

WHEREAS, In the United States of America the opportunity to receive an education is a fundamental right; and

WHEREAS, Communities throughout the country will be observing the 71st celebration of American Education Week; and

WHEREAS, The theme for this year's celebration is America's Schools: Take A New Look; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system believes every student can succeed, and is committed to the quality education of each student through excellence in instruction, supporting services, and administration; and

WHEREAS, Every child will achieve academic success only if parents, members of the business community and other residents are regularly involved in the learning process; and

WHEREAS, Local schools are open to all county residents to visit, to become involved in the learning programs, and to foster the academic and personal achievement of all our students; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County does hereby recognize the period of November 15 through November 21, 1992, as American Education Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board urge school system staff members and residents of Montgomery County to forge strong partnerships on behalf of all our students, to work diligently to maintain the high quality education offered in our schools, and, on a daily basis, to convince all our children that they can succeed.

RESOLUTION NO. 790-92 Re: NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

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

WHEREAS, The family unit in the United States is the setting in which the personal ideals of fulfillment and success begin in our children; and

WHEREAS, The love and support of the family are key elements in our children's development of positive and healthy self-esteem; and

WHEREAS, The involvement of parents and other family members in the learning process increases student participation in school and improves their academic achievement; and

November 10, 1992

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is committed to involving the families of our students in the learning process by encouraging them to participate in school life, by giving them strategies to help their children learn, and by assisting them in the responsibility of parenting; and

WHEREAS, The Congress and President of the United States have proclaimed November 22 through November 28, 1992, as National Family Week; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County recognize November 22 through November 28, 1992, as National Family Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education encourage parents and other family members to become regularly involved in our students' learning process by providing positive feedback, by participating in some way with students in their daily school work, and by volunteering to assist teachers and other staff at the local school in helping every student be personally and academically successful.

Re: FACILITIES ALTERNATIVES

Mrs. Hobbs explained that it would take four votes to adopt a facilities alternative. The vote of the student member did not count because the issues were related to school boundaries and the capital budget.

RESOLUTION NO. 791-92 Re: FACILITIES ALTERNATIVE - CHURCHILL CLUSTER

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

Resolved, That the following alternative as proposed by the Churchill cluster be adopted:

A. Cabin John - Stone Mill Elementary School would be transferred to Cabin John Middle School and Potomac and Bells Mill Elementary Schools would remain at Cabin John. Upon completion of middle school, Stone Mill students would enter Wootton High School and Potomac and Bells Mill students would attend Churchill.

B. Cold Spring/Seven Locks - Cold Spring and Seven Locks Elementary Schools would be transferred to Herbert Hoover Middle School.

C. Permanent Reassignment of Cold Spring - Cold Spring Elementary School would become a permanent member of the

Churchill Cluster and students upon graduating from Hoover Middle School would attend Churchill High School.

D. Scheduled Modernization - Maintain modernization schedule for Churchill High School.

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN ON AN
ALTERNATIVE FOR THE QUINCE ORCHARD
CLUSTER (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman to develop an alternative for the Quince Orchard Cluster that would retain the Willow Ridge community in Jones Lane Elementary School failed with Mrs. Brenneman, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and (Mr. Sims) voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Fanconi, Ms. Gutierrez, and Mrs. Hobbs voting in the negative; Mrs. DiFonzo abstaining.

RESOLUTION NO. 792-92 Re: POLICY ON RELEASE OF DATA

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

WHEREAS, On March 12, 1991, the Board of Education asked for a discussion on developing a policy on the release of data; and

WHEREAS, On April 27, 1992, Mr. Ewing requested that the Board take tentative action on such a policy and send it out for public comment; and

WHEREAS, A policy analysis and a draft policy were presented to the Board of Education on August 4, 1992; and

WHEREAS, The draft policy was tentatively adopted at that time and sent out for public comment; and

WHEREAS, Supportive comments have been received and further recommendations have been made to the draft policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following policy on the release of data:

I. PURPOSE

To provide the Board of Education and the public with timely access to data from MCPS research and evaluation studies and other school systemwide data, information, and statistics that are in the public domain (any product produced using public funds).

II. ISSUE

Federal and state law provides for the public's right to inspect and obtain information generated by public agencies. MCPS practices have long supported these principles. The release of data, however, must be done so that the rights of individuals are protected as provided in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and the Public Information Act of Maryland. It must be clear to all interested parties what data are obtainable and how those data can be obtained.

III. POSITION

- A. With the exceptions noted below, MCPS will promptly release data from research and evaluation studies, as well as other systemwide data, information, and statistics which are clearly in the public domain, to the Board and to the public, whether stored in computer files or hardcopy form and whether or not the data have been included in previously published reports. The superintendent shall determine when and under what circumstances such releases will be made, as described in (D) below.
- B. If the data or other materials are produced as the result of the provision of state or federal laws, regulations, or conditions on the use of funds, all requirements for the release of data imposed by state and federal laws, regulations, or conditions on the use of those funds shall be observed.
- C. Outside agencies sometimes specify a particular release date for data. MCPS will release such data in accordance with the specifications.
- D. Requests will be processed as expeditiously as possible, and in accordance with the provisions of the Public Information Act of Maryland which provides that records shall be released within a period not to exceed 30 days after receipt of a written request.
- E. The superintendent or a designee may release data with qualifications regarding its reliability and utility, and may describe plans for further analyses and provide other information relating to the data.
- F. The public may obtain data by requesting in writing that the superintendent provide the data, subject to the limitations contained in this policy. The request should describe with reasonable specificity the kinds of data elements that are needed, whether the data are

preferred to be provided in hard copy or machine readable form, and when the data are needed.

- G. If the data are more than six pages in length or are provided in machine readable form, the superintendent may impose a reasonable charge for the cost of reproducing the data.
- H. Refusal to release data may be appealed in accordance with MCPS policies and state law.
- I. MCPS had no obligation to release data, under the provisions of this policy, that are not readily available in either hardcopy form, or in computer files that can be inexpensively copied. Further, the school system has no obligation to provide data in other than the format in which the data are stored.

V. DESIRED OUTCOMES

Implementation of this policy will provide a process for obtaining the timely release of data. This will facilitate clear communication between the school system and the community about the release of information relating to the function of the school system while complying with federal and state laws.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

- A. The superintendent will create a process for the release of data that facilitates the public's right to inspect and receive copies of data collected or calculated by MCPS that are not excluded from release under the provisions of this policy, other policies, state or federal laws.
- B. Procedures for releasing data contained in student records are set forth in Administrative Regulation JOA-RA: Pupil Records.
- C. Data contained in statistical reports or files will be released in accordance with Administrative Regulation EGH-RA: Preparation of Statistical Reports.
- D. Data related to research designs and products from the Department of Educational Accountability will be in accordance with Policy AFA: Educational Accountability.
- E. Data contained in other records and files will be released in accordance with Policy KBA: Policy on

Public Information and Administrative Regulation KBA-
RA: Public Information.

- F. The superintendent will develop regulations as needed to implement this policy.

VII. REVIEW AND REPORTING

This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education policy review process.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Marilyn Van Degrift, Wootton HS PTSA, and Walt Lange, Wootton Cluster
2. Carole Newman, CASE, and Marsha Ostur, POSE
3. Marilyn Dalton, PISCES
4. Jeff McCrehan, PISCES
5. Sharon Maneki, National Federation of the Blind
6. Judy Rasmussen, Sligo Creek Chapter, National Federation of the Blind
7. Barbara Cheadle, Parents of Blind Children

RESOLUTION NO. 793-92 Re: FY 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND
COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Dr. Cheung, 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 1993 supplemental appropriation of \$205,583 from the United States Department of Education through the Maryland State Department of Education under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 and the Omnibus Drug Act of 1988, for the Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	2.0	\$ 59,113
2	Instructional Salaries		80,422
3	Other Instructional Costs		36,713
7	Student Transportation		653
10	Fixed Charges	—	<u>28,682</u>
	Total	2.0	\$205,583

14-92	Paint and Paint Sundries	
	<u>Awardees</u>	
	Chaselle, Inc.	\$ 45
	Duron, Inc.	22,883
	The Glidden Company	6,031
	Lasting Paints, Inc.	6,978
	McCormick Paint Works Company	2,420
	Potomac Paint Company	560
	Rockville Paint Center	<u>1,022</u>
	Total	\$ 39,939
31-93	Woodwind and Brass Instrument Repair	
	<u>Awardee</u>	
	L & L Musical Instrument Repair	\$ 40,000
	MORE THAN \$25,000	\$372,616

*Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 797-92 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - FUEL BURNER
 REPLACEMENT AT JACKSON ROAD
 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace one of the fuel burners at Jackson Road Elementary School, funded from Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR) capital funds, were received on October 19, 1992, with work to begin immediately and be completed by November 17, 1992:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Mech-Air, Inc.	\$32,400
2. G & L Mechanical Services	33,325
3. Combustioneer Corporation	35,800
4. M & M Welding & Fabricators, Inc.	36,280
5. American Combustian Industries, Inc.	36,542
6. Adrian L. Merton, Inc.	40,079

and

WHEREAS, Mech-Air, Inc., has replaced fuel burners successfully at Candlewood and Bethesda elementary schools; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the budget estimate of \$34,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLUTION NO. 800-92 Re: ACCEPTANCE OF ROSA PARKS MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That having been duly inspected on November 2, 1992, Rosa Parks Middle School now be formally accepted, and that the official date of completion be established as that date upon which formal notice is received from the architect that the building has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications, and all contract requirements have been met.

RESOLUTION NO. 801-92 Re: POSTPONEMENT OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF SUMMIT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

Resolved, That the proposed resolution accepting Summit Hall Elementary School be postponed until November 23, 1992.

RESOLUTION NO. 802-92 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - JULIUS WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the modernization and addition to Julius West Middle School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Julius West Middle School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the modernization and addition to Julius West Middle School developed by Smolen & Associates.

RESOLUTION NO. 803-92 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS - NORTH CHEVY CHASE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The architect for the modernization of North Chevy Chase Elementary School has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The North Chevy Chase Elementary School Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the modernization of North Chevy Chase Elementary School developed by Garrison-Schurter Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 804-92 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, 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. 805-92 Re: PERSONNEL REASSIGNMENTS

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

Resolved, That the following personnel reassignments be approved:

<u>Name</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Mary Brenneham	Classroom Teacher Weller Road ES	Instruct. Asst. Glenallan ES Will maintain salary status To retire: 7-1-93
Katherine Seward	Classroom Teacher Viers Mill ES	Instruct. Asst. To be determined Will maintain salary status To retire: 7-1-93

RESOLUTION NO. 806-92 Re: EXTENSION OF SICK LEAVE

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

WHEREAS, The employee listed below has suffered serious illness; and

WHEREAS, Due to the prolonged illness, the employee's accumulated sick leave has expired; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education grant an extension of sick leave with three-fourths pay covering the number of days indicated.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position and Location</u>	<u>No. of Days</u>
Fink, Jr., James B.	Building Svs. Wk. Ldr. I Meadow Hall ES	20

RESOLUTION NO. 807-92 Re: DEATH OF MS. CAROLE WALSH, SPECIAL
EDUCATION RESOURCE ROOM TEACHER ON
PERSONAL ILLNESS LEAVE FROM
MONTGOMERY VILLAGE MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The death on October 4, 1992, of Ms. Carole Walsh, a special education resource room teacher at Montgomery Village Middle School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Walsh was a special education resource room teacher for more than 18 years and demonstrated an understanding and concern for her students; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Walsh was respected by staff, students and parents for her dedication to teaching children with special needs; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Ms. Carole Walsh 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 Ms. Walsh's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 808-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Maxine Counihan	Asst. Principal Tilden MS	Coordinator, MSDE Challenge Grant Office of School Admin. Grade O Effective: 11-11-92

RESOLUTION NO. 809-92 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Ms. Gutierrez 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>
John C. Larson	Evaluation Spec. Div. of Instruct. Eval. & Testing	Research/Statistical Coordinator DEA Grade M Effective: 11-11-92

Re: REVIEW OF ALL COURSE OFFERINGS

Dr. Vance reported that on June 10, 1992, the Board had adopted a resolution on senior high school course offerings which directed the superintendent to initiate a review based on FY 1992 enrollment with recommendations for reducing selective course offerings and/or transferring courses to adult education in the FY94 budget process. The paper in front of the Board contained his recommendations on courses to be eliminated in FY94, and the second grouping were those that should be maintained until the full impact of the new graduation requirements had been assessed.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, stated that they had looked at enrollments for the past two years in all courses. They had identified courses where no students had enrolled, and they were recommending these be deleted from the course bulletin. The second list had low enrollments, but they were reviewing curriculum and might be deleting more courses. For example, the Council on Instruction was examining a program in technology education which might change the number of courses in this program from 27 to seven courses. Therefore, they proposed not eliminating the courses in the second group until the study had been completed.

Mrs. Fanconi asked whether they had no enrollment in the Summer School for the Performing Arts because of the late decision on charging fees. Dr. Villani thought that was one of the issues,

but no one signed up for the course. Mrs. Fanconi recalled that the course had been by audition, and that generally a lot of students wanted to get into this program. She asked if she could have information about putting this program into the Enterprise Fund with the other summer school courses.

Mrs. Brenneman asked whether or not principals had to have a minimum number of students before offering a course. Dr. Villani replied that they had three categories of courses. The first core consisted of courses required for graduation, the second core required 15 or more students to be enrolled for the course to be offered, and the third core was "other" courses. Mrs. Brenneman asked whether it would be up to the principal to decide whether to offer a third core course if three signed up. Dr. Villani replied that a principal could do that if he or she could afford to staff the program.

Mrs. Brenneman said that she totally disagreed with eliminating courses based on enrollment because it took the options away from principals and set a bad precedent because a group of students might want a course. She would rather see the courses left in; however, she agreed that courses could be eliminated if they were being combined. From what she had seen as a Board member, it was difficult to add courses. She would keep the courses unless there was a problem with the content of the courses.

Dr. Cheung thought they needed a couple of years of data before they cancelled courses. Ms. Kathy McGuire, director of guidance, commented that staff had gone through course enrollment for the last two years. The Board had directed staff to look at courses with low enrollments, and there were some courses on the list for which coordinators believed enrollment would increase in the next several years.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that staff had done what was requested of them by the Board resolution. He thought that the Board should have asked for staff's judgment about courses based on criteria about what was important for students to have. Staff might have suggested eliminating courses, placing them in another category, or placing them in adult education. He pointed out that there was a fiscal impact here, but that needed to be weighed with the question of a balanced program for students. He hoped that before the Board took action it would reformulate the question.

Mrs. Hobbs noted that the Board had been provided with an article about Fairfax's merging or eliminating almost 60 high school courses. Fairfax had looked at courses that were underenrolled as well as lower level courses. She thought that Montgomery County was faced with the dilemma of having a smorgasbord of courses available to students. She disagreed that they should offer a course when they had only three students. The Board should review courses that could go into adult education. She was glad to see that there were nine courses which could be

eliminated, and of those nine, three were summer school courses. She was sorry to see that so many of the courses in the second list were in the area of career and vocational technology. She believe that it was time to look at streamlining the course offerings.

Ms. Gutierrez agreed that they did need to do something because they had a very large course offering. She did not know how frequently they reviewed the offerings, but enrollment for one year was not an adequate criteria. As for the vocational and technical courses on the second list, she wondered what they could do to make these courses more attractive to students. Reducing 27 courses to seven appeared to her that they were eliminating options for students. While the information began to tell the Board some things about the curriculum, it did not provide enough information. The public believed that MCPS was offering three levels of gourmet cooking.

Dr. Villani replied that through this process he had learned that idea of three levels of gourmet cooking was indeed a myth. The courses with less than 100 students were generally honors courses or specialty courses such as ESOL 6. He thought that Board members might be surprised at the large numbers of students taking each course. They did not have a wide array of courses, but it appeared that way because of semesterization. He would be happy to share with the Board the list of courses and the student counts. He believed that most of their courses were economical in the sense that they were self supporting with numbers of students enrolled in the class which could justify assigning a teacher to it. Ms. Gutierrez said she would be interested in seeing the list.

Mr. Sims thought that the MCPS could do a better job of advertising these courses. The course bulletin was not easy to read. He said that it was interesting that students would talk about the importance of multiculturalism, but on the other hand students were not signed up for classes like Africa South of the Sahara and Hebrew 1, 2, and 3. He thought they could correct the problem without eliminating the courses. As long as the budget implication was not massive, he would vote against removing these courses. He also agreed with Ms. Gutierrez that some of these courses were directed at the students who might not be college bound, and he found it interesting that students were not enrolling in marketing and business education.

Mrs. Brenneman thought they had to give some latitude here to the principals regarding what courses needed to be offered even with low enrollments. Mrs. Fanconi said it would be important for the staff to tell the Board what they had learned from this exercise. She had a feeling that with the cutbacks in staff that schools had chosen not to have a lot of small classes. They also needed to know that the schools had the flexibility to offer a course to meet a specific need. It would be good to have this information before the Board got to the budget.

WHEREAS, MCPS has no health education requirement, but will need to add a one-half credit requirement; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education establish the following as graduation requirements for students entering Grade 9 for the first time in September 1993 and thereafter:

Physical Education - one credit (two semesters which may be taken anytime during grades 9-12), and

Health Education - one-half credit taken as a semester course in comprehensive health education sometime during Grades 9-12.

Re: REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION ON THE
RESTRUCTURING OF THE OFFICE FOR
SPECIAL AND ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION

Mrs. Hobbs thanked the members of the commission particularly for preparing their report before she left the Board. Dr. Vance said he was pleased to share the report from the commission, and he was grateful to the two chairs, Ms. Anna C. Ossler, principal of Sherwood Elementary School, and Dr. Rita K. Ives, professor, George Washington University. He thanked the members of the commission for their sincere efforts and for the many hours of thoughtful deliberations reflected in the report. He hoped that by January he would have his recommendations on the report in time for the FY 1994 operating budget.

Ms. Ossler introduced Mr. James Robinson, Ms. Rita Furst-Seifert, and Dr. Liz Glowa who would be making presentations to the Board. She asked the members of the commission in the audience to stand and introduce themselves. She reported that at times there were as many as 40 people attending their meetings, but the original composition of the commission was 35 members. It was a large and hard-working group.

Dr. Ives reported that Appendix D in the report spoke to the actual activities. There were six major points which led to the report. The first one was the decision-making process, and early on they decided how they were going to be making decisions. They agreed they would attempt to come to consensus, and when they could not come to consensus they voted. A second point was an orientation of openness that pervaded everything they did. They had a division of labor because they formed work groups. As they moved along in the process there was an obvious development of cohesiveness and mutual respect. She felt they had made very good use of the expertise on the commission. Their final report showed a multi-dimensional input from their information gathering.

Ms. Ossler said that the commission had worked in a very politically charged climate because of activity among the advocacy groups. Their guiding principles were arrived at by consensus and were used throughout the process. They recommended maintaining a continuum of options to provide support to all students. They did recommend creating a position of equity assurance officer in the office of the deputy superintendent for instruction to focus on the overrepresentation of African-American males in special education.

In regard to restructuring, Ms. Ossler reported that they currently had the Department of Special Education and Related Services and the Department of Pupil Services, the Division of Adult Education and Summer School, and the Division of Interagency and Alternative Programs. In addition, they had four units: Field Offices, Central Placement, Child Find, and Diagnostic and Professional Support Team. The Commission recommended streamlining and having a Department of Special Education Support Services and a Department of Pupil Services. The two units directly reporting to the associate superintendent would be the Central Placement Unit and the Management Support Services Unit. Many of the functions in the Department of Special Education Support Services were similar to ones that were currently in the Department of Special Education and Related Services with some exceptions and some additions. They were recommending that the administration of the seven special education schools be under the Office of School Administration. Early Childhood Special Education Programs and Child Find would be joined together with other special education programs in the new department. Transition Services would move back into Special Education. Within the Department of Special Education Support they would have the development and management of an interdisciplinary approach to schools. They were talking about providing more direct services to schools and organizing the central office staff to do this.

Ms. Ossler said the Department of Pupil Services would be similar in some ways to what was already there. They had added the central administration of guidance, administration of interagency and alternative programs, and the possibility of moving suspension and expulsion hearings into that department. The department would also be involvement with parental involvement and training. In the new units reporting directly to the associate superintendent would be the Central Placement Unit which would become more user friendly and would continue to be responsible for hospitals and non-public assessments. The Management Support Services Unit would bring together many of the functions required for students with special needs including budget, coordination with Dr. Rohr's office, and the analysis of data from the special education data system.

Ms. Ossler indicated that the field offices needed more study. Many of the functions previously the responsibility of the field office units were no longer there. They had to study what form these offices should take and what the staffing should be. They were eliminating the diagnostic, professional, and support team because their functions were moved to the Department of Pupil Services. They were suggesting that the legal functions including formal appeals be moved to Legal Services. They were recommending this because the adversarial issues could be separated from where people were providing services and support. They had eliminated Child Find, Early Childhood, and SEDS as presently designed. They had recommending moving the input and output functions to the Department of Technology, Planning, and Data Operations. The SEDS interaction with the school system would be in the Management Support Services Unit. Adult Education and Summer School would go to the Department of Student, Community, and Staff Support in OIPD for adult education; summer school, Saturday school, and night high school would go to Academic Programs in OIPD, and the EYE function would go to Personnel. They had more detailed explanation about the Central Placement Unit on pages 23 to 25. They emphasized the need for on-going and up-dated training regarding the law, educational management teams, and admission, review, and dismissal committees. There was a need to continually monitor what was happening in local school EMTs and ARDs. They also spoke about the fact that Success for Every Student was a document they started with, and while the standards in that document did not necessarily apply to all the specific needs of some of the special education population, they needed to develop standards for those students.

Mr. Robinson stated that in the process of working through various proposals for reorganization, they thought it was important to take a very careful look at every aspect of the proposals coming before the commission. Some of them from the community went in with the understanding that no matter what kind of organizational structure they came up with, unless the reorganized office provided for basic fairness and equity in dealing with all students, reorganization would serve no purpose. He suspected that most people knew that African-American male students had traditionally been over-represented in special education classes in MCPS as long as he could remember. It appeared to them that very little had been done to correct a serious problem and a problem which placed an enormous burden on a segment of the student population, to some degree, unjustly.

Mr. Robinson explained that several of them came to the conclusion that there was a need for some kind of extraordinary measure even within the context of the reorganized office to ensure that these young people would not be victimized. The outcome of that discussion was that there should be a person within the school system who would have the responsibility

initially for looking into the status of these young people as they entered the school system to determine what put them at risk and why the system seemed unable to prevent that. They were recommending the establishment of a position with direct responsibility and the authority to look at any aspect of the school system's operation to identify the instances where young people were coming into special education in disproportionate numbers. This would be an equity assurance officer in the deputy superintendent for instruction's office. This person should have the responsibility for monitoring all of the schools to be sure that any unusual numbers did not occur or the reasons could be understood and corrections and changes could be made immediately. They did not all agree that this officer should be solely focused on this problem, but they came to the conclusion that it would be better to begin by having such a person whose sole responsibility initially would be that of monitoring the data and the intakes which would come from all areas of the school system's operation and to identify unusual numbers and move with dispatch to correct whatever the problem turned out to be.

Ms. Furst-Seifert reported that there were several parents of special education children on the commission. They participated fully in the deliberations of the commission, and like any group of people they had differences among themselves. They did agree that Success for Every Student included special education students, that reorganization had to expand the range of services at the home school while assuring that there was a range of options including special centers and private placement, and that the family and the school staffs would be partners in the education of children. Staff had to be trained to provide an effective delivery of services to all students. These were translated into the recommendations for the parent information and training center in the Department of Pupil Services which should improve parent access to information. Another recommendation was to monitor the EMT and ARD procedures so that they were more consistent across schools. The Placement Unit had to be more user friendly. Elimination of the DPST and moving the appeal procedures to Legal Services would help relationships. The interdisciplinary teams would be available to schools as consultants to increase the success for students with special needs. She said they had good programs in Montgomery County, and they wanted to make sure that any future administrative structure would safeguard the quality of services for special and alternative education. If the seven special schools converted to the Office of Administration, they wanted the program supports maintained in special education. She suggested that in the implementation process there should be some continuity with the commission and that the vast amount of materials should be transferred to the next group.

Dr. Glowa said that she was one of several principals on the commission. She stressed that they were talking about

alternative as well as special education. They recommended a full range of services from intensity one consultation by special education teachers and the expanded pupil services teams to intensity five and six special schools. Equally essential were the time and human resources to provide adequate services for the students, their teachers, and their parents. They spoke often of the necessity of increased staff development to work effectively with the broad range of students. Students were increasing in terms of learning styles, behavioral styles, and academic levels. This impact was felt in the local schools. If they set up the organization in terms of the interdisciplinary teams, they would increase the ability of staff to deal not only with special education students but students with special needs and alternative students. In order to achieve this, they had to realign current staff, services, and functions to most closely serve the needs of students. The current Pupil Services team combined with the proposed Special and Alternative Education Support teams could provide an invaluable asset to the schools. An additional recommendation was the streamlining of placement procedures which would assist staff and alleviate some parent concerns. The major impact was long-term because they would increase the ability of local schools to deal effectively with all students.

Dr. Ives commented that they saw their task as offering direction in the restructuring and not as implementation. The continuity with the documentation and wealth of information was important. The work of the commission was reflected in national trends and concerns in both regular and special education. They were concerned about greater inclusion where possible and for less referrals to special education by improving resources at the local school including the ability of personnel to handle diversity. Another concern was for the essential staff and parent training to make inclusion possible. While they needed additional training in the placement process, they also needed to train teachers to increase their sensitivity to diversity. They were concerned that existing good programs should not be thrown out in the name of inclusion. Their report spoke to the balancing and that there be a range of services. There was great concern on the total commission for Afro-American equity, and there was concern for a user friendly placement process and a more user friendly school system.

Mrs. Hobbs reminded the Board that Dr. Vance had recommended that they schedule a second time to discuss the report and take action. She acknowledged the recommendation that a staff group be appointed to continue and indicated her support for a staff group with more parent involvement from the community.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the members of the commission, especially the chairs. She was personally thrilled with principles that were agreed on by consensus. She particularly liked the emphasis

on early intervention services, avoiding confrontation, and support for school staff. Because this item would come back in January, she felt that the Board should indicate whether or not they supported the basic premise of the report. She could not respond to the report until she knew, for example, how DPST was going to be reorganized and how the services would be different. Although she was supportive of the principles, she needed some specifics. She suggested they might want to have a separate group look at the AARD, CARD, SARD process to make this process user friendly. She commented that the theme through the report was cooperation between parents and staff, and if they were serious about that, the superintendent should flesh this out. She was very interested in the issue of the field offices. The Board would be getting another report on SED, and some of the SED people were in the field offices, and she needed to know how the field offices would be organized. She remarked that as they went into the individual family service planning and worked with the infants and toddlers program she hoped this would assist them in moving toward an interagency look at these families. She asked whether it would be possible to have some of these pieces put together in January, and Dr. Vance replied that it was his intent to do this along with budget implications.

Mrs. Fanconi recalled that in 1988 she had served on a task force which talked about the use of the AARD teams to do more intervention. She hoped that they would look at this. She indicated her support for the idea of the equity officer, and she thought they needed to look at how they would use that position to assist schools to individualize programs for students.

Mrs. Hobbs thought that the recommendations on reorganization were very good. The first charge of the commission was to look at saving \$400,000, and they had brought the Board many good recommendations at that time. She asked whether they had thought about combining the Early Childhood Special Education, Child Find, Head Start, and the Early Childhood programs under Dr. Plumer. Ms. Ossler replied that at one point there were several options in an attempt to bring special education and regular education closer together. There was much sentiment about combining all the early childhood classes including Child Find and Head Start. They had backed away from that in their final recommendations, but they agreed that in the future this might be the first place to combine things. They had kept Child Find with the Early Childhood Special Education program because they had new laws, and it was safer to keep these programs in the Department of Special Education and Support Services.

Mrs. Hobbs recalled that originally there was a recommendation to eliminate the vision supervisor and the auditory supervisor and develop a new position which would have been the supervisor of auditory and vision services. Two teacher specialist positions would have been converted to Grade E. The Board had asked them to revisit this recommendation. Ms. Ossler replied that they had discussed this in detail, but they did not feel they could get into this at this time. Therefore, they did not make specific

recommendations. They did talk about the unique needs of the auditory population and the cultural impact on that particular population. Nationally there were discussions about a move to more inclusion as well as a move to keep the identify of the hearing-impaired community.

Mr. Ewing noted that there was a recommendation to move the administration of the seven special education schools to the office of school administration. The report stated that all supports in place for special education schools would continue to exist but would be administered by the office of school administration. He was not sure how this would work. For example, what was administrative and what was support?

Ms. Ossler replied that all schools sent their school improvement plans to the Office of School Administration. Special schools this year were asked to send their plans to that office as well as Dr. Fountain's office. The special schools were often left out of the loop in training plans, distribution of information from Academic Skills, and the development of special projects available to staff. The services would follow the special education schools, but the schools would be in line administratively with the other schools in terms of facilities, transportation, etc.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that one of the seven schools was Mark Twain which dealt to a large extent with SED students; however, the commission had not discussed this program. Ms. Ossler replied that the commission had reviewed several reports on SED, but they felt that the Board was already dealing with this issue. They did not pull out Mark Twain when they made the recommendation about the seven schools because they treated it as a school not as a program although its population was unique.

Dr. Cheung thanked the members of the commission for their report. They had a difficult task of making the Office of Special and Alternative Education both efficient and effective. From the effective standpoint, this meant trying to optimize what they were doing well, as well as trying to improve what they were not doing as well. He thought that special education was an area where they tried to look at the needs of individual students and to serve as a model for Success for Every Student. He also distrusted restructuring because if they had the same people with the same attitude it did not make a difference how these people were shifted. It was difficult to change attitudes, and he really appreciated their suggestions about the need for extensive training which hopefully would modify behavior and change attitudes.

Dr. Ives commented that historically they realized that if regular education was going to serve a diverse population, attitudes were the basis of everything. Yet nationally they refused to commit to the training to induce these changes. Dr. Glowa remarked that it was not always a matter of attitude. Frequently the attitude was there that students really needed services. What was sometimes missing was the background knowledge on how to deal with the diversity, different learning styles, and different behavior styles. Dr. Cheung commented that attitudes came from knowledge and experiences, too. Dr. Ives stated that attitudes did not always mean negative attitudes. If the teacher did not feel that she could handle a diverse population, this was also an attitude that you could only get at through training.

Dr. Cheung asked whether the commission had considered ADA. He noted that they planned to recommend the elimination of DPST and put it in Pupil Services, and he asked about the function and role of DPST in Pupil Services. Dr. Glowa replied that one of the essential roles of DPST was as a mediator and that role would continue in Pupil Services, but they would not have the legal role of the formal hearings. Ms. Ossler replied that the commission had received an overview of the laws including the Americans with Disabilities Act, and they had discussed the need for ongoing updated training with regard to the laws particularly with getting this information down to the local schools. She said that the Diagnostic and Professional Support Team was originally designed to provide diagnostic and professional support, but it had become the arm of the school system which mediated, did hearings, and provided the liaison for students in parochial and nonpublic schools needing special education services. The report did not recommend maintaining DPST. It moved some of the functions to Legal Services, to the Central Placement Unit, Special Education Support Services, and Pupil Services.

Mrs. Brenneman said she would have more questions when she saw the recommendations from the superintendent in January. She did have questions about the equity assurance officer. She could understand where they were coming from, but she would like information on the justification for adding another position as well as the perception of another layer of bureaucracy. She asked who was monitoring this at present. Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, replied that this position would monitor pre-special education. Once the child was in the special education loop, this was a different story. In this case they were talking about students EMT and before. This was not the monitoring his office had been doing. In special education they did well in knowing where students were and what they were doing. Mr. Robinson had spoken about the concern about how these students got into special education. Once a student got into special education, it was difficult for them to get out.

Mrs. Brenneman pointed out that they had SIMS as well as directors assessing principals. She wondered whether they had an existing process that could be perfected to look at this without creating another position. Mr. Robinson replied that sitting out there in the community and working in the context of the commission he did not see a comparable task being performed anywhere in the system. There was no person or persons looking at what happened to youngsters, how many students were coming from certain schools into special education, etc. This person would have more than just a monitoring function because the person would have the capacity, the authority, and the responsibility to correct situations instantaneously. Mrs. Brenneman stated that what they were talking about was accountability and whether there was a structure right now to do this or whether they needed to bring in another layer of accountability. Mr. Robinson hoped that something would materialize to help as an advocacy for these young people. The community was not persuaded that even the equity assurance officer would make a world of difference as to whether or not the system would change. He was persuaded that there was a pattern so deeply ingrained that even this might not be the solution, but they were willing to try it.

Ms. Gutierrez saw this concept as being equivalent to product assurance on a very large system. The idea was that the system could not assure itself because it was involved with the issue. The assurance role was an oversight above the system looking at the overall outcomes of the system, having an independent role, and having some kind of authority to do audits, identify data, and enforce corrective action. The idea of an assurance role was available in other school systems, but MCPS did not have that model. Usually a quality assurance office was at the highest level in school systems. She did not think it was another layer of bureaucracy because they were not talking about layers but rather a single office using the existing resources of the system. She thought they should not get hung up about adding another position because with the kind of restructuring they were recommending there should be ample opportunity to convert or identify a position for this role. Mr. Robinson replied that her remarks were very consistent with the discussions the commissions had.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether they had looked at the scope of the assurance officer because right now it was limited to the over-representation of the African-American male. She had also heard about the under-serving of the limited English proficient community because this population had little access to pupil personnel services, speech therapy, and that kind of thing. When they talked about bringing the services of special education and regular education together, she wondered if they had considered the ESOL community which had moved from this umbrella to OIPD and was not yet part of the total regular education program. Dr.

Ives replied that their thinking did not go to the finite things Ms. Gutierrez was addressing, but they saw it in its very broadest scope. She thought that Ms. Gutierrez had phrased their vision.

Ms. Gutierrez requested the superintendent to look at the ESOL aspect as he made his recommendations. She was aware of special needs that were not being met. Overall, she liked the restructuring and the streamlining of services. Any time they could consolidate, they would get efficiencies of scale and better coordination. She was concerned that a lot of the responsibilities were moving to OIPD and were being taken away from this unit, and before the units were balanced in size. She would want to make sure that resources and supports were moved to OIPD as well. However, she did support the overall concept. She wondered about what happened to the commission now. Dr. Vance replied that now he and his executive staff would have to study the recommendations. They would involve members of the task group in their deliberations and representatives from the various special education organizations. In the final analysis, the next step would be the superintendent's recommendations to the Board, and from this point on everyone including the executive staff would be in an advisory capacity to the superintendent.

Mr. Ewing asked whether it was the judgment of the commission as to whether their recommendations were budget neutral, were likely to save money, or were likely to cost additional money. Dr. Ives did not think this saved money. They had approached this from a programmatic and philosophical view rather than from the point of view of budget. It was her personal opinion that if the training were done well it would cost more money. Ms. Ossler thought that the initial recommendations were budget neutral. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that when the superintendent presented his recommendations he had to provide the budget implications for FY 1994. Dr. Vance replied that this was his intent. Mrs. Fanconi suggested that it would be important for the commission to let the Council know how important staff development was because this was one of the Council's cuts. Mrs. Hobbs thanked the members of the commission for their recommendations and report.

Re: PRESENTATION FROM MODEL INCLUSION
SCHOOLS

Dr. Vance stated that he had provide material on four inclusion models housed in McNair, Bethesda, and Whetstone elementaries and Poolesville Junior/Senior High School.

Dr. Fountain explained that the purpose of the presentation was to provide a picture of four inclusion models. The two major concepts governing the provision of special education services were first the least restrictive environment and a continuum of alternative placements. According to the Code of Maryland,

October, 1991, based on the least restrictive environment this meant that to the maximum extent appropriate students with disabilities would be educated with students who were not disabled. Special classes and separate schooling would occur only when the nature and severity of the disability was such that the education of that child could not be done in a regular program with the addition of services. A public agency had to assure that a continuum of placements would be available including instruction in regular education classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions. Dr. Fountain reported that as of October, 1991 approximately 88 percent of MCPS students with disabilities in Intensities 1 through 6 were served in general education, and 57 percent of those students were being served in their home schools. This left 12 percent in special centers and private placements. They had started out in Intensity 4 and now had moved to Intensity 5 students with the goal of moving these students from separate facilities into regular education. Right now they had almost 30 classes that had been served in special schools. Inclusion efforts had developed over a number of years, and the integration of special and general education appeared to have been successful for students and well supported by teachers. It had proved more efficient than piecing together services in separate places.

Dr. Fountain introduced Ms. Dawn Capron, principal of Bethesda ES; Dawn Moore, general education teacher of Whetstone ES; Linda Tribble, parent from McNair ES; and Donna Pyrdol, special education teacher from Poolesville Junior/Senior High School. He also introduced Ms. Sandra Lebowitz, acting director.

Board members viewed a video tape on the inclusion program.

Ms. Capron reported that her school housed an Intensity 5 school community-based program with an enrollment of five students with moderate to severe disabilities. Over the last few years the program had evolved from a self-contained class that occasionally mainstreamed students into a full inclusion program where each of the five youngsters was assigned to a regular education class on a full-time basis. The results were encouraging because both special and regular education teachers agreed that the fully included students had made significant social and academic progress. Additionally, regular education students demonstrated an increased understanding of what being disabled did and did not mean. Over 25 students had volunteered to be special friends for students with disabilities. These results would not be possible without the skilled regular education teachers who had come to believe in the value of full inclusion and significant special education supports. They had one teacher and two assistants to support instruction in the regular education classes. They had one Intensity 5 staff member in each regular classroom which included students for at least 90 percent of the day. These

staff provided appropriate accommodations for students and general assistance for the teacher.

Ms. Capron indicated that all the therapists worked in the regular classroom whenever possible. She believed that it was crucial that there be enough trained personnel to fully support the students in the regular classroom. The regular education teachers needed additional training. There was an impact on teachers' planning time. Their special education teacher conducted frequent planning sessions with special and regular education staff to ensure that each student's program is cohesive and focused on their IEP goals. Ms. Capron suggested that they had to consider class size in relation to full inclusion. A class of 21 second graders with one severely handicapped student, one special educator, and one or more therapists at any one time looked very different from a class of 22 second graders. They had to look at accessibility. In her school they had two students in wheelchairs in a building with three floors and one elevator. She indicated that alternative settings were needed, both center and school based, for those students for whom full inclusion was not an option. Because an alternative was available, they were able to resolve a painful situation in one case when full inclusion was not the appropriate placement.

Ms. Moore stated that she taught third grade at Whetstone ES. When her principal first approached her with the idea of having an inclusion student, she was quite excited about this. During the 1991-92 school year she had 24 students, and two of those were mildly to moderately mentally retarded. In addition, nine other children had reading levels ranging one to two years below grade level. Her students challenged her as a teacher because she had to make accommodations in the curriculum, seek alternative strategies for behavior modification, and collaborate with other specialists. She felt that she had become a more flexible teacher. The two students were seen during the week by many resource persons including the inclusion resource teacher, reading teacher, speech pathologist, occupational and physical therapists, and instructional assistants. Last year the students gained in the area of speech, motivation, independence, social skills, and academic performance. This year she had 28 students including a child in a wheelchair. She believed that all students benefitted from inclusion, provided that teachers were given training and support as well as the understanding that each child brings unique challenges.

Ms. Tribble reported that her son was a sixth grade student at McNair. He had started his education at a regular preschool in Ohio where he received speech and language services. After further testing, it was determined he needed special education services. In Montgomery County her son attended programs at Viers Mill, Rockview, Fairland, and Diamond elementary schools in a search for a special education program to suit his needs. She

saw progress in academic skills when her son attended Diamond; however, her son continued to show inappropriate behaviors. MCPS then offered her a placement in a regular fourth grade class at McNair. She indicated that his social skills and maturity level had improved. His self esteem was better, and he now made direct eye contact when speaking. He had buddies in his classrooms, and he felt that his classroom tasks were important. His academic work had improved, and his math skills were better. He followed through with directions, and his behavior had improved. He continued to need individualized programming and more pressure on him to achieve in the classroom. Ms. Tribble stated that another issue was that her son saw his friends only during the school day because he did not live in the McNair attendance area. She was worried about seventh grade and whether or not he would continue on to middle school with his classmates or attend his home school in Gaithersburg. She did not want to see her child in a special education placement in a middle school.

Ms. Pyrdol stated that she was the resource teacher for the special education program at Poolesville Junior/Senior High School. There were three objectives for their total inclusion program. The first was to improve academic achievement, the second to raise their self esteem, and the third was to encourage socialization and participation in extracurricular activities. Prior to 1984, the special education students were taught in a special education classroom with all grade levels in one room with one special educator and an assistant. In addition to the problem of one teacher being required to teach all subjects to all grade levels, the self-contained classroom isolated and stigmatized the special education students. In the special education classroom, the students showed little respect toward their peers or themselves and their behaviors were often socially inappropriate. In 1984 Poolesville began to include learning disabled, low ability, and emotionally impaired students in regular education classrooms. By 1987 they had achieved full inclusion. The special needs students now attended a full schedule of classes with their non-disabled peers. While students following the prescribed curriculum, the presentation of materials and methodology might vary. Special education staff members shared teaching responsibility and adapted materials and tests. Students now felt they were part of the school, and they were more motivated to succeed with regular students as role models.

Ms. Pyrdol remarked that while the full inclusion model could produce positive results for a wide range of special education needs, it was not designed to be all things for all students. It had limitations. They would like to provide support for the special education students in all of their classes, but they did not have enough special education staff to meet all of these needs. It was not possible for a regular education teacher to make all the necessary accommodations and provide needed

attention in a large class without support from a special educator. Second, they found that the program was not an ideal learning situation for every student. Some students with very low ability were better served in programs that focused on fundamental life skills. Students with emotional impairments might interfere with their own learning as well as the learning of others and might be better served in alternative programs. In conclusion, the parents, teachers, and students at Poolesville agreed that the total inclusion model did provide benefits for the special needs students and did contribute to the goal of Success for Every Student.

Ms. Lebowitz commented that full inclusion models came in many shapes and sizes. The success of the models depended on the commitment and support of the school's administrative and teaching staff, sufficient staffing to support the students' needs, a great deal of on-going collaboration between special and regular education staff, training of staff both before the activity was undertaken and then as they continued to work through it, and parental support and involvement. There was an impact on planning time and a need to be flexible. There were concerns about what would happen to students who had been in these models as they moved forward in their education. The four programs were not the only inclusion models in MCPS. They had similar models at Forest Knolls, Resnik, Goshen, Lakewood, McAuliffe, Poolesville, and Summit Hall elementaries as well as Cabin John Middle School. In all of these settings, groups of students with similar needs had been clustered together and were being educated for all or the majority of their day in the regular classroom. In addition to these models, they had approximately 40 individual students with significant special needs who were attending their home schools. She asked the Board to keep in mind that inclusion was seen as one model of the least restrictive environment, but all placement decisions must be based on individual student needs. As they continued to work with students and expand their models, they hoped to expand and improve the options they had for students in MCPS.

Mrs. Hobbs asked that Board members be provided with a list of schools with inclusion programs. The Board had just heard from the OSAE commission, and they referred to a staffing formula. She thought it would be helpful to the Board during budget deliberations to look at the formula that needed to be used when they had full inclusion.

Mrs. Brenneman reported that she had been in many of these schools. She had visited a class the other day, and the situation worked beautifully because they had a caring and supportive teacher. However, she was also hearing from teachers that they did not feel they had the support and training they needed to do inclusion, but they were afraid to say no to someone who is disabled. They had class sizes that were large, and there

were a variety of learning styles in that room that had to be accommodated. A lot of comments were coming from parents who did not have disabled children. They were happy about having disabled children in a room, but they wondered about whether everyone was benefitting and whether their child was being educated equally as well. When she had visited that classroom, she noticed that a lot of attention was being paid to the disabled child. She had talked to the teacher about supports and training, and the teacher had had no special education training and had an aide and an instructional assistant for 45 minutes twice a week. She had also asked teachers if they thought the disabled children were learning, and the teachers thought so but were not positive because they did not have the training to assess progress. Ms. Pyrdol replied that there were benefits to the regular and special education children because there were two teachers in the classroom and both were working with students.

Mrs. Fanconi requested information about research on the effect of inclusion on the regular education student. She also asked whether it would be possible when they did SED in December to deal with the SED cluster and how that worked out and how this was dealt with in the regular classroom. Dr. Vance replied that he would talk with Mrs. Gemberling and Dr. Fountain because they were in the process of putting together that presentation and let her know.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that they had to look at the total issue in terms of what kind of changes were planned for the system. She would like an idea of next steps in this direction. She asked whether the superintendent would be looking for a formal position from the Board before he moved further in expanding inclusion programs. Dr. Vance said that this was an excellent question for a number of reasons. He would suggest that other than the proposed Board solution on the capital budget in the eastern part of the county there was no other issue that occupied his mind more than this one. He thought they needed to consider a policy and a policy analysis as suggested by Mr. Ewing. In that context, the superintendent would present a plan to plan.

Mrs. Hobbs thanked staff for their presentation.

Re: MULTICULTURAL SCHOOL CALENDAR

Mrs. Hobbs noted that this was a motion made by Ms. Gutierrez to review and expand the school calendar to better reflect and acknowledge multiculturalism. This was listed for discussion and possible action.

Ms. Gutierrez explained that if the Board were to take action it would reaffirm the Board's support for celebrating diversity. While MCPS did publish and provide many calendars, they focused on judeo-christian holidays. She had received comments from

Muslims, Vietnamese, Buddhists, and Cambodians about their special days for their students. It would help if a list of holidays could be sent to all teachers to remind them of the various holidays. This would promote the self esteem of these children, and many teachers would benefit from having this information. She planned to make a motion that the Board reaffirm its support of celebrating diversity by including more information in a multicultural school calendar.

Dr. Vance asked Dr. Oliver Lancaster, director of the Department of Human Relations, to update the Board on what MCPS was presently doing. Dr. Lancaster explained what his office did to provide information to schools on the various holidays. He reported that the comprehensive calendar had grown tremendously in recent years, and they were attempting to respond to all groups of any size, interest, or concern.

Mrs. DiFonzo questioned why a Board-adopted resolution to discuss this had been turned into a discussion/action item. It seemed to her that an individual had managed to change the decision of the body. Mrs. Hobbs explained that this item had been scheduled for discussion on an earlier agenda and had been postponed. When it was rescheduled, Ms. Gutierrez asked that it be scheduled as discussion/action, and she had seen no reason not to grant that request because Ms. Gutierrez could have introduced another motion to do so.

Mrs. DiFonzo made the following statement for the record:

"I have grave concerns about what I consider to be a very clear disregard for the procedural process. Secondly, we have a calendar that is loaded with Ramadan, TET, the Persian New Year. Yes, it had the judeo-christian holidays in it, too, but it had holidays that most of us have never even heard of. I have been in schools, and I have seen bulletin boards dedicated to Ramadan. Personally, as a Christian, I have known lots of occasions at the high school level where on Ash Wednesday the food cooking classes still prepare something and all kids are expected to eat it. It flies in the face of Catholics who abide by not eating between meals on Ash Wednesday, and yet there is that insensitivity there, too. Personally, I think this is a redundant motion because I think we already have a calendar that is extremely complete, extremely broad, and is constantly being tweaked up and improved as we become more aware of these things. I don't think we need anything further to do. If we are going to talk about Ramadan and some of the other holidays in schools, then we also have to talk about Christmas and we also have to talk about Easter and Ash Wednesday, and I am not sure we want to do that."

Ms. Gutierrez felt that they only recognized the official holidays. Mrs. Hobbs pointed out that other holidays were also listed on the comprehensive calendar. Ms. Gutierrez said that

what she was looking for was something that went beyond just a date. She had received examples of multicultural calendars that provided more information. Dr. Cheung felt that she was talking about more than a calendar because he had a book showing every day of the year with every important event on that day. This was very different from a calendar. Ms. Gutierrez agreed that this information would be useful, but a calendar would show what should be acknowledged on that day. Teachers could use this information for bulletin boards and to point out the significance of the date from a multicultural and multiethnic perspective. Dr. Lancaster pointed out that each media center would have many more materials as well.

Mrs. Fanconi said she had heard that this year's comprehensive calendar was less useful to teachers without the full page of the calendar. She wondered whether celebrating cultural diversity should be a companion document. She did not support an action item because she really wanted to have a discussion about what they were doing now and what were the plans to continue to expand their multicultural awareness. She pointed out that at Summit Hall they had students from over 60 countries, and there was a bulletin board with stories from the children about their culture. She would like them to consider companion documents rather than trying to get everything in one calendar.

*Mrs. DiFonzo left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Sims indicated that he would like to talk about multiculturalism in the curriculum. If they talked about trying to increase the awareness of multiculturalism, it was important to have things like calendars and posters, but the most important thing was what students did in the school.

Mrs. Hobbs asked whether Ms. Gutierrez had a motion. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she would leave this as a discussion item.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Brenneman said she had gone to Jones Lane to see a community outreach program where they were trying to encourage partnerships with local businesses. She thought this was a unique idea because Jones Lane had reached out to small businesses. Other schools had complained that there were no big businesses in their neighborhoods, and Jones Lane had shown that small businesses could be involved with the school.
2. Ms. Gutierrez reported that this past weekend MCPS and the Hispanic Alliance had sponsored the second series of financial aid workshops. This one had been held at Blair, and 120 people participated. She thanked Kathy McGuire, Judy Docca, and Nivea Berrios for pulling together the workshop, and she pointed out that this was one of the items on Success for Every Student.

Dr. Vance said that Saturday morning he had attended a conference, and Judy Docca joined the program and told him how great the turnout had been. Sunday afternoon he had attended another meeting and Kathy McGuire had told him the same thing.

3. Mrs. Hobbs acknowledged the efforts of Board members, the superintendent, and MCPS staff in the way they managed to work together and defeat Question A.

4. Mr. Ewing reported that the president of the Washington Metropolitan Area Polish American Congress had asked him to respond to a request from the Polish embassy about the interest of the Polish government in sponsoring student exchanges particularly with the Global Ecology Program at Poolesville. He had given Dr. Vance the letters, and he hoped that something would come of that.

5. Mr. Ewing indicated that there was a special session of the Legislature coming up, and it was worth noting that the members of the Montgomery County Delegation had been strong and united in their defense of education. They were pressing to come up with a solution to the deficit problems, and he wished them every success.

6. Mr. Sims stated that the MCR meeting would be held on Thursday, and he hoped Board members and members-elect would attend. The second of "Student Voices and Views" would take place tomorrow, and the issue was gender equity. Lillian Potter from the Whitman NOW Chapter and Dr. Lancaster would be on the show.

7. Mr. Sims commented that in looking at the problem of student violence, he would like to hold a countywide student summit on how students could work together to find solutions to this student problem. The December BOE Gazette would have an article on student violence and request for students to send in a coupon if they were interested in having this meeting. Dr. Vance thought that this was an excellent idea, and he said he would work with Mr. Sims on that project.

8. Dr. Vance said he would like to devote his comments to an item of information on the status of the Board's action areas and the extent to which the Board and staff had addressed the action areas as identified by the Board in February 1991. He believed it provided a comprehensive overview of the considerable work completed by the Board of Education in a relatively short period of time. It marked the progressiveness of the Board's agenda as well as its capacity for hard work and hard decision-making. The initial agenda was introduced under the presidency of Mr. Ewing and continued under the presidency of Mrs. Hobbs. He thought that the Board should be proud of its accomplishments, and he said that this pointed the way to the next Board retreat.

RESOLUTION NO. 814-92 Re: THREE RESOLUTIONS ON RECOMMENDED BOOKS, CHECKLISTS OF MATH SKILLS MASTER, AND FORECAST OF MATH SKILL REQUIREMENTS

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time for discussion and subsequent action on three resolutions proposed by the Gifted and Talented Association on reports to parents on recommended books, checklists of math skills mastery, and a forecast of upcoming math skill requirements on average progress in mathematics of students below, on, or above grade level at each school as of the end of each marking period; and be it further

Resolved, That this discussion include information on the impact on staff time and budget costs of this proposal.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSIONS - OCTOBER 26 AND 29, 1992

On October 13, 1992, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board voted to conduct closed sessions on October 26 and 29, 1992, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, October 26, 1992. This closed session came under the rubric of an executive function to which the Open Meetings Law does not apply.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Thursday, October 29, 1992, from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. The meeting took place in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board met to discuss upcoming contract negotiations with MCCSSE and MCEA. In attendance at the closed session were: Melissa Bahr, Larry Bowers, Fran Brenneman, Carole Burger, Alan Cheung, Sharon DiFonzo, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Thomas Fess, Katheryn Gemberling, Wes Girling, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Marie Heck, Catherine Hobbs, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Philip Rohr, Paul Vance, William Westall, and Mary Lou Wood.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ewing moved and Dr. Cheung seconded the following:
Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule discussion and possible action in January of 1993 of the recommendations coming

from the superintendent based on the report of the Commission on the Restructuring of the Office of Special and Alternative Education.

2. Mr. Sims moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following: Resolved, That the Board of Education schedule time to discuss and take possible action on recycling efforts in MCPS and making this a priority in the upcoming budget year.

Dr. Cheung assumed the chair.

4. Mrs. Hobbs moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following: Resolved, That the Board schedule a comprehensive presentation on home teaching and the state mandates involved and how MCPS oversees it or has jurisdiction over home teaching.

Mrs. Hobbs assumed the chair.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. Board of Education Action Areas
4. Monthly Financial Report
5. Minority-, Female-, or Disabled-owned Business Procurement Report for the First Quarter of FY 1993
6. Recycling Efforts in MCPS

RESOLUTION NO. 815-92 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 6:25 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw