

RESOLUTION NO. 568-92 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JULY 20, 1992

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for July 20, 1992, as amended.

*Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. DiFonzo jointed the meeting at this point.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Walter Gold, Bells Mill Community Group
2. Nancy Bowen, Bells Mill Community Group
3. Brooks J. Bowen, Jr. and Christopher Bowen
4. A. Hewitt Rose, POSE
5. Gerald Rosenberg, POSE
6. Debbie Camp, CASE
7. Candice King, PISCES
8. Susan Murphie

RESOLUTION NO. 569-92 Re: COMMENDATION OF MAJOR ROBERT B. RENFREW

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

WHEREAS, Major Robert B. Renfrew has served the Montgomery County Department of Police and the citizens of Montgomery County with honor and distinction for 32 years; and

WHEREAS, Major Renfrew has worked with school administrators to improve and strengthen close cooperation between the Montgomery County Public Schools and the Montgomery County Department of Police; and

WHEREAS, Major Renfrew has contributed to a school safety program that is a vital part of the MCPS educational program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That on behalf of the students and staff of the Montgomery County Public Schools, the members of the Board of Education and superintendent of schools commend Major Robert B. Renfrew for his outstanding contributions to the county and to the safety and security of the public schools; and be it further

July 20, 1992

	Versatile Enterprises, Inc.	994*
	Wharton Supply Inc. of Virginia	3,441
	Frank W. Winne and Son, Inc.	<u>1,800</u>
	Total	\$519,660
125-92	Student Accident Insurance	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Mass Benefits Consultants, Inc.	\$ 71,716
	Mayberry Benefit Services	<u>25,200</u>
	Total	\$ 96,916
137-92	External CD Rom SCSI Drives	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Connecting Point Computer Center	\$ 3,914
	Landon Systems Corporation	16,505
	Online Computer Products, Inc.	3,950
	Sands and Associates, Inc.	<u>2,850</u>
	Total	\$ 27,219
142-92	Power Mowers, Lawn and Garden Tractors	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Gladhill Brothers	\$ 72,605
	Kohler Equipment, Inc.	<u>6,944</u>
	Total	\$ 79,549
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$813,981

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 571-92 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - PLUMBING
FIXTURES AT LONGVIEW SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace plumbing fixtures at Longview School, funded from Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) capital funds, were received on July 1, 1992, in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices, with work to begin immediately and be completed by August 31, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Vernon F. Gaegler, Inc.	\$22,043.08
2. Thomas E. Clark, Inc.	22,290.00
3. Delmar Plumbing & Heating, Inc.	23,192.92
4. K&B Plumbing & Heating, Inc.	35,352.00

and

July 20, 1992

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the budget estimate of \$23,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, Vernon F. Gaegler, Inc., has completed similar projects successfully in the Washington metropolitan area; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$22,043.08 contract be awarded to Vernon F. Gaegler, Inc., to replace plumbing fixtures at Longview School.

RESOLUTION NO. 572-92 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - CLARKSBURG
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on July 7, 1992, for the modernization of Clarksburg Elementary School, with work to begin immediately and be completed by August 1, 1993:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Henley Construction Co., Inc.	\$3,355,300
2. Caldwell & Santmyer, Inc.	3,378,500
3. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	3,452,000
4. Bildon, Inc.	3,497,533
5. Hess Construction Company	3,513,990
6. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	3,517,300
7. Dustin Construction, Inc.	3,554,500
8. Waynesboro Construction Co., Inc.	3,567,200
9. Triangle General Contractors, Inc.	3,581,200
10. J. A. Scheibel, Inc.	3,594,200
11. CKS, Inc.	3,603,556

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the architect's estimate of \$3,400,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, Henley Construction Co., Inc., has completed numerous projects successfully, including Sequoyah Elementary and Capt. James E. Daly Elementary School; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$3,355,300 contract be awarded to Henley Construction Co., Inc., for the modernization of Clarksburg Elementary School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Bowie Gridley Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 573-92 Re: SITE SELECTION OF GAITHERSBURG
MIDDLE SCHOOL #2 - 1995

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

WHEREAS, The approved FY93 Capital Improvements Program indicates the need for a new middle school to serve the Gaithersburg cluster by September, 1995; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education, after considering ten alternative locations for the future schools, prefers a site within its inventory located on the south side of Mid-county Highway, west of Taunton Drive, and known as the Muncaster Middle School site; and

WHEREAS, The Muncaster Middle School site is recommended by the Site Selection Advisory Committee to provide an efficient and effective short-term solution for middle school needs in the Gaithersburg cluster and a potential long-term solution for middle school needs in the Magruder cluster; and

WHEREAS, This school site, having been acquired by the Board of Education in 1978, is immediately available and has been physically evaluated as satisfactory to meet program requirements; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board select the 20.51 acre school site located at Taunton Drive and Mid-county Highway for the September 1995 occupancy of Gaithersburg Middle School #2; and be it further

Resolved, That staff continue to work with the City of Gaithersburg to acquire a portion of the Casey/Goshen Tract to provide for a long-term solution to middle school needs in the Gaithersburg cluster.

RESOLUTION NO. 574-92 Re: ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
INSTALLATIONS AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on June 25, 1992, for energy management system (EMS) installations at Ashburton, Burtonsville, and Quince Orchard #7 elementary schools, and on July 20, 1992, for an energy management system (EMS) installation at Forest Knolls Elementary School; and

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$ 8,085
2 Other Instructional Costs	1,308
10 Fixed Charges	<u>607</u>
Total	\$10,000

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 576-92 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1993 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR PROJECT
INDEPENDENCE - ESOL

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1993 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$7,901 from Montgomery Employment & Training (MET), administrative entity for the Montgomery County Private Industry Council (PIC), under the federal Family Support Act of 1988, P. L. 100-485, for Project Independence - ESOL, in the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2 Instructional Salaries	\$6,950
3 Other Instructional Costs	395
10 Fixed Charges	<u>556</u>
Total	\$7,901

and be it further

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

RESOLUTION NO. 577-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Elfreda W. Massie	Director Dept. of Personnel Service	Assoc. Supt. Office of Personnel Services Effective: 8-5-92

RESOLUTION NO. 578-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
William B. Westall	Labor Relations/ Human Resources Consultant Self-employed	Asst. for Labor Relations Dept. of Assoc. Relations Grade P Effective: 8-3-92

RESOLUTION NO. 579-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Julia E. Toxie	Principal Olney ES	Principal Farquhar MS Effective: 7-21-92

RESOLUTION NO. 580-92 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
George Crochicchia	Supervisor of Elem. Instruc. Area 2	Principal Burnt Mills ES Effective: 7-21-92

RESOLUTION NO. 581-92 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Kathleen Lasinski	Acting Principal Monocacy ES	Principal Carderock Springs ES Effective: 7-21-92

RESOLUTION NO. 582-92 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFER

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

Resolved, That the following personnel transfer be approved:

<u>Transfer</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Jay Dingle	Asst. Principal RICA	Asst. Principal Mark Twain School Effective: 7-21-92

RESOLUTION NO. 583-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Nancy Fowler	Technical Analyst Div. of Systems Development User Liaison Unit	Supervisor of School Liaison Services Div. of Systems Development Grade N Effective: 7-21-92

RESOLUTION NO. 584-92 Re: TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENTS FOR THE
1992-93 SCHOOL YEAR

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

Resolved, That the following temporary reassignments be approved for the 1992-93 school year:

<u>Name and Present Assignment</u>	<u>Position Effective July 21, 1992</u>	<u>Positive Effective July 1, 1993</u>
Beverly Harmon Principal Taylor Learning Center	A&S Teacher Taylor Learning Center	Retirement
David Litsey Director Secondary Learning Centers	A&S Teacher	To Be Determined

Re: HOME SCHOOL EFFICIENCIES REPORT

Dr. Vance stated that on March 25, 1991, the Board of Education adopted a plan for a comprehensive analysis of 27 initiatives to reduce costs and improve the efficiency of the school system. One of the concepts was to determine the feasibility of educating most special education students in their home schools rather than transporting them to another school. He introduced Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent for special and alternative education.

Dr. Fountain introduced Ms. Lisa Baach, parent; Ms. Carole Newman, parent; Mrs. Sandra Lebowitz, acting director of the Department of Special Education and Related Services; Ms. Diane Tessier-Switlick, acting supervisor, Special Education Instructional Unit; Ms. Carolyn Reed, transportation specialist; Ms. Robin King, facilities data analyst; Ms. Jane Butler, principal, Bannockburn ES; and Dr. Edward Shirley, principal of Paint Branch High School.

Dr. Fountain reported that the 35-member task force had started its work over a year ago, and they were charged with looking at putting students in their home school rather than where they were presently assigned. They had organized themselves into three work groups. The first was to study the research and literature regarding the efficiency and service of serving most special education students in their home schools. The second group looked at cost effectiveness of alternative models in other school districts comparable to MCPS. The third group looked at

the cost differential between current MCPS models of special education and the delivery of special education services in home schools for students with learning disabilities, mental retardation, physical disabilities, and serious emotional disturbance. As the group began its work, it became evident that separating philosophical and programmatic issues from cost effectiveness was impossible.

Dr. Fountain said that in the spring the Board itself requested that the group include philosophy in its final report. Historically, concerns with individual student needs began at the turn of the century first with placement in institutions that focused on medical needs and later with special schools based on a medical model. The first programs served those who were crippled, blind, or deaf. Students with more severe disabilities were often kept at home because the sentiment was that students not capable of handling a program did not need an education. Many churches and societies took on the burden of providing programs for these students. Montgomery County had a long history of serving students with disabilities, and in 1968 a continuum of programs permitting most children to be served in regular classes with additional resources was started. In 1976, the Office of Continuum Education was established to coordinate the administration of programs for children with special needs. Montgomery County was second to none in providing special education services even prior to P.L. 94-142 which was adopted in 1975. In fact, Mark Twain was established five years prior to the law, and at the same time they had Longview, Stephen Knolls, Concord, and Rock Terrace. In addition, they had a number of private providers offering services to children, even preschool children, before P.L. 94-142.

Dr. Fountain stated that the law mandated equal educational opportunities for all with a guarantee of a free and appropriate public education for children with disabilities. Programs and funding were based on categorical labeling and levels of service, and up until the mid 1980's programs and staff training were based on disability categories. During this time, they also looked at the individual handicaps such as learning disabilities, dyslexia, minimal brain dysfunction, and speech and language disabilities. Many national and local organizations for specific disabilities were formed during this time. In the late 1970's and early 1980's MCPS added additional separate schools because the drop in population made space available. As the student population increased, the Board decided to establish programs within the public schools themselves. New schools were built with special education in mind, and the need for separate centers in certain parts of the county lessened.

Dr. Fountain commented that in the late 1980's they began to be aware of some difficulties that graduates were having. Many graduates could not get jobs because they did not have the social

skills; therefore, MCPS developed programs with outcomes which led to the transitional support group. Because students with disabilities often lacked social and work skills, MCPS had to provide more opportunities for these students in the least restrictive environment. At the same time, the Maryland State Department of Education published guidelines for placing students in the least restrictive environment. As they looked at where they had been, where they were now, and where they were headed, they saw a need to maintain a continuum of services, but at the same time they had to consider the home school as point zero and move out from there as student needs dictated.

Ms. Baach reported that Dr. Fountain's office had put together an impressive library of materials on educating students with disabilities in the regular education environment. They had provided the Board with a bibliography which represented only a fraction of what had been written in this field. They had read material from university professors, informal accounts from the field, and position papers from professional organizations and advocacy groups. They had also obtained position statements from the state and federal levels including America 2000: An Opportunity for School Restructuring and Inclusion, from the U.S. Department of Education and the Strategic Plan for Least Restrictive Environment, from the Maryland State Department of Education.

Ms. Baach commented that there were several pieces still missing. The literature did not cover work being done on educating students in their home school. Only Professor L. Brown from the University of Wisconsin had written about this. Secondly, cost comparisons had rarely been examined, and the only data was available from California and compared cost benefits for students receiving education in separate centers with those receiving education in regular schools. The study actually attempted to look at post-school economic factors such as hours of public support received, supplemental income provided, the cost for adult vocation programs, hours worked per week and per year, hourly wages, and taxes paid. She noted that most literature examined students with mental retardation, multiple handicaps, or learning disabilities. SED students were excluded from these general studies. Much of the literature seemed to assume that the regular students in the classroom were breezing through school. It was unfortunate that more research did not address the impact on the delivery of services to the regular education population.

Ms. Baach remarked that while the paper before the Board put the issue of inclusion as a dichotomy of views, most people in the field subscribed to the same set of principles. However, everyone agreed students with disabilities must receive the supports they needed to achieve the goals and objectives of their

IEPs and that these supports could not be relinquished to generate savings.

Ms. Newman reported that they had gathered information from a variety of school districts throughout the country. They wanted to examine five school districts larger in size than MCPS and five smaller. They did not consider Vermont, New Hampshire, and Colorado because they had smaller school districts. Districts were contacted and asked the same set of questions. They found that inclusion was not a blanket solution because school districts implementing inclusion had not implied this model to all students with disabilities. Students with learning disabilities were most likely to be included in regular education, and SED students were the least likely to be included in the home school model. Medically fragile students and those with severe disabilities in home schools cost more than comparable programs in special or separate schools. All systems felt that medically fragile students were the most expensive to educate, and a number of systems were looking into Medicaid and third party billing. One school system, Orleans Parish, had established a system to bill for health services, but 85 percent of that school system was eligible for Medicaid.

Ms. Newman observed that in many school systems, inclusive was a collaborative effort between the school system and the university which provided technical support, staff training, and supervision. Most systems operated both inclusive and separate programs, but none of the school systems had hard cost data. A number of school systems felt that cluster schools or separate schools for MR or SED were necessary because there was such a small incidence in the population to make it financially unfeasible to have a class in every school. A number of school systems had started their home school policy as a result of federal desegregation rulings in the 1970's which happened at the same time P.L. 94-142 was enacted. The systems having LD students in every school felt that the resource teacher had to be the most qualified special education teacher in the system because that teacher was dealing with such a wide range of learning disabilities. Most systems did inclusion because of philosophy and desegregation rather than cost efficiencies.

Mrs. Lebowitz reported that MCPS was currently providing a continuum of services for students in a variety of settings from neighborhood schools, to special classes, to special day schools, and to residential settings. As of October, 1991, approximately 88 percent of students with disabilities were being served in regular education settings, and 57 percent were in their neighborhood schools. Approximately 12 percent or 1,200 were receiving their education in special schools or centers. MCPS was providing a full range of supports in all settings. Intensity 1 to 3 was available in every school. Special classes providing more than three hours a day of support were grouped by

disability. For students with more severe disabilities, there were special classes as well as special schools with fewer students per each teacher. These programs were also in non-public schools. Examples of Intensity 5 in regular school settings included the secondary learning centers, the school/community-based classes, school-based learning centers, and classes for students with autism. There were eight Intensity 5 schools in the county: Twain, RICA, Sandburg, Taylor, McKenney Hills, Rock Terrace, Stephen Knolls, and Longview.

Mrs. Lebowitz stated that over the past five years they had been implementing inclusion in several ways. In some settings, students in special classes had been fully included in regular classroom settings. Examples of these were McNair, Whetstone, Bethesda, Forest Knolls, and Resnik elementary schools. At the secondary level, these were Cabin John MS and Poolesville Jr./Sr. HS. Participation by these schools had been voluntary. They had also been expanding the concept of mainstreaming to provide increased opportunities for students in special classes to integrate them in regular classes by using a team teaching model. This had been successfully done in Goshen, Poolesville, McAuliffe, Summit Hall, and Clearspring. More recently a limited number of students with significant needs had been included in their neighborhood schools.

Mrs. Lebowitz had found that careful planning had contributed to the success of these efforts. The planning had included training and preparation of staff and students. The most positive results had been when training and collaboration efforts came before the actual implementation of the programs and when the program involved groups of students in a particular setting rather than for individual students in isolated settings.

In regard to the cost efficiency analysis, Mrs. Lebowitz said they looked at staffing, transportation, and facilities. Students receiving Levels 1 through 3 service were primarily already in their home schools; therefore, they were not included in the cost analysis. Other students excluded from the analysis were those students at RICA, pre-schoolers, and those in non-public programs. Cost data was calculated for three options. Option A projected the return of all Intensity 4 and 5 except those excluded. However, because public law requires a continuum of services, they had to look at two other options. Option B included all Intensity 4 and 5 students but expanded the exclusions to all students who were SED, autistic, and with auditory and vision disabilities. Option C looked at the cost of returning all Intensity 4 students to home schools except for SED and did not include any Intensity 5 students.

Mrs. Lebowitz explained that the cost analysis assumed that a full continuum of services would need to be available in each home school to fulfill the IEPs of students. The analysis was

based on a sampling of MCPS schools. Eight high school clusters were randomly selected and SEDS data was reviewed for all students in those schools receiving special education support. This represented 38 percent of MCPS schools. She reported that the analysis data was soft because projecting costs was very difficult especially in a system as large as MCPS. The documents prepared by the committee showed the range of costs across the three options, but the final cost savings were estimates only.

Ms. Tessier-Switlick stated that she would talk about the redistribution of staff. Their first assumption was that there would be no decrease in the amount of special education services. The second was that there would be a continuum of special education services in every school. There was no assumption that students returning to their home schools would be fully included in regular classes, but rather that service delivery models would be developed in each home school that might include a range from full inclusion to various pull-out services and special classes. There was also an assumption that all current resources could be totally redistributed or reconstituted into school-based services where necessary. Finally, an assumption was made that individual needs of students as identified in IEPs would determine how services and resources would be developed, not program design or location.

Ms. Tessier-Switlick called attention to the SEDS data on which the cost analysis was based. In order to determine the percentage of students within the eight sample clusters that were going to be returning to home schools, they had used this data. They next analyzed the number of staff in various programs based on the percentage of students. She called attention to the staffing ratios which were average ratios spanning across all Levels 4 and 5 students in Option A. It compared with the current ratio of 10.4:1 for regular school-based special education programs. In Option B, this ratio was 9:1. Option C came out to ratio of 12.6 students per teacher which was close to the average ratio provided in Level 4 programs currently. She pointed out Appendix D which was a listing of staff not actually tied to student/teacher allocations. In Option A these staff would be made available countywide to be reconstituted into school-based positions.

Ms. Tessier-Switlick reported that the group had discussed special cases where a lower student/teacher ratio might be needed in a particular school. They had looked at additional related services staff and staff to coordinate school-based programs or to provide additional needs for transition services. She believed that Option A provided the most flexibility in redeploying staff. Option B provided less countywide positions to be deployed because one of the special centers would not close. Option C had no countywide positions to be made available to provide any supplement in particular schools. There would be

some instances where the logistics of redistributing staff would mean that a .2 teacher would need to be assigned to a school which would make it difficult to staff.

In terms of dealing with regular education staff, the group proposed that a formula be used to facilitate school-based delivery of services especially where an increased number of students would be participating in mainstreamed classes. This was not a new concept because it had been discussed a number of times in the past, nor was it related per se to home/school service delivery, but it would ease the burden of class size.

They had outlined a budget for staff training which was based on information from other school systems. The training would need to be philosophical, technical, and strategic in nature. It would involve an analysis of the student population, community involvement, and assessing needs. The training itself would involve technical knowledge regarding specific disabilities, analysis of service delivery models, and topics related to special education instruction.

There were two other areas of staff. One was the Department of School Services. In Option A if special centers were closed, there would be 23 building service workers and 4.5 food service workers who would not be needed which would save \$837,877. This amount decreased in Option B because one of the centers would remain open, and the savings disappeared in Option C. The Montgomery County Health Department would incur expenses in Option A because they would need to provide health technicians to 26 schools which would be a minimum cost of \$520,000. It was anticipated that there would be an additional need for school nurses.

Ms. Reed stated that special education transportation served all of the many programs for students with special needs except for Levels 1 through 3. In addition, they served ESOL, GT, IB, and Global Ecology. Last year they transported 7,280 students on special buses, and over 4,900 of those were in special education programs. She showed an example of one elementary school where 38 students left the school to go to 16 different schools, and in addition some students were transported to that school from other schools.

Ms. Reed commented that bringing the data together was complicated and difficult. They had to look at door-to-door transportation, special lifts, wheelchairs, oxygen, suction, tinted windows, and attendants. Some students who had door-to-door transportation now would ride on regular buses or would be in the walking area. This might mean some loss of state revenue. Some students could ride on regular buses with an attendant. Option A would produce the largest savings. Option B would reduce the number attending their home schools, and Option C

would still have a savings because 1,800 students would walk or ride regular buses. She illustrated the effect of the various options on one school.

Ms. Reed explained that it was difficult to project savings because they did not have a simulation tool to project the effect of each scenario. She said that this would need further study. She believed that Option A reflected the most cost savings in transportation, but there might be an offset because of other programs not in this study. Option B would decrease their seat utilization and decrease route efficiency and increase the number of schools served. Option C was difficult to project without the simulation tool.

Ms. King explained that the facility analysis costs were soft figures because they had to make certain assumptions. The first assumption was that they would provide the same service in terms of space in the home schools. Another assumption was that additional support space would be calculated into these figures for students with autism, LD, and SED. Another assumption was the need to modify some spaces to create smaller spaces and time-out rooms. This translated into a 10 percent reduction in their savings figure. They had done the analysis on the eight clusters which was 38 percent of the county. They were not making recommendations but were showing where there was space that could be used. Special Education had provided them with information on which special education programs were compatible with other programs.

Ms. King said their first item was the cost to provide relocatable classrooms at the home schools. Some home schools did have space to accommodate these children, but on the average the elementary schools in the eight clusters were at 95 percent utilization. At the secondary level this figure was 85 percent. Bringing back these students would require a great deal of additional space. The second item was the cost of providing handicap accessibility which amounted to \$6 million which could be done over a two-year period. This translated into a reduction in the CIP project for accessibility modifications which spanned 15 years at \$300,000 per year. Ms. King pointed out that some relocatable classrooms would be freed up at schools with special classes, and the six-year capital budget would be reduced because additions would not be needed at several schools with special education programs.

Ms. King commented that they would be able to reuse Longview, McKenney Hills, and Mark Twain, but they were not able to identify uses for Stephen Knolls, Sandburg, Taylor, or Rock Terrace. There would be operating budget savings for utilities of \$75,000 per year each and revenue from leases at about \$2.50 a square foot for those four facilities but this revenue went back

to the county government. She noted that the figures for Options B and C were in Appendix F of the report.

Dr. Fountain asked if Board members had questions, and Mrs. Hobbs requested that Board members prioritize their questions and comments and follow up with written questions.

Mrs. Fanconi expressed her appreciation for the discussion of the philosophy. She noted that staff was recommending expansion of the pilot programs and documenting them. She asked whether they had documented the successes of the current programs because it was important to hear about those pilots and what had been learned from them. She asked whether it would take additional time to document this, and Dr. Fountain replied it would require more time to measure and look at costs. Mrs. Fanconi asked whether they were looking at the effectiveness of the pilots, and Mrs. Lebowitz replied that they were looking at the success at the individual student level in judging achievement. However, they had not collected data to compare resources made available in one setting versus another.

Mrs. Fanconi said a concern was raised about losing services if the children were moved to their home schools. She asked whether they could take a specific service and explain how the service followed the child. Mrs. Lebowitz explained that OT and PT services should move with the child, and they were now providing both of those in many schools in the county. It was their assumption that related services would be brought to the schools. They did not have a clear picture of what would happen if those resources were moved from a special center because they would lose some time because of transportation if services were put on an itinerant basis.

Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement for the record:

"I hope that the Board will be following this up with a discussion of the things that we have tried, the successes we have had, the things maybe that haven't worked out so well that we have not continued to do, and a discussion about whether philosophically we in the school system want to continue to move in the direction that we have started. I feel that any savings that we were to get out of transportation I personally would want to see go back into the purchase of services so that it would be cost neutral if we decided to do this for a philosophical reason."

Mrs. Fanconi indicated that she was not in favor of using this as a cost saving although she appreciated all the work that staff had put into this study. She thought the report gave them a great deal to consider as they looked at the best method of providing services for all students. She indicated that she would hold the rest of her questions.

Mrs. DiFonzo asked if a staff person could call her during the week. In regard to Section J on surveys, she noted that one principal had indicated that he or she would not keep the present teachers and would want to hire others because of attitudes and skills. This principal would move these teachers to another building which did not address the attitude problems. She said that a person's attitude would not change just because that person moved to another building. While they couldn't legislate attitudes, they could try to educate. She questioned whether someone's attitude about inclusion was a reason to clean out a staff.

Mrs. DiFonzo pointed out that under the high school section there was a suggestion that a full-time staff trainer be employed. She asked whether they were going to need a full-time trainer at this high school and at other schools. Dr. Fountain replied that they were thinking about four persons systemwide in the early years and cutting that back to one person training systemwide. Mrs. Lebowitz explained that this was an opinion from one school which they thought would be valuable for the Board to see.

In regard to the reuse of special school facilities, Mr. Sims asked whether it would be possible to find uses for Stephen Knolls, Sandburg, Taylor, and Rock Terrace when they were also discussing building new schools. Ms. King replied that they had looked at the location of these facilities, and they were located in neighborhoods and clusters where there was no need for additional classroom space. However, they could revert back to school use in the future.

Mr. Sims reported that he and other Board members had attended a discussion with Michael Delaney from Colorado who was very helpful in discussing his arguments for integration. Mr. Sims stated that he was very concerned about the social acceptance of students in an inclusion situation. When students came out of an integrated setting, they were better suited to be active participants in society. He thought it was important that these students receive the treatment accorded other students and that they had friends outside of school and an active social life. This was not only a social issue, but a learning issue. He asked whether research showed this would happen or whether this was a hurdle they needed to address.

Dr. Shirley reported that the interaction at the school level was very good. The second step was a hurdle that needed to be addressed because he was not sure that the social interaction was taking place outside of school. Ms. Baach added that a great deal had been written on peer interaction, and the information could be provided to Mr. Sims.

Mrs. Brenneman noted that surveys were done with principals, and she wondered whether any survey had been done with staff. Mrs.

Lebowitz replied that a staff survey had not been done. However, the surveys distributed to the principals requested the principal and his or her staff to look at these questions. She believed that all surveys returned did have staff involvement.

Mrs. Brenneman reported that in her college teaching she had had hearing-impaired students in her class with interpreters; however, she had not been provided with staff development on how to teach hearing-impaired students. She had to find out on her own how to teach these students, but again she taught only 20 or 22 students. She was concerned about teachers with larger classes which included disabled students and those with other languages. She felt that staff development was a key component here.

Mrs. Brenneman commented that the conversation away from the this table had been very polarized. A lot of people were in favor of total inclusion, and others were opposed. They were basically talking about Level 4 and 5 students who were not right now in their home schools. She asked whether parents had been surveyed to find out whether they wanted change. Mrs. Lebowitz said that she had not been involved in surveying parents. Mrs. Brenneman said she would be curious to find out whether these parents wanted their children to be moved and suggested that it would be well worth doing.

Mr. Ewing said that his concerns revolved around the comments on page 14 where it said, "the cost analysis is based on the assumption that a continuum of services will be available in the home school and that students with disabilities will receive all special education services as indicated on individualized education plans." They had three options, and he realized that those were not intended to cover all the possibilities. He felt that the use of Levels 4 and 5 as a criterion was reasonable, but on the other hand it was likely that there would be students at Level 4 who would not be included fully where there might be students at Level 5 that one could choose to include fully depending on the criteria for selection. What was not clear to him was how they might go about choosing if they did not want to choose based on Levels 4 and 5. Having made some choices, how would they decide how to allocate resources?

While Mr. Ewing agreed they might not want to do this for reasons of cost savings, the fact was that the fiscal situation was unlikely to improve. The consequence would be that they would have to face additional economies and efficiencies. He would not want them to go into this with the expectation that this was a great "cash cow" that they could milk. He thought that before they went anywhere with this they had to be clear about what the criteria were and to be clear on how they were going to manage the allocation of resources. He asked about the criteria they

were going to use to decide what students might be possibilities for inclusion.

Mr. Ewing thought that before they had a Board debate on this policy issue they ought to find out some more about what the impact was going to be on the classroom teacher. They expected to have additional resources in schools, and he wondered whether this would translate into smaller class sizes for all schools or for some schools. If not, would training of teachers compensate well enough in the sense of providing them with the skills they needed to avoid the outcome that some people feared which was that more time would be spent on children with disabilities? This was a worry for parents of regular education students, and he wondered how they would address that issue. While he was a supporter of going as far as they could with inclusion, he was concerned about this issue.

Dr. Fountain commented that they had talked about bringing experts in to do the kind of analysis it would take to look at those issues. Time did not permit them to get into this. He believed that the report gave the Board an opportunity to make some choices about where they wanted to go from here. He did believe they needed a group of experts to take a hard look at this, not 35 people with other jobs.

Ms. Gutierrez complimented the committee and the staff on the work they had done. She was concerned that the scope of the report focused on efficiency and cost. She thought that the educational and philosophical aspects would also have to have a case built. She had attended Dr. Delaney's presentation, and it was very evident that there was a sound philosophical basis for inclusion. She stated that the report was to be an efficiency effort, and she was concerned that they didn't have a better cost model. She believed that they did have some information to begin to build a cost model. Her final concern had to do with next steps and recommendations. Although it would be nice to have a set of experts to give them a recommendation, MCPS already had a lot in place. They did have the pilots, schools with experience, and teachers with experience. They did have the in-service training that began to support this. She did not see much of that captured in the report. She asked whether it was the sense of the committee to go outside for a greater study. Dr. Fountain explained that their charge was to look at efficiencies, not ways to better bring about inclusion. If they had been sent out to do that, they would have brought a different report.

Mrs. Hobbs asked whether they were at a time and place when the Board or the superintendent should be facilitating more communication between various parent groups. They had had the efficiency report and the restructuring of OSAE, and there was a high level of anxiety among parents. Dr. Fountain replied that facilitating communication was always good to do, but he would

hope that they included all MCPS parents. He pointed out that they now had a new young, energetic, and bright group of parents of special needs children, and these young parents would dictate the special education program of the 1990's and beyond.

Mr. Ewing said he would like to hear from the superintendent regarding his recommendations about the direction in which the school system ought to move. They needed information about operational details of these and other options combined with some policy options and directions. The Board needed to review these and make some decisions in a timely way to influence the next operating budget.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that she would like to table this report as a stand-alone report and include it in the larger context of what the philosophy of the school system was going to be. She suggested a worksession with principals, teachers, and parents from the various pilot schools and maybe from a school that only had one child. This would give them an opportunity to ask some of the operational questions and share some of the successes they had had.

Dr. Vance complimented Dr. Fountain for his leadership in assembling the task group and thanked each of the members. He thought it was timely that the superintendent initiate efforts to get the advocacy groups together in the same room at the same time. He hoped to get a report to the Board on progress made. He thought there were a number of other considerations he would like to have in front of him before he shared next steps with the Board. One was getting the advocacy groups together and other parents, and the second was receipt of the report on restructuring the Office of Special and Alternative Education. He suggested the possibility of a forum or public hearing, and if all of this information could be gathered, he would bring recommendations prior to the next budget season.

Dr. Fountain thanked Ms. Vicki Mulherne who put the report together. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Hobbs thanked the committee.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing reported that the Board was in receipt of a letter from the Montgomery County Federation of Teachers regarding the issue of what MCPS was doing to hire male teachers. He asked that the superintendent provide his reaction to this letter.

2. Mrs. Hobbs said that on July 23 at 7:30 p.m. the Council would be holding a public hearing on the Board's request for an emergency supplemental appropriation for all-day kindergarten, QIE, and evening high school, and on July 27 at 2 p.m. the

Education Committee would be reviewing this request. Final action by the full Council would take place on July 28.

3. Dr. Vance indicated that he had discussed the memo from the Federation of Teachers with the executive staff, and there had been some negative reaction to it. It was felt that they should also look at why college students with superior ability were not selecting education as their major, and why blacks and Hispanics were not selecting education. They would share information with the Board, but it would be expanded beyond the shortage of male teachers.

4. Dr. Vance reported that he and the executive staff had had a great time at the TQM seminar at the Xerox Corporation. He continued to be thoroughly impressed by their total quality management program, and he believed it offered much of value to MCPS, particularly during this time of restructuring. He would keep the Board posted on further efforts and provide Board members with a paper.

5. Dr. Vance said he would like to reinforce what Mrs. Hobbs had said about the public hearing on the three emergency supplemental appropriations. He hoped that parents and other interested citizens would come out to testify and support these requests. He believed that the programs at stake affected their youngest and some of their most needy children, and young adults at the high school level needed the flexibility and opportunity that was provided by evening high school.

6. In regard to restructuring, Dr. Vance indicated that they were moving forward, and at the end of this week the newly appointed directors would have had an orientation and training session with Dr. Fisher, the deputies, and the superintendent. He felt that they had a power team that would be a true asset to MCPS. He was preparing a memo to the Board to give them an update on where they were with the relocation of the office of administration. He would provide the Board with a copy of the materials used in the training and orientation.

7. Dr. Vance said that the Board could expect a significant number of appointments at the all-day meeting in August, particularly at the level of school principal.

Re: UPDATE ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Dr. Rohr reported that they had moved into Whitman, Parks, and Ride. They had started moving into Rockwell, Fairland, Bel Pre, Garrett Park, Pine Crest, and Travilah. They were scheduled to move into Glenallan and Summit Hall. In early August they were scheduled to move into the addition at Rock Creek Forest ES. They were well into the process of moving out of Ashburton, Burtonsville, Clarksburg, Forest Knolls, Oakland Terrace, and

Springbrook. Additionally they had over 100 projects in PLAR which were generally on schedule. Dr. Rohr indicated that 60 percent of the 55 relocatables had been moved. He believed they were in excellent shape compared to prior years.

RESOLUTION NO. 585-92 Re: CLOSED SESSION - AUGUST 3 AND 4,
1992

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on August 4, 1992, at 9 a.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland, to discuss personnel matters, pending litigation, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and that such portion of its meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

Resolved, That such portion of its meeting continue in closed session at 12:15 p.m. to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Section 4-106 and that such portion of its meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education also conduct a portion of its meeting in closed session beginning on August 3, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland, to discuss personnel matters and pending litigation as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

RESOLUTION NO. 586-92 Re: MINUTES OF JULY 1, 1992

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

Resolved, That the minutes of July 1, 1992, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

The following report on closed session was made available to the public:

On June 22, 1992, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct closed sessions on July 7 and 8 as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, July 7, 1992, from 12:15 to 2:20 p.m. The closed session took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board received advice from its attorney on pending cases. The Board considered personnel issues including the monthly personnel report and appointments for associate superintendents, directors of school administration, and the principalships of Eastern and King IS, and Edison Career Center. The Board also considered assistant principal transfers for Stephen Knolls, Rosa Parks ES, and Sally Ride ES. Actions taken in closed session were confirmed in open session.

In attendance at the closed session were:

Mrs. Frances Brenneman	Dr. Alan Cheung
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo	Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mrs. Carol Fanconi	Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs	Mr. Jonathan Sims
Dr. Paul L. Vance	Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling
Dr. H. Philip Rohr	Mr. Thomas S. Fess
Ms. Melissa Bahr	Ms. Mary Lou Wood
Mr. Brian Porter	Dr. Hiawatha Fountain
Mrs. Marie Heck	Mr. Zvi Greismann
Ms. Edith Kropp	Dr. Stanley Sorotkin
Ms. Mary Lee Phelps	Dr. Joseph Villani
Dr. Neil Shipman	Dr. Elfreda Massie
Mr. Jack Schoendorfer	Dr. Phinnize Fisher
Ms. Sandra Lebowitz	

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Wednesday, July 8, 1992, from 7 to 7:10 p.m. The closed session took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board received advice from its attorney on the Sligo modernization project.

In attendance at the closed session were:

Mrs. Frances Brenneman	Dr. Alan Cheung
Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo	Mrs. Carol Fanconi
Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez	Mrs. Catherine E. Hobbs
Mr. Jonathan Sims	Dr. Paul L. Vance
Dr. H. Philip Rohr	Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling
Mr. Richard Hawes	Mr. Thomas S. Fess
Ms. Melissa Bahr	Ms. Mary Lou Wood
Mrs. Marie Heck	Mr. Brian Porter
Atty. David Hjortsberg	

Re: A MOTION BY MR. EWING ON THE BELLS
MILL COMMUNITY (FAILED)

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for review and discussion of the issues raised by the Bells Mill community group about the matter of the siting of the entrance, among other issues they raised about the Georgetown Hill Child Care Center.

RESOLUTION NO. 587-92 Re: BELLS MILL COMMUNITY

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education hold a briefing on the issues raised by the Bells Mill community group about the matter of the siting of the entrance, among other issues they raised about the Georgetown Hill Child Care Center.

RESOLUTION NO. 588-92 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION
ON CHILD AND ADOLESCENT HEALTH

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

Resolved, That the following resolution be postponed until August 4:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a meeting to engage in discussions about child and adolescent health.

RESOLUTION NO. 589-92 Re: COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Dr. Cheung (On July 8, 1992), the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule a discussion on the constitution of an external advisory committee on technology, computer, and information system usage to serve as an advisory body for the school system.

RESOLUTION NO. 590-92 Re: APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.

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

WHEREAS, On July 12, 1988, the Board of Education established the Montgomery County Public Schools' Educational Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education approved the Article of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Montgomery County Public Schools' Educational Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The Bylaws authorize the Board of Education to select seven Directors as follows: One member of the Board of Education, three members from the community-at-large, and three members of the Montgomery County Public Schools' staff; and

WHEREAS, One vacancy exists and two appointments have expired on the Educational Foundation Board; now therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to bring the Educational Foundation Board current, the following persons be appointed and reappointed to the Education Foundation for terms ending December 31, 1993:

Mr. Blair G. Ewing (reappointment)
 Dr. Patricia Sweeney (reappointment)
 Mr. Richard Zitelman (appointment)

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mrs. Fanconi moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following: Resolved, That the superintendent provide the Board with an opportunity to have discussion with those schools that are models for inclusion in the very near future; and be it further Resolved, That this discussion include principals, teachers, and parents of regular education and special education students.

2. Mr. Sims moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:
Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss and possibly take action on the issue of voting rights for the student member of the Board in regard to the budget.

3. Mr. Ewing moved and Ms. Gutierrez seconded the following:
Resolved, That the Board request the superintendent to develop for its consideration a plan of action including Mrs. Fanconi's suggestion that would move the Board, step by step, in the direction of understanding fully the operational and cost options and the policy issues associated with inclusion with a view ultimately to the development of Board policy in this area.

RESOLUTION NO. 591-92 Re: RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education recess to closed session at 11:15 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw