

WHEREAS, Hispanic American students and staff contribute to the success of MCPS through their participation in all aspects of education, and the growing Hispanic community enriches our county in many ways; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the superintendent, staff, and students of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the Board of Education hereby declares the period of September 15 to October 15, 1991, to be observed in MCPS as "Hispanic Heritage Month"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education extends its appreciation to Hispanic magazine for its contribution to MCPS which will support the increasing interest in Hispanic life and culture.

Re: REPORT ON THE OPENING OF SCHOOL

Deputy and associate superintendents reported on the opening of school and praised staff who had contributed to the smooth opening. Board members added their compliments to the many staff who worked over the Labor Day weekend to prepare schools for students. Everyone agreed that thanks to the efforts of administrators, teachers, and supporting services workers, it was an outstanding beginning for the school year.

Re: HISPANIC MAGAZINE

Mr. Brian May and Mr. Randy Belcher Torres of Hispanic Magazine joined the Board to report on the donation of back issues and subscriptions to their magazine. On behalf of the Board, Mr. Ewing thanked the staff of Hispanic Magazine for its contribution to increasing the awareness of MCPS students regarding the contributions of Hispanic Americans. Mr. Torres indicated that the magazine would also like to feature some of the outstanding programs in MCPS.

Re: REVIEW OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION
PLACEMENT PROCESS AND THE DELIVERY
OF SERVICES

Mr. Ewing explained that this item stemmed from a resolution adopted by the Board earlier this year. The Board had indicated that it might want to take action on aspects of the special education placement issue. Board members had been provided with executive summaries of the report on seriously emotionally disturbed students and the report on learning disabled students as background information for this discussion.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, introduced Mrs. Pat Coffin, parent coordinator; Dr. Mary Holly Allison, principal of Westbrook Elementary School; Mrs. Joanne Saridakis, parent; Ms. Mary Lee Phelps, supervisor of placement; Dr. Betty Howard,

area supervisor of special education and pupil services; Mr. Tony Paul, coordinator for SED programs; and Ms. Jane Parra, coordinator for LD.

Mrs. Coffin explained that she had been given the task of describing the placement process in ten minutes. Normally this would be done for parents and staff in a six-hour workshop. She had a chart showing the process which was based on federal and state laws. In MCPS they started with the educational management team, a local school group, which was not mandated by state and federal law. The EMT gave school personnel an opportunity to have an in-depth look at a youngster who was experiencing difficulty. After the EMT, an effort was made to start with lower level interventions before the staff started talking about disabilities. However, if the strategies were unsuccessful, the EMT started talking about the possibility of educational disabilities. At that time the child was referred to the screening admission review and dismissal (ARD) team. The initial letter determined where the meeting was taking place. For example, a CARD was at the central office, and an AARD was at the area level.

Mrs. Coffin said that at the SARD they got into federal and state regulations, and at a minimum five people attended this meeting, usually the principal, parent, special education teacher, the teacher, and a psychologist. They reviewed preliminary information and completed a questionnaire with the parent. There was an independent observation done by someone other than the classroom teacher, and a review was conducted of all records on the child. At this point the team was only determining whether there was enough evidence of the possibility of handicapping condition or educational disability. If this was the result, they ordered a battery of assessments including psychological testing and educational assessment. If they did not suspect a disability, the child went back to the EMT and lower level intervention services.

After the assessments were completed, Mrs. Coffin reported that they came back to the eligibility ARD and four questions to be answered. Is there a disability here? What is the disability? Is this disability affecting the child's ability to achieve? Are special education services necessary? If they could answer yes to all four questions, they moved to the individualized education plan (IEP) phase, which was both a document and a meeting. They looked at goals and objectives to help a child achieve. This was discussed with the parent and the teacher. Then they looked at the issue of related services and whether there were services needed by the child to access education. They discussed where the services could best be delivered in the least restricted environment. For most children, this meant their home school.

Mrs. Coffin said that in Maryland they had a level system. The majority of the children were in Levels 1, 2, and 3 at their home school. If students were unable to learn in these levels, Level 4 or 5 service was considered. The parent had to agree to the placement and sign the IEP. She explained that entire process could take almost 165 days which was hard for parents and staff to understand. However, while the whole process was going on, a lot of youngsters were receiving uncoded service and getting help from the resource room teacher and others. Once special education services were provided, there was a mandated 60-day review with the parent and the committee. Each year they had an annual review to see whether the goals and objectives were being met. Every three years, the child went through the whole evaluation process again to determine whether he or she still needed special education. She pointed out that there were timelines that needed to be met and that at any point along the way the parent or the school could disagree. There was an appeal process in place, and her office helped parents understand what was involved in that process. Her office assisted people in understanding the process and did offer a six-hour workshop for parents.

Dr. Allison explained that she was at the table because she was a principal representative to an advisory group and because last spring she and other principals had done a special project with ARD procedures. This project involved identification of areas of difficulty for schools in implementing those procedures. In addition, they conducted training for administrators on successful practices for implementing programs for youngsters in the least restrictive environment. She reported that principals were strongly committed to meeting the needs of special needs youngsters in their schools, but they found it to be one of the most challenging aspects of the complex role of the elementary principalship.

Dr. Allison indicated that it was the principal's responsibility to manage all of the legal requirements, procedures, and forms of the special education process and the implementation of the IEP's. Principals were advocates for children and recognized the need for safeguards and due process rights. However, the demands of current ARD procedures competed for time with other demands of the principalship in a time of diminishing resources and reduced support to classroom teachers.

Dr. Allison reported that at the school they worked together to create a positive environment and build teams to make parents feel a part of this. There was a need to encourage general educators and special educators to work as a cooperative team for success for all youngsters. They also tried to develop a calm environment because emotions ran high in these situations. There needed to be time for communication among staff, therapists,

psychologists, private providers, medical doctors, and other county agencies.

Dr. Allison said that a second concern of the principal was monitoring the instructional practices including implementation of the MCPS curriculum and making reasonable accommodations to allow special education students to be successful in the least restrictive environment. Staff had to be knowledgeable about procedures and forms as well as changes in the law. Another issue was training of new special education staff. In area 1, there were 10 SED classes at the elementary level, and seven of those teachers had less than two years experience in MCPS.

Dr. Allison commented that another issue was paperwork and clerical tasks. For example, the scheduling of ARD meetings required coordination of all the service providers and the parents, plus there had to be coverage so that the classroom teacher could attend. They had to meet deadlines for sending out material, and all the paperwork had to be written, copied, shared with the parent, and maintained in a confidential file. This had to be recorded in a special education data system.

Another issue was crisis management. For example, this past week started a new school year, and there were new staff members. SED youngsters had high anxieties, and this frequently led to time out or restraint. Students and staff needed the support of a crisis resource team. Oftentimes, parents and therapists had to be contacted, and plans had to be made to problem solve for these students. In some cases they had to deal with attorneys, advocates, and interpreters.

Dr. Allison explained that at Westbrook they tried to limit these meetings to two hours. It did take that long for parents to have the contact with service providers and to have their questions answered. All of what she had described took time, and principals had to face the issue of serving youngsters or meeting legal requirements. For example, did they change procedures or add more resources? She said that as they continued to serve handicapped youngsters at the local school, there continued to be a need for additional clerical support, maintaining high levels of training for staff and parents, and the provision of resources to implement IEP's. She felt that it must be a priority for staff to deal with children, and not paper.

Dr. Howard recognized the outstanding support they had received from the Parent Information Center. The goal of the area teams was to provide support to schools. The pupil personnel workers had the primary goal of attending EMT meetings at the schools because they felt the greatest impact could be made prior to the special education identification stage. Many of the PPWs had counseling and teaching backgrounds and felt that they were almost a member of the school team although they were assigned to

six or seven schools. They did follow up with parents and interagency recommendations for support to the families. They did attend the SARD meetings as time permitted and did become the case manager for any case referred out of the school to the area office. The psychologists did attend at least two ARD meetings in each of their five assigned schools, and at the assessment meetings they provided reports. They were also involved in supporting Level 4 students and Levels 1 to 3 students at the schools and did participate in crisis management. Dr. Howard felt that this was getting to be a time consuming process for the psychologists. Many of the cases were more complex and multiply involved than they had been in the past. Often they scheduled appointments with parents and students for assessments only to find that parent just moved the day before. At times they had to go to the parent's place of employment to secure the informed consent or to the home.

Dr. Howard reported that the cases were referred to the area office when the school had exhausted all resources. She felt that principals were doing an outstanding job because the areas received well documented cases of efforts and alternatives. With the new procedures, the area did not have to schedule an AARD on every case. If they felt the recommendation was well founded and there were no dissenting opinions and the parent was comfortable with the recommendation, they could do a folder screening and place that student in a Level 4 class or refer the case to a higher level. However, if the parent, principal, or school team member had a concern, they did schedule an AARD meeting. On that team was a physician from the Health Department, an area chairperson for speech and language, a psychologist, an educator, an administrator, and parents as a partner in this process. They came prepared with an understanding of the process and their role. They often brought advocates and at times they brought attorneys. They felt that the parent had more information about the child than any other person at that table.

Dr. Howard commented that at the area they offered parents the due process brochure only to find that they had several copies of it. She noted that in almost all cases the principal attended the area meeting. If the area placed the child in a Level 4 program, the PPW presenting the case continued to be the case manager and supported the parent until the child was placed into the recommended school. He or she arranged an intake conference and made sure that the transportation arrangements were comfortable. The case management then transferred to the PPW assigned to the school where the program was housed. The psychologists worked closely with the schools in assessing nonpublic cases and often came to the area for a review and decision.

Dr. Howard indicated that the PPWs, the psychologists, the assistant supervisors, the speech/language chairperson, and the

behavior support teachers provided on-going support to students who were placed in Level 4 classes. In Area 2 there were 884 Level 4 students. They did have weekly meetings at the area, and they were interested in continuing to provide in-service to the schools in implementing the procedures because they did have many new principals.

Ms. Phelps stated that there were always exceptions to any process. One group was the pre-school aged students who did not have the advantage of the EMT. The Child Find Office served as a single point of entry, and they received referrals from parents, doctors, and daycare providers. When the assessments were completed, Child Find referred these children to the appropriate ARD group. Another group not going through the entire process were children new to MCPS who had an IEP from another jurisdiction. Their goal was to get these students into school as quickly as possible; therefore, the information was reviewed, and an effort was made to place them in the most comparable MCPS program. While they were in the program, MCPS updated the assessments and received additional information. At the 60-day review, adjustments were made to their programs.

Ms. Phelps said that the third group consisted of students who were hospitalized into psychiatric facilities by their parents. From this group, they received about 300 referrals a year, and about one-third of those students requested special education services. These cases were challenging because the families were in considerable stress. Families were also faced with a great financial burden because most insurance policies did not cover the entire hospitalization. They were also faced with the threat that coverage would end before the child was discharged from the facility. The majority of the children had never been identified as needing special education services, and the parents were unfamiliar with the placement process. They needed support, information, and some guidance during the process. The maximum coverage was 30 days, but the MCPS timeline might take 105 days.

Ms. Phelps explained that because of limited community mental health resources, parents turned to the school system. They requested emergency responses in the identification of their children and in the provision of emergency services. However, MCPS procedures were not designed to respond in an emergency. She indicated that MCPS needed to provide some interim services. All children had the right to return to their home school, but sometimes this was not the recommendation of the mental health professionals. MCPS used home instruction, partial day, modified schedules, and alternative programs until they could get their processes in place. Parents frequently requested residential services for reasons other than education. Sometimes this was to treat substance abuse or avoid juvenile court recommendations because of crimes committed. In other cases, it was to help resolve some family problems. Hospital staffs were not always

familiar with the responsibilities of education, and because their resources were drying up because of insurance, they encouraged families to go to MCPS for those mental health services.

Ms. Phelps said that in these cases parents perceived the school system as being unresponsive or as uncaring. MCPS had tried to make this a more user-friendly system, and in the Central Placement Office they had identified a case manager to work with parents who had children in the hospital. They also tried to inform parents about community mental health services and alternative programs. They had met with parent groups to identify issues and clarify problem areas. They had also met with hospital staffs to try to explain the role of education in mental health. More recently residential treatment facilities funding had become much easier through the use of Medicaid, private insurers, and special education funding. These interventions had helped MCPS provide more timely and more responsive services, but they still had a long way to go.

Ms. Phelps reported that they were now seeing more elementary school children being hospitalized with severe mental health disorders. They were seeing an increasing number of cases where parent addiction and mental illness were identified as family issues. They were also seeing children who were victims of sexual and physical abuse. The staff was still being asked to respond to crises and emergencies, but they were still constrained by legal mandates. However, the staff was committed to taking steps to try to ease and streamline the process to be responsive to children and family needs.

Mrs. Saridakis said she would like to share the views of a parent of a handicapped child. Her 10 year-old daughter was multiply handicapped with her most severe handicap being visual impairment. She had had 16 surgeries and had spent over 150 days at Children's Hospital in her first two years of life. They had enrolled her in the preschool education program for what they thought would be a temporary placement in an early intervention program; however, when she started to talk, they realized she needed speech services. Then they realized she needed physical therapy and that she was legally blind. Every year they had more surprises, and she was currently enrolled in a Level 5 vision program at Lakewood which was a 45 minute drive from their home school. She was mainstreamed for most fifth grade subjects and was on grade level.

Mrs. Saridakis reported that in the last nine years they had been through the special education placement process many times. They had been on the receiving end of many services including speech, OT, PT, vision, counseling, adaptive PE, resource teachers, etc. She said that when she walked into a room for an IEP she was overwhelmed and confused, and she considered herself to be an

educated parent with a master's degree in computer systems. She realized that any decision she made would affect her daughter's education for the rest of the year. The professionals often spoke in technical terms, and it was extremely difficult for her as a parent to comprehend the impact of the goals and recommendations in the short hour allocated for an IEP. After years of attending IEPs, she now requested that materials be given to her in advance in order to review, comprehend, and analyze this information before the meeting. This preview allowed her to relate these objectives to her child's day-to-day experiences. It also allowed her to ask questions when she attended the IEP.

Mrs. Saridakis indicated that she had become familiar with these procedures during the parent training sessions and in her role as special needs chairperson at school. However, this was an ongoing process, and she was still learning about this complex system. Once the IEP was determined, it created a set of goals and objectives for the child. An additional level of frustration occurred in their attempt to put these theories into practice and to create a comprehensive program to meet the educational needs of her child. At one time her child was pulled out of the classroom more than she was in it. Mrs. Saridakis explained that she was under the misconception that more was always better, and in her fight to give her child every service she was entitled to, they had fragmented the educational process. They had learned a valuable lesson in communication and had scheduled services to minimize class pull out. They had worked with supportive administrators and teachers who were sensitive and flexible in incorporating a child's disabilities into a classroom. The teacher was often the difference between success and failure.

Mrs. Saridakis explained that as frustrated as she felt, she recognized that she had the advantage of having a supportive husband and family. However, many children receiving special education and services were coming from single parent families or families where English was spoken as a second language. She said that the United Way had reported that the divorce rate among parents of handicapped children was 80 percent which was twice the national statistic.

Mrs. Saridakis felt that the more support MCPS provided through compassionate communication with both parents, the better the chances the child would have a cohesive program at school and at home. She pointed out that she was the parent and ultimately she had the responsibility for the well-being of her child. Last evening when she looked over her daughter's 16-page IEP, she noticed that her signature was at the bottom of each form. Parents had the last word in their child's placement. She asked the Board to keep in mind the role of the parent as they reviewed the special education placement process.

Mrs. Saridakis said she was grateful for the services she had received and the success they had enjoyed over the years. The system was complex and at times frustrating, but it had enabled her daughter to function in the least restrictive environment at grade level.

Dr. Fountain reported that they provided 18,439 services to over 11,000 students each year. At any given time those services could create a situation where there might be disagreement. Although the process was very difficult to get through because of federal and state mandates, they believed the process was working relatively well.

Mr. Ewing thanked all of the presenters for their valuable reports which provided a clear picture to the Board.

Mrs. DiFonzo recalled that a comment had been made that youngsters were not being denied services while in the process of placement. Over the years the Board had requested information on how many children a psychologist was serving or how many was a speech therapist serving. She asked whether these non-coded youngsters were listed in a response to how many children a therapist was seeing. Dr. Fountain replied that in most cases these children were not counted until they were talking to a resource room teacher who also served non-coded students. The other staff might consult but could not offer services.

Dr. Vance asked about the case load for a psychologist. Dr. Howard replied that the highest case load for potential cases was 3,574. This included all students in the psychologist's assigned schools from elementary to high school. All of these would not be referrals. For a pupil personnel worker, the potential was 5,097 students. She explained that when they made assignments they looked at the number of Level 4 classes in those schools because Level 4 students had to have psychological evaluations every three years.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked for a sense of what was causing the need for more and more immediate services. Ms. Phelps replied that part of the conflict was the situation with insurance companies because they were much more strict about expenditures. Employers were also cutting back on coverage for families. Frequently the insurance coverage ended before the hospital staff recommended discharge.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked why there were more students needing psychological services immediately. She asked whether they were becoming more sensitive to this or whether mental health was becoming a more appropriate subject that they could now talk about it. Mrs. Phelps replied that this was one factor. They were seeing drug involvement, more family stress, and financial stress. Adolescence was a complex time, and there might be

issues outside of school that made these children vulnerable. Sometimes it was just one more thing to reveal the difficulties faced by these children. They were seeing younger children which might be the result of the addiction of parents.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that when she had run for the Board of Education there were two issues raised at every meeting. One was personnel and the other was special education placement. A lot of people felt very frustrated that MCPS was not taking care of the needs of their child. This was not to say that staff was not working very, very hard. She felt that somehow they had to look for a way to assist parents to understand that staff did care about that child but had to follow timelines. She said that prevention was the answer, and they were trying to move toward that. However, in the last budget season even the things they had put in for SED were thwarted.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether or not there had ever been a DEA study or evaluation of the process. She wondered whether they had a comparison of their services with those of Fairfax or other counties. She was concerned about the continuing problem of getting a CARD and the length of time it took to get a CARD. She would like to have an opportunity to discuss with staff the possibility of using the special education process as a way of looking at total quality management.

Mrs. Fanconi asked how they could get a handle on this or what kind of pilot could they do that would look at delivery of service and humanizing the process for parents. Mrs. Saridakis replied that the process could be speeded up if the parent had information before going into the meetings. The special needs chairpersons needed to get this information out to parents. Parents had to be informed about choices and alternatives. When she went to these meetings, she had already done her homework. She usually called Pat Coffin a week before the meetings.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether this was a new position. Ms. Coffin replied that they were starting their fifth year of operation, but this was only the second year the program had been full time.

Dr. Allison reported that at Westbrook they spent time identifying the issues in terms of communication among staff and working with the parents. They had a meeting for parents in the evening to get them more informed. For the annual reviews, they had all the service providers work together on the IEP development. These were provided to the families at least a week ahead of the meetings. They were looking for things to make it more inviting for the parent to participate actively in an informed way. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether there was a way of evaluating what Westbrook was doing in comparison with what other schools were doing. Dr. Allison thought that the new coordinators would help facilitate this.

Dr. Fountain commented that for the past decade or more the Board of Education had been responsive. He could name 10 programs that had come out of parental concerns. For example, they had to come up with the bilingual assessment team because of the nature of the population.

Dr. Cheung said that the community had told him they were pleased with the programs once they got through the process. The problem was with the process. It seemed to him that a lot of this involved paperwork, and he wondered whether this could be improved by computerization. He asked whether the special education data system could be used to handle most of that paperwork. They could have a scheduling system, and at meetings they could have a lap top to enter in data. He asked about the extent to which they had computerization. He suggested they might be able to relate this to the SIMS project.

Dr. Fountain replied that the MCPS computer people were working on enhancing the student profile to include a number of areas in special education. The computerized data system they had now had been started in 1979, and its purpose was to make sure they had the correct numbers to show to the state for reimbursement purposes. The system was not up to date, and they were trying to improve it. He believed that when they improved the total student information system they would be able to do a better job. Dr. Cheung thought that this should be a high priority because with good data they would be able to expedite the process and fix their problems.

Mrs. Hobbs reported that in the new teacher orientation brochure for special education there was a page that gave the impression they did have computer support for the IEP's. Dr. Fountain said they did have a system that was computerized to the point of being able to list the specific objectives. They wanted to make the objectives consistent across the county. However, this was just a small piece of the student data system.

Mrs. Brenneman commented that these meetings could be overwhelming for parents. She asked whether they were flexible as far as meeting with working parents. For example, did parents have to take leave to attend these meetings? Dr. Fountain replied that they were very flexible. Mrs. Saridakis added that the staff would offer her a variety of dates. If they had a schedule running from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., she would be put in the 4:30 slot so that her husband could attend.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that when her child had a problem she was given a lot of information the first time which was overwhelming. She asked how they knew that parents looked at the due process paper. She asked whether someone sat down with the parents to review this. Ms. Saridakis replied that it was better in recent years. As special needs chairperson, she had put together a

letter with the principal to explain what an EMT was. They did this prior to the SARD meeting as well. She thought it was important for parents to know that they did not have to sign the IEP at that first meeting.

Dr. Howard reported that at the area level they called the parent before the meeting. They had held meetings at 5 and 6 p.m. in the evening to accommodate parents. Some PPWs had even driven parents to meetings during their lunch hour.

Mrs. Brenneman said that she had been asked to accompany a parent who felt very uncomfortable about the process. She asked about roles for advocates. Dr. Howard replied that they encouraged advocates, and they also encouraged the PPW to meet with the parent 15 minutes before the start of the actual meeting with staff. Ms. Coffin reported that she was unable to attend meetings with parents, but she did help prepare parents for these meetings. They also put parents in touch with advocacy organizations; however, they did encourage parents to be their own advocates as much as possible. She agreed that in some cases it was good just to have someone with them for the support.

Mrs. Hobbs said that one of the best explanations she had ever seen of the EMT/ARD/IEP was in the Chevy Chase ES newsletter. She thought that the special needs chairperson in that school probably wrote the article. As a Board member, she was seeing an increasing number of decisions by hearing examiners that referred to violations of state and federal rules. These included timeliness, parent notification of meetings, due process rights, placement decisions before the IEP, incomplete IEPs, availability of extended school year services, etc. She knew that some of these violations were cited in the findings of the January 1991 study of MCPS learning disabilities initiatives. She asked whether the Maryland Special Education Mediation Project still in effect and, if so, was MCPS using this service.

Dr. Fountain replied that it was. It was available if parents wanted to use mediation. Oftentimes after mediation, they still wanted to go to a hearing. Mrs. Hobbs asked whether MCPS was agreeable to mediation, and Dr. Fountain replied that it was. Mrs. Hobbs reported that at the new teacher orientation when the information was given to new teachers, she had noticed there were a couple of brochures that seemed to be out of date. She asked if there were plans to revise these brochures. Were they on hold to see what was done with mainstreaming special education students? Were there budget restraints preventing the updating of the brochures. Dr. Fountain replied that he would need to know more information about which brochures she was talking about. Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that on one brochure Dr. Cody was listed as the superintendent.

Ms. Gutierrez thanked staff for their presentation. She said that she had more questions than they could possibly deal with today. She felt that it was important that they continue to see how they could improve on the process. She did understand the constraints under which they worked, but she thought it was important for the Board in this year to begin to look at areas in which they could improve. She particularly supported the idea of using technology in a more effective way. She thought that their model would lend itself to computerization because of the rules and regulations. She said they should be more aggressive in this area and this might be the subject of another discussion. She thought this was an area that could increase professional productivity by using the computer to assist with paperwork and meeting deadlines.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that another area was the parental reaction to all of this. All she could think about were the parents who did not speak English. This seemed to be a real issue that they needed to focus on. When they added the language barrier to an already complex situation, this was a concern. She asked if they could look at this issue and bring in the community to help them provide the information and understanding to parents who did not speak English.

Ms. Gutierrez asked that the superintendent consider using a cross-functional team to identify and prioritize some of the major issues, short-term actions, and longer-term actions. If they could link that into their budget process for this year, they could have an impact on the whole situation. During the Board election campaign, this was considered to be a very high priority.

Mr. Ewing commented that the placement process inevitably was greatly affected by the expected availability of programs and the spaces in programs for students. They had to be aware of how limited their program opportunities were, not qualitatively, but given the needs, the program was limited. To some extent the length of time to get through the process was affected by the search for the appropriate and available program and space. If their resources were more generous, they would perhaps be able to move more quickly both in terms of the people who were making the decisions and in terms of where they could locate space for people. In that connection, it seemed to him that one set of data which would be useful to have for budget decision making would be to have some trend information by major categories of handicapped students over the last five or six years. He would like to know what had happened in terms of the numbers of students who had been identified as well as the numbers as a percentage of the total student population. They needed a sense of absolute numbers and percentage changes. They could provide the information for SED, LD, vision, retarded, etc. If they did this, the Board, community, and County Council would

have a sense of what was happening overall and where the demands were the heaviest. If one connected that to information available programs for those categories, one would have a sense of where there was the biggest need. He had a sense that one of the biggest areas of rapidly rising need was for the SED students where the increased continued unabated year by year as well as the severity of the disability. The age at which the disability was identified seemed to be getting younger. He thought they should have some assessment of what was happening here and, for that matter, what was happening in each of these cases. Did they know anything about the sources of change? He thought that SED might be a good area for an in-depth look.

In regard to resources, Mr. Ewing stated that in the case of SED students, insurance companies had for years restricted their coverage. Now they were restricting it even more, and when they were not, employers were. The more typical case was that both were simultaneously. The result was that for children with this disability there was less and less available service. The school system could not replace this, but this was something that they needed to call to the attention of the decision-makers. He agreed that they had to improve their placement process, but he pointed out that this led to services. If services were limited, the best placement process in the world would not help.

Mrs. Fanconi said she would like to add a few things to Mr. Ewing's request for data. They needed information about the waiting lists, youngsters eligible, etc. She would like to see the trends by the level of services. For example, was there an increased need for services at higher and higher levels. For example, SED students were not served in their homes schools and for the most part were in Levels 5 and 6. She also requested data on compliance. They needed to look at where they were failing to comply and what the variables were. She would like to see this in comparison with other jurisdictions. She suggested that DEA could look at the data sources they currently had to see what could be quantified. She asked if they could look at trends in costs for such things as residential placement. Dr. Vance indicated that this information would be available because normally this was done in the spring with the providers.

Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that the survey of SED was scheduled on a November agenda. She hoped they could allow some extra time to pull some of these issues into that discussion. She thanked staff for their efforts. On behalf of the Board, Mr. Ewing thanked staff for an excellent presentation and a clear explanation of the placement process.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from 12:20 p.m. to 2 p.m. to discuss appeals, funding issues, conference attendance, and their calendar.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

- 1. Bill Fitz and Jane Evans, Laytonsville community
- 2. Marge Samels, Parents Supporting Parents
- 3. Cathy Geisler
- 4. Joanne Hamilton
- 5. Earl Marshall
- 6. Sharon Friedman, MCCPTA
- 7. Jean Mallon
- 8. Joan Karasik, Montgomery County Association for Retarded Citizens

RESOLUTION NO. 770-91 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 92 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH SCIENCE ALLIANCE PROGRAM WITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1992 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$24,724 from the National Institutes of Health to evaluate its Science Alliance Program that will pair teams of their scientists with Brookhaven Elementary School in MCPS and Burroughs Elementary School in the District of Columbia in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Administration	\$23,079
10 Fixed Charges	<u>1,645</u>
Total	<u>\$24,724</u>

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 771-91 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE MODEL LEARNING CENTER

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1992 supplemental appropriation of \$228,875 from the Montgomery County Government to operate the Model Learning Center in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	1.0	\$199,280
3 Other Instructional Costs		8,000
10 Fixed Charges	—	<u>21,595</u>
Total	<u>1.0</u>	<u>\$228,875</u>

* 1.0 Teacher A-D (10 month)

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. 772-91 Re: FY 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend in the following categories a \$234,590 grant award from the Maryland Department of Human Resources, Community Services Administration, Office of Refugee Affairs, under the Refugee Act of 1980 for the FY 1992 Intensive English Language Program:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1 Administration	\$ 234
2 Instructional Salaries	212,316
3 Other Instructional Costs	5,055
10 Fixed Charges	<u>16,985</u>
Total	<u>\$234,590</u>

RESOLUTION NO. 776-91 Re: PERSONNEL MONTHLY REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cheung, 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. 777-91 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

<u>Name</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Jane Akerman	Alternative teacher E. B. Lee Middle School	Instructional Assistant Briggs Chaney Middle Will maintain salary status To retire: 11-1-91
Barbara Fries	Spec. Ed. Resource Teacher Kemp Mill ES	Spec. Ed. Inst. Asst. Paint Branch High Will maintain salary status To retire: 7-1-92

RESOLUTION NO. 778-91 Re: DEATH OF MRS. PATRICIA FITZPATRICK,
BUS OPERATOR IN AREA 2

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 3, 1991, of Mrs. Patricia Fitzpatrick, a bus operator in Area 2, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In more than 29 years with Montgomery County Public Schools, Mrs. Fitzpatrick demonstrated exceptional ability as a bus operator; and

WHEREAS, Her cheerful and cooperative attitude and her concern for her passengers were a credit to the entire pupil transportation program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Patricia Fitzpatrick and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Fitzpatrick's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 779-91 Re: DEATH OF MRS. VIVIAN GAGNON, HEAD
START INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT,
ROLLING TERRACE ELEMENTARY

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 22, 1991, of Mrs. Vivian Gagnon, a Head Start instructional assistant at Rolling Terrace Elementary, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Gagnon had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for more than 18 years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Gagnon was a reliable and responsible employee always willing to learn new skills, was kind and encouraging with students, and gave freely of her time and energy to help them improve; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Vivian Gagnon and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Gagnon's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 780-91 Re: DEATH OF MR. THOMAS NEUGEBAUER,
SPECIAL EDUCATION BUS ATTENDANT IN
AREA 1

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 2, 1991, of Mr. Thomas Neugebauer, a special education bus attendant in Area 1, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Neugebauer had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools for more than nine years; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Neugebauer's dedication to his job was recognized by students, staff, and the community; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Thomas Neugebauer and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Neugebauer's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 781-91 Re: DEATH OF MRS. FRANCES ROTAN,
CAFETERIA WORKER AT WALT WHITMAN
HIGH SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on August 2, 1991, of Mrs. Frances Rotan, a cafeteria worker at Walt Whitman High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Rotan had been a loyal employee of Montgomery County Public Schools and a member of the cafeteria staff for more than 24 years; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Rotan's pride in her work and her ability to work effectively with students and coworkers were recognized by staff and associates; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Frances Rotan and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Rotan's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 782-91 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Edmond W. Green	Director of Transportation Portland School District #1 Portland, Oregon	Director of Transportation Grade P Effective: 10-14-91

RESOLUTION NO. 783-91 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Robin Confino	Admin. Asst. Off. of Instruct. & Program Development	Admin. Asst. Office of the Deputy Supt. for Instruct. Grade N Effective: 9-12-91

Re: SUMMER SCHOOL REPORT

Ms. Gutierrez invited staff to help the Board understand why the concept of an enterprise fund did not work out as well as they had hoped. Dr. Vance asked Mr. Larry Bowers, director of the Department of Management, Budget, and Planning, to respond.

Mr. Bowers replied that he was not sure that the increases in rates for elementary school and arts programs affected the outcome. However, at the senior high school levels, they had increased the price from \$55 to \$200 for electives, and he believed this had an impact. He thought that those programs had not been offered, and they would have to take another look at those courses next year. The biggest factor was the lateness and uncertainty because of the budget process. The registration process was a little bit different this year, but he thought that the most critical factor was the lateness. He said they did not see much of a drop-off in courses for which there was no charge last year and for which there was a charge this year. This included the Summer Institute, the middle level remediation, and high school programs to prepare students for the Maryland Functional Tests. Because they did not have the resources and positions, they were going to have to look at the gifted and talented program. They had seen a tremendous drop off in numbers in the elementary gifted and talented program.

Mrs. Brenneman said it appeared that they could not charge less for the \$200 programs and keep them self-supporting. Mr. Bowers replied that this was the case. Mrs. Fanconi asked if they would be able to make some predictions for the coming budget or suggest some way of getting around the lateness issue. Mr. Bowers replied that there was no way to tell what would happen after March 1. He believed that the enterprise fund would be okay because, while they did not get the revenue, they did not have the expenditures.

WHEREAS, The County Council also reduced the Board's request for extended-year employment by \$800,000; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education established an Adult Education/ Summer School Enterprise Fund on May 29, 1991; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education increased summer school fees for FY 92 to make the enterprise fund self-supporting and to raise additional revenues for those summer school programs not in the fund; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education indicated its intent on May 29, 1991, to request the County Council to approve an emergency supplemental appropriation for the amount that exceeds the projected revenue that was included in the Board's FY 92 Operating Budget request approved in February; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1992 emergency supplemental appropriation of \$265,693 from the Montgomery County Government in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$246,012
10 Fixed Charges	<u>19,681</u>
Total	<u>\$265,693</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: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION GRADUATION
REQUIREMENTS AND PROPOSED ACTION ON
SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Mr. Ewing announced that this item was one of the Board's action areas dealing with the outcomes of education. First, the Board would discuss the state's graduation requirements proposal and then discuss and take action on the science and math proposals.

Dr. Vance invited Dr. Mary Helen Smith, director of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Cindy Sullivan, director of the Division of Academic Skills, and Mr. William Clark, former director of Academic Skills to the table. On July 9, 1991, the Board had discussed its resolution to increase graduation requirements to four years of math and four years of science. In preparation for continuing this discussion, he and

staff had decided it would be appropriate to discuss the state Board recommendations in order to review the proposal and to give the Board the staff views of the impact of the proposal. Dr. Vance expressed his support of Mr. Ewing's proposal to increase MCPS requirements in science and math.

In regard to the state proposal, Dr. Vance believed it was appropriate to increase the math credit requirement from three to four; however, their recommendation to keep the science credits at two was difficult to understand in light of what had previously been considered by the state Board. The recommendation of a one credit technology requirement was unclear because the contents of the requirement had not been defined.

Mrs. Gemberling urged the Board to take a very strong and public position on the state proposal. She recalled that the last time they discussed the local proposal for changing requirements they had told the Board that state changes were minimal and would not affect this proposal; however, the latest state changes were not minimal.

Mrs. Gemberling suggested that Board members turn to the chart for an overview of the state proposal. The issues on the chart, while raised by OIPD staff, were also issues of concern to staff in other counties. She pointed out that the increase from 20 to 21 credits was not a major consideration because MCPS already had 22 credits. Of concern was the fact that so many of these credits were specified by the state, and options for electives by students were greatly reduced. Going to four credits in math would affect about half of the MCPS students who did not take a fourth credit now. They believed that the MCPS curriculum could be consistent with the state requirements in math. The new social studies requirement was a surprise to staff because it had not been discussed at the state level before. It consisted of four specific requirements, and two of them were courses that virtually were not offered in MCPS at the high school level. They were not sure what other changes they would have to make in world history, but the requirements about geography and economics were specific. The social studies requirements would cause changes in the elective program as well as existing courses. There were staff certification and preparation issues as well.

In regard to science, Mrs. Gemberling said the state's original proposal had been for increasing to three credits. However, at the last meeting they had gone to two credits and had proposed the technology education credit. At this point, staff was not sure what would meet the requirement for technology education. The proposed physical education requirement would affect MCPS offerings or if the MCPS requirement were retained, it would reduce choices for students.

The other issue was the requirement for 75 hours of student volunteerism. Mrs. Gemberling said there was much debate about the oxymoron of required volunteerism. There was staff support for incorporating outcomes within curriculum that addressed issues of responsible citizenship and contribution to the community. There was concern about keeping track of students off site.

Mrs. DiFonzo thanked staff for the outline of the issues in Attachment C. She suggested that the Board members give their comments to staff so that staff could prepare testimony to the state Board of Education on October 29. She said that she had always been a strong advocate of student volunteerism, but students were involved in these activities because they received pleasure from them. If this were a required course, students would not be so excited about donating their time. She was also concerned that this would put boards of education across the state into positions of having to decide what qualified as a volunteer project. Students would have problems with transportation, and additional staff would be required to monitor whether or not students were volunteering. She pointed out that in the western counties this would be a problem because population was spread out and students would need transportation. When staff prepared testimony, they should do so not only from the point of view of Montgomery County but from the impact it was going to have on other LEAs as well.

Mrs. DiFonzo was concerned about the social studies requirement because it was so prescriptive. She thought that the state Board's proposal was the result of compromises among their Board members. She agreed that the technology education credit was very vague. In regard to transfer students, it appeared to her that they were saying a superintendent in another state could grant a waiver to give a transfer student a Maryland diploma. Upon further reflection, she thought it might mean that a student moving away from Montgomery County could apply back to Montgomery County to be given a Maryland diploma. In any event, the language was vague.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out the requirement that high schools had to be open for at least 180 days with a minimum of 1170 school hours during a 10-month period. She thought this was poorly worded because they could have the schools open every day, but they had to require students to attend. She was also greatly concerned about the number of half days, planning days, and days off they had in MCPS. She thought they might be coming close to the provisions of this particular law. She also thought that in their testimony they had to point out that there were a lot of school systems in the state that did not have the seven-period day, and the new requirements would create havoc for those students. She felt that Montgomery County was not out of the woods on this one because there had been some talk about moving

to the six-period day because of the economic conditions in the county.

Mrs. Fanconi said she would like to echo what Mrs. DiFonzo had stated. It seemed to her that the state was setting two different standards for children selecting either the "before employment track" or the "post high school track." Mr. Clark explained that both required 21 credits, but those going on to college had 19 specified credits, while those going to work had 21 specified credits.

Mrs. Fanconi indicated that she would have a problem saying to a ninth grader that he or she had to chose whether or not they wanted to go to college or whether they wanted to go on the employment. Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that this decision would have to be made in eighth grade. Mrs. Fanconi recalled that when she had gone to a college orientation with her daughter, it had been pointed out that students change their majors on an average of four times in four years. She knew that Oregon had proposed a tracking system in college. Mr. Clark understood that the state was trying to make sure that the academic backgrounds of students going on to college and of students going on to employment were similar. However, the minimum requirements for students in the career program were four credits. Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that they did not have a provision for a student who started out in one program, changed his or her mind, and headed the other way.

Mrs. Fanconi asked about the implications for vocational education in all of this. For example, they had changed home economics and vocational education from life preparation, and no one knew what technology education was. Mr. Jack Schoendorfer, director of the Division of Career and Vocational Education, commented that the state was going to be developing curriculum guidelines for technology education which would be in terms of student outcomes. When this had been done, MCPS staff would have to look at its programs to bring them in line with state requirements. He pointed out that it was going to be difficult for students in the program to meet all the requirements for graduation. Students lost a period a day for transportation to the programs, and many students decided to move into career education after beginning the ninth grade, and their credits would not be focused early on.

Mrs. Fanconi highlighted the fact that vocational programs required students to travel from their home school to the Edison Center and the minicenters. If they did not have enough students in one place, this would limit their offerings. This concerned her in a time when they needed to be preparing students for both kinds of opportunities.

Mrs. Fanconi hoped that the Board would hear from MCCPTA, MCAASP, and MCEA regarding their views on the state's proposal. She also

noted that Board members would be attending the Maryland Association of Boards of Education convention at the end of the month, and this would provide Board members an opportunity to discuss this issue with other counties.

Mrs. Fanconi asked to go on record as saying that the vocational education concerns were significant. She also had a problem with aesthetic education and cited the experiences of her daughter in high school. The number of credits now required by the state would not permit students such as her daughter to be involved in choir, theatre, or yearbook. Dr. Charles Caputo, acting director of the Division of Aesthetic Education, suggested that the Board had to consider the basic assumption as to whether mandating more courses would turn out better students. He did not necessarily agree with this. Students were already faced with the problem of singleton courses as described by Dr. Gezelter and the experiences of his daughter at Rockville High School. As long as they based their staffing ratios on per pupil ratios and course enrollment, they would continue to have that problem. The state proposal would exacerbate this issue.

For the record, Mrs. Fanconi stated that she had concerns about the loss for the local LEA of making decisions on double-period courses. Clearly if everything was mandated by the state, the LEA lost flexibility in addressing issues such as double-period algebra. She was also concerned about the impact of the state's proposal on the dropout rate because it was going to be hard for students to make up classes if they failed.

Dr. Cheung complimented staff for developing the excellent matrix. He would look at the state's proposal and the Board's proposal on science and math from a more global perspective. They were living in a more technologically-oriented society and had to look at the curriculum as a way of preparing children for the future. For example, 180 days might not be enough for all the things they wanted to do. He thought that Montgomery County should lead the state, especially in science and technology, because it was the best school system in the United States and had within its borders nationally known organizations and government agencies specializing in science. The school system had to develop resources to support the 270 high tech corridor.

In regard to community service, Dr. Cheung suggested that students could spend two hours a week to tutor elementary school students in science, math, and other areas to fulfill this requirement. They could think about internships and externships in the medical and legal professions. He did not think the 75-hour requirement would be too difficult to meet. He said that perhaps they should look at the science, math, and technology requirements proposed by the state as an integrated program through which students could meet the requirements. A school in Alaska had one class meeting the requirements of English, math,

Resolved, That the Board of Education extend discussion on high school graduation requirements to 4:45 p.m. and defer the item on mid-level schools to a future agenda.

Re: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION GRADUATION
REQUIREMENTS AND ACTION ON SCIENCE
AND MATHEMATICS PROPOSAL
(CONTINUED)

Mrs. Brenneman reported that she was now teaching remedial writing to 75 students at Montgomery College. Most of these students had graduated from MCPS, and she had taken the opportunity to discuss graduation requirements with her classes. Many of these students had not planned to go on to college, and she had asked for their views on the requirement of four years of math. She was surprised when most of them supported the requirement and regretted not having studied more math. One student had dropped math in his senior year and had ended up in a lower level math class at the College. He thought that if he had been forced to stay in the class, he would not have had to start his college career in a lower level class. Some students had told her that they might have gone directly to a four-year college if they had had the math background. Students had told her that when they were in high school they assumed students were learning everything they needed to learn and that the school system was providing everything. However, after graduation, they were not so sure.

Mrs. Brenneman said that some students thought of community service as a punishment required by the police or the courts. Students wondered how students could be forced to volunteer. A couple of students from private schools had discussed the value of their required community service. Former MCPS students thought that community service would infringe on their private time and would be forced on them.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that she had also appeared before a service oriented group and had asked their opinion on community service. These people were concerned that student volunteerism would take away from jobs that someone could get paid for. The people thought that community service should come from the heart and not from a state mandate. She recalled that at the Maryland Association of Counties meeting the governor had talked about federal mandates on the state without the necessary funding. Now the state was putting mandates on the counties without providing the money. She felt that the state Board's proposals would cost money to implement and while some of the proposals such as the math were ones she could support, she worried about funding. For example, she had talked with some elementary school students who had had no science education during the first two weeks of school. They had to start teaching enthusiasm about math and science in the elementary school to sustain student interest

through their high school years. She said that her bottom line was resources to implement these proposals if the state did require them.

Mrs. Hobbs said she was surprised that the Board had not received very much mail on this subject. There had been newspaper articles but not much mail from parents or students. She wondered whether people were waiting to see what happened. As they talked about testimony to the state Board, she suggested it would be important for the Board to discuss this with Jack Sprague. A dialogue with Mr. Sprague might be better than testifying or sending a letter.

Mrs. Hobbs shared many of the concerns expressed by other Board members. She was concerned that implementation starting with the ninth grade in 1993-94 was too soon. Parents and students would have to make choices in the 1992-93 school year which was not enough leadtime. She inquired about problems in hiring staff to teach the additional math credits, especially higher level math. She also wondered about laying off staff in other areas such as electives if the state mandated more and more courses.

While Mrs. Hobbs was not in favor of required community service, she thought it was interesting that the state was looking at the mid level as a time when that credit could be earned. She wondered about asking the state to be flexible and letting students begin to earn other credits for graduation at an earlier age. If geography and math were priorities at the state level, they could look at credit for these subjects in the mid level. Mr. Mike Michaelson, administrative assistant for student affairs, had offered this suggestion to her. Mr. Ewing pointed out that this issue had been raised by Boards over the last several decades, but he agreed it might be a good time to raise it again with more force. Mrs. Hobbs said that her last point was her disappointment that the state had not required a general health course.

Mr. Ewing, too, believed that the technology issue was vague. He was in favor of four years of science and four years of math. While he was in favor of community service, he was opposed to this kind of requirement for the reasons Mr. Pischevar had expressed. He had done some calculations, and staff would be required to keep track of 720,000 hours of student time. This worked out to about 90 work years a year if spread out over four years. He did not know how they could certify to the state that all of this volunteer work had, indeed, occurred.

Mr. Ewing was in favor of four years of social studies, but he thought that one full year should be left as an option. In this way the fourth year might be in a class where social studies could become in part a math course using statistics and probability as applied to social, political, and economic

problems. Social studies might be combined with technology or science as well. He thought staff could work out a course that would give students credits in a range of subjects across several disciplines. He pointed out that many vocational courses required students to understand mathematical and scientific concepts and applications. He felt there might be a way to permit students to get credit toward math and science graduation requirements through career education. This might not solve the problem but might help to ameliorate the impact of additional math and science requirements on those areas.

Mr. Ewing noted that there was language in the state's proposal to excuse or partially excuse students going through an ARD process from some requirements in math and science and to substitute other courses. He thought that was very reasonable and a necessity in certain cases, but he did not think it should be a blanket excuse. He thought that the suggestion made by Mrs. Hobbs to allow credit for mid level courses was an extraordinarily important one. He felt that they should make a strong argument in favor of this. If approved, this would allow some flexibility for students in their senior high school years. Mr. Ewing commented that in Montgomery County the public was increasingly anxious about whether the public schools would be able in the future to assure that students received high quality educational programs. The public was anxious, in part, because of the demographic changes, the budget crunch, and a variety of other reasons. When a school system reached a level where the white majority was only 60 percent, people got anxious. They could infer this anxiety from research in other systems and because of what they were hearing from the community. The public was asking about educational standards and expectations for the future. In some cases test scores had fallen, and in other schools test scores had risen particularly in schools where the demands on students were extraordinary, standards were high, expectations were high, and where students were spending extra time and taking extra courses. This was true at Blair and Richard Montgomery high schools. They knew this was due to the demands the school system was making and the requirements of the programs in those schools.

Mr. Ewing stated that increasing requirements by themselves was not any guarantee of improvements. The requirements had to have substance in themselves. Teachers had to work hard to make sure they were able to help students meet those requirements, and he was sure that MCPS teachers would be asking for additional training without waiting for it to be offered. It would send a good message to parents that the Board was concerned about the quality of educational programs and results. It would show the public that the Board was determined to increase graduation requirements and provide through staff the kinds of supports needed by students to succeed. He thought that the taxpayers would be happy with this if they were shown the payoff on the

system's investment. He thought that the Board should move in the direction to increase math and science requirements. He suggested that the Board should be in the position of telling the state that they had done this and why. If the state went in another direction, there would be opportunity to negotiate and revise. However, he felt that MCPS would be in a better and stronger position if they were clear about what it was they expected to do. He hoped that the Board would take action when it got to the proposed resolution on math and science.

He knew that the Board was running out of time to discuss these proposals, and he suggested that the Board look for another date to continue this discussion. The staff should follow through on suggestions made by Board members, but the Board needed to raise their standards and expectations. The comments made by Mrs. Brenneman about former students were impressive because they showed the expectation of young people that adults guiding them were doing the right thing. Students depended on adults to make the right choices for them, and he believed that increasing math and science requirements was the right choice for them.

Ms. Gutierrez did not think that the proposal from the state was a very serious one on what she thought was a very serious issue. She thought that what they had was a melange of issues raised by state Board members. It seemed to her that the path specified by the state did not allow flexibility for local boards. She was sorry that the state had not taken this opportunity to come out with a very clear new purpose in education in these times when there was a crisis in education and when directives were coming down from the national level. The prescriptive social studies requirement was just unrealistic in her view. She thought there was a lack of understanding on the part of the state Board as to what was going on in local school systems.

Ms. Gutierrez said that the state had not done anything with languages. This had always been a very serious limitation in American education. She was familiar with European forms of education and all required community service which was a very enriching and wonderful experience for young people. She knew people had a problem with mandating this, but she hoped that people would see the potential in community service and look at ways where it could be encouraged and facilitated. She would not dismiss this on the basis of manageability because she thought there were creative ways to hold students accountable.

Ms. Gutierrez said that she, for one, planned to listen to the testimony of other LEAs. MCPS needed to have its own clear purpose and direction, and they could give a clear signal by taking an action in science and math if they felt this was the way to go. She agreed that they should have as much dialogue and communication with the state Board as soon as possible.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that their next step was to ask the superintendent to put together some testimony for October 29. Dr. Vance commented that many of the issues raised by Board members had been raised by his staff in previous discussions of the state issue. He suggested that testimony be drafted in time to circulate it at the MABE convention.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that she had served on a math/science special task force. Representatives of the National Science Foundation had spoken to the task force about the need to prepare elementary school teachers to teach math and science. NSF believed that the way to get students interested in science and math at the high school was to develop this interest in the elementary schools. She thought there were a number of ways to get at expanding capabilities and interests in science that might or might not include requiring more courses. She would like staff to do some analysis of what would happen if the state Board went with 21 credits and MCPS added two science credits. She asked staff to look at the "rif" issue and the personnel issue. They had to be concerned about the right-brain issue because these children had a higher dropout rate and needed a different type of education than the lecture kind. It would be extremely important that MCPS continue to offer drama, art, creative writing, aesthetic education, etc. She asked how the new requirements would impact these children. She indicated that she would like to use the grid provided by staff at the MABE meeting, but it needed some identification as to who prepared it, the date, and its purpose.

Mrs. Hobbs suggested that when testimony was prepared it should request the state to consider raising the legal age when students could withdraw from school. It was currently 16, and if graduation requirements were increased, it should be made more difficult for students to quit school.

Mrs. DiFonzo assured Ms. Gutierrez that the state Board was deadly serious about its proposals. The big problem as she saw it was that no one on the state Board had ever had local Board experience. They were business people who expected that their directives would be fulfilled.

Mr. Ewing indicated that the Board officers and superintendent would look at the calendar to reschedule the proposed resolution on math and science. Mr. Pishevar expressed his support for the suggestion made by Mrs. Hobbs about giving credit to students who completed certain courses in the seventh and eighth grades. Mr. Ewing thanked staff members for participating in the discussion and gathering background information for the Board's decisions.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Dr. Cheung shared with the Board a poster produced by the National Women's History Project. This poster honored American women in history from 1591 to the present. Mary Lee Au, an assistant principal in MCPS, had been included as an educator and Chinese American historian. He asked that the Board send a letter of congratulations to her.

2. Mrs. Fanconi reported that she planned to attend tomorrow night's hearing that the County Council was having on youth issues. Mr. Subin planned to hold four of those hearings, and she hoped they would follow up on these. Mrs. DiFonzo added that she had been requested to be the kick off speaker for tomorrow's hearing.

3. Mr. Ewing stated that the Board of Education and senior staff had had a retreat in Annapolis on September 5, 6, and 7. They had a discussed a variety of issues including the matter of a vision for MCPS for the future and some goals to support that vision. They had made a lot of progress which was a major step in the right direction.

RESOLUTION NO. 786-91 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - SEPTEMBER 23,
1991

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on September 23, 1991, at 6:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 787-91 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 26, 1991

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Pischevar seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining because she had not attended this meeting:

Resolved, That the minutes of August 26, 1991, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 788-91 Re: PROPOSAL TO DISCUSS LC POLICY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education hold a discussion on the LC (Loss of Credit) attendance policy.

RESOLUTION NO. 789-91 Re: COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE
LEGISLATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education reaffirm its position to support compulsory school attendance legislation as long as there was additional funding.

Re: STATE AND COUNTY FISCAL SITUATION

Dr. Cheung moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The state of Maryland and Montgomery County both face revenue shortfalls for the current fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, The state has estimated that there will be a revenue/expenditure gap of over \$600 million in FY 1992 and MCPS staff estimates of Montgomery County's FY 1993 revenue/expenditure gap are between \$60 million and \$75 million; and

WHEREAS, The education aid that Montgomery County receives from the state is critical and any loss of aid to help solve the state's fiscal problems would make the County's fiscal problem much greater; and

WHEREAS, In order to resolve the FY 1992 revenue/expenditure gap of \$185 million the Council did not fund the negotiated salary

increases for MCPS employees, and the MCPS operating budget was reduced by \$25 million below the level needed to maintain the current level of services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the Montgomery County Delegation to the state legislature to support fully the state's fiscal commitment to primary and secondary education, which is essential to maintaining the gains made during the 1980's; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County delegation needs to ensure that Montgomery County does not lose any current state funds for basic current expense, compensatory, transportation, and special education aid or state on-behalf-of payments for teacher social security and retirement, and that, if additional funds are approved for elementary and secondary education in FY 1993, Montgomery County receives a proportionate share; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports an increase in revenues for FY 1992 to close the projected expenditure/revenue gap through authorization from the state for new revenue sources such as an increase in the local income tax piggyback rate from 50 percent to 60 percent; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the County Council to consider increasing revenues from other taxes and user fees or to override the property tax cap in order to raise the revenues that are needed to close the expenditure/revenue gap, if authorization for new revenue sources from the state are not adequate to close the gap; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education is committed to requesting the funds that are needed in FY 1993 to maintain the current level of educational services for our growing population, including the amount needed to fund the negotiated salary increases with the three employee organizations.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN TO AMEND
THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON THE
FISCAL SITUATION (FAILED)

The following motion by Mrs. Brenneman failed of adoption with Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pishevar voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the third Resolved would end after the words "revenue sources; and be it further

Resolved, That the fourth Resolved would read, "That the Board of Education encourages the County Council to increase revenues from other sources."

Mrs. DiFonzo asked that the question be divided.

RESOLUTION NO. 790-91 Re: FIRST RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL SITUATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the Montgomery County Delegation to the state legislature to support fully the state's fiscal commitment to primary and secondary education, which is essential to maintaining the gains made during the 1980's; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 791-91 Re: SECOND RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL SITUATION

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

Resolved, That the Montgomery County delegation needs to ensure that Montgomery County does not lose any current state funds for basic current expense, compensatory, transportation, and special education aid or state on-behalf-of payments for teacher social security and retirement, and that, if additional funds are approved for elementary and secondary education in FY 1993, Montgomery County receives a proportionate share; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 792-91 Re: THIRD RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL SITUATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pishevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports an increase in revenues for FY 1992 to close the projected expenditure/revenue gap through authorization from the state for new revenue sources such as an increase in the local income tax piggyback rate from 50 percent to 60 percent; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 793-91 Re: FOURTH RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL SITUATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pischevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. DiFonzo voting in the negative:

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the County Council to consider increasing revenues from other taxes and user fees or to override the property tax cap in order to raise the revenues that are needed to close the expenditure/revenue gap, if authorization for new revenue sources from the state are not adequate to close the gap; and be it further

RESOLUTION NO. 794-91 Re: FIFTH RESOLVED CLAUSE OF PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL SITUATION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education is committed to requesting the funds that are needed in FY 1993 to maintain the current level of educational services for our growing population, including the amount needed to fund the negotiated salary increases with the three employee organizations.

Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement for the record:

"I am going to vote for this. I supported Fran's amendment, and I know that I would feel much more comfortable with the Resolveds as they were proposed to be amended, but I think it is imperative that since I know that I am going to be sitting over there before the County Council, that I know that I am going to be fighting for these funds, that I know that we have contracts that need to be funded in spite of the fact that I did not support two out of the three of them, I think they are going to need to be supported, and I intend to be there shoulder to shoulder with those members of the Board who did. So I intend to support the entire motion, but I do want it to be remembered that I do have problems with the third and fourth Resolveds."

Mrs. Brenneman made the following statement for the record:

"I am going to abstain. I can't vote against the motion because I really do believe that we need to support the budget. My concerns lie in the way we are going to do that. I would like the record to show that I do support the first, second, and last Resolveds as more on how we are to go about asking for the

revenues. I would prefer just to ask for revenues without specifying."

RESOLUTION NO. 795-91 Re: STATE AND COUNTY FISCAL SITUATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cheung, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, Mrs. Hobbs, and Mr. Pishevar voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman abstaining:

WHEREAS, The state of Maryland and Montgomery County both face revenue shortfalls for the current fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, The state has estimated that there will be a revenue/expenditure gap of over \$600 million in FY 1992 and MCPS staff estimates of Montgomery County's FY 1993 revenue/expenditure gap are between \$60 million and \$75 million; and

WHEREAS, The education aid that Montgomery County receives from the state is critical and any loss of aid to help solve the state's fiscal problems would make the County's fiscal problem much greater; and

WHEREAS, In order to resolve the FY 1992 revenue/expenditure gap of \$185 million the Council did not fund the negotiated salary increases for MCPS employees, and the MCPS operating budget was reduced by \$25 million below the level needed to maintain the current level of services; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the Montgomery County Delegation to the state legislature to support fully the state's fiscal commitment to primary and secondary education, which is essential to maintaining the gains made during the 1980's; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montgomery County delegation needs to ensure that Montgomery County does not lose any current state funds for basic current expense, compensatory, transportation, and special education aid or state on-behalf-of payments for teacher social security and retirement, and that, if additional funds are approved for elementary and secondary education in FY 1993, Montgomery County receives a proportionate share; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports an increase in revenues for FY 1992 to close the projected expenditure/revenue gap through authorization from the state for new revenue sources such as an increase in the local income tax piggyback rate from 50 percent to 60 percent; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourages the County Council to consider increasing revenues from other taxes and user fees or to override the property tax cap in order to raise the revenues that are needed to close the expenditure/revenue gap, if authorization for new revenue sources from the state are not adequate to close the gap; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education is committed to requesting the funds that are needed in FY 1993 to maintain the current level of educational services for our growing population, including the amount needed to fund the negotiated salary increases with the three employee organizations.

Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement for the record:

"I will be abstaining on many of the Board appeals. I was out two evenings. Once the Board was running about three hours late in its agenda and I had made a previous engagement and I needed to absent myself. The second evening I was participating in a very hastily called second evening of interviews for the Montgomery County chief of police."

RESOLUTION NO. 796-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-21

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-21 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 797-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-38

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-38 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 798-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-51

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-51 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 799-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-58

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-58 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 800-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-70

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-70 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 801-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-73

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-73 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 802-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-75

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-75 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 803-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-78

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-78 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 804-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-79

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-79 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 805-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-81

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-81 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 806-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-82

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-82 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 807-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-85

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-85 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 808-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-86

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-86 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 809-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-88

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-88 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 810-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-89

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-89 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 811-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-90

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-90 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 812-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-92

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-92 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 813-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-94

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-94 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 814-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-95

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-95 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 815-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-96

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-96 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 816-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-102

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-102 (a transfer matter).

RESOLUTION NO. 817-91 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1991-105

On motion of Mrs. Hobbs seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1991-105 (a transfer matter).

Re: NEW BUSINESS

The following motion by Mrs. DiFonzo failed for lack of a second:

Resolved, That when a Board of Education meeting exceeds by 25 percent again the total time allotted for that meeting that the Board of Education will adjourn.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Status Report on Supporting Services Classification Study

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw