCTURE OF HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

The committee reviewed the comments submitted by the public and the changes that were made to the policy based on those comments. Mr. Barclay questioned whether the policy should include references to regulations given the regulations are the purview of the superintendent and can be changed without Board approval. Staff explained that this was not consistent with the general practice of policies; however, a majority of the

committee thought it was important to include the regulations in this policy to help facilitate the reader's understanding of the policy and the regulations to review for more information. There was a conversation about the number and level of courses for high school graduation with a commitment for all students to access coursework. The committee also asked for clarification of exams for credit.

ACTION: The committee decided to keep the references to other policies and regulations in the proposed Policy IED to accommodate the reader. The committee agreed to send the policy to the full Board for final action with an analysis by staff and an explanation of exams for credit.

POLICY FKB, MODERNIZATION/RENOVATION

Mr. Crispell noted that MCCPTA made public comments and offered suggestions which staff felt were warranted for inclusion in the policy. There was a discussion about maintenance work orders, the Capital Improvement Program, and other programs, such as PLAR.

ACTION: The committee agreed to incorporate the three revisions proposed by MCCPTA and forward the policy to the Board for final action on December 7, 2010.

POLICY JEE, STUDENT TRANSFERS

Staff provided a briefing to the committee on Policy JEE to clarify that Policy JEE does not apply to the consortia school. The briefing included a discussion of the history of the policy; overview of the development of the consortia; the activity of the Eastern area study group; the boundary study and the desire to balance diversity; establishment of the Northeast Consortium (one school with three campuses); policies QIE and FAA; the Preferred Choice Process; and transfers and athletic waivers within the consortia.

The committee discussion focused on the Change of School Assignment process and the Choice Process (that applies to the consortia). After outlining the two processes and the criteria of each, staff explained the difference between the use of unique hardship as criteria for a transfer between schools in a consortium versus regular transfers. There were still questions from the committee, and staff volunteered to come back to the committee with suggestions to make the process more easily understood by the community.

ACTION: The committee charged staff to come back with information and recommendations regarding: the difference between the COSA and Choice process; whether an athletic waiver process should be implement for students who transfer within consortium's schools; whether there are any patterns for requests for particular schools in the COSA process or Choice Process, including transfers into or out of Wheaton High School; and any patterns regarding the number of students and their choices as they move from Round 1 to Round 2.

POLICIES WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following policies were reviewed to determine if the changes proposed by staff were non-substantive in nature. After discussing the proposed changes, the committee decided on the following actions:

ACTION:

- 1. Policy JED. The committee agreed that the changes were non-substantive, but requested clarification on schools that were open to tuition-paying students.**
- 2. Policy IOD. The committee thought the changes were substantive and requested that the policy be scheduled for tentative approval by the Board.**
- 3. Policy IQD. The committee agreed the changes were non-substantive and added references to gender, race/ethnicity and special services in section F.1. The committee stated that the Strategic Planning Committee should review the ineligibility rate in the Annual Report.**
- 4. Policy GIJ. The committee agreed that changing the policy's three-letter reference code was non-substantive.**

POLICY JNA, CURRICULAR EXPENSES FOR STUDENT

After a survey was conducted, staff reported that impact of the changes in course-related fee guidelines. In general, principals reported little impact in the areas of instructional materials, supplies, subscriptions, and class projects. Overall, there have been adjustments in schools, but staff reports that the impacts have been minimal.

ACTION: The committee wants to continue monitoring the impact of curricular fees on programs and supplies in the event that there is a need to change the policy or practice.

WORK PLAN REVIEW

Staff presented a proposed schedule for policy action in 2011.

ACTION: The committee accepted the work plan and will add it to upcoming meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.