

APPROVED  
3-1998

Rockville, Maryland  
January 21, 1998

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in a special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, January 21, 1997, at 7:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present:                   Mrs. Nancy J. King, President  
  in the Chair  
  Dr. Alan Cheung  
  Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
  Mr. Reginald M. Felton  
  Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon  
  Ms. Ana Sol Gutiérrez  
  Ms. Mona M. Signer  
  Ms. Debra Wheat  
  Dr. Paul L. Vance, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent:                   None

Re:   **PUBLIC HEARING ON OPERATING BUDGET  
      PROPOSALS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING  
      JUNE 30, 1999**

The following people appeared before the Board of Education:

1.     Diane Creed, Longview PTA
2.     Jerry Heupel, Stephen Knolls PTA
3.     Carole Brand, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Cluster
4.     Marilyn Shoenfeld, Blair Cluster
5.     Lucie Campbell, Churchill Cluster
6.     Michelle Turner, Einstein Cluster
7.     Leslie Fried, Walter Johnson Cluster
8.     Lafe Solomon, Whitman Cluster
9.     Debby Vivari, Wootton Cluster
10.    Kermit Burnett, Title I
11.    Jenny Jones, Elementary School Administrators Association
12.    Don Barron, Secondary School Administrators Association
13.    Becky Newman, MCAASP
14.    Milton Reyes
15.    Ivan Loaisiga
16.    Gene Kijowski, Superintendent's Business in Education Council
17.    Ann Irvine, Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce
18.    Bradley Westpahl, High Technology Council of Maryland
19.    Roberta Shulman and John Williams, Montgomery County Workforce Development Corp.

20. Timothy Hall, Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce
21. Bob Astrove, Parents for Options in Special Education
22. Liz Roth, Special Education Advisory Committee
23. Stanley McCombs and Celia Serkin, Head Start
24. Joan Karasik, Arc of Montgomery County
25. Ricki Sabia, Parents of Children with Downs Syndrome
26. Christy Coburn, Coalition for Alternatives in Special Education
27. Kathy Weinstein
28. Kate Phillips
29. Mosen Vakili
30. Curtis Royster, Longview Site-Based Management Team
31. Alvin Rivera, Latino Civil Rights Task Force of Maryland
32. Nora Baklishi
33. Vicki Lynn Boyle, MCEA Special Education Liaison Committee

The Board members asked the following questions after the testimony indicated:

After Ms. Creed's testimony, Ms. Gutiérrez asked the Superintendent to respond to the issues raised, particularly the issue of reducing the enrollment projection by 44 students. Ms. Signer indicated that was her concern, as well.

After Mr. Heupel's testimony, Mr. Ewing asked the Superintendent to give the Board a response to these requests on pages 9 and 10. For the last five years, he had raised the question of the accuracy of student projections, and staff did not give him a satisfactory explanation. He asked for an explanation of how that is done in the school system, why Stephen Knolls was over enrolled, and why MCPS cannot add staff. It seemed to him that MCPS has got to fix the problem for this year and in the future. He hoped that the Board could get an answers before it acts on the budget.

Ms. Signer pointed out that she was aware of the problem at Stephen Knolls and had sent a memo to the Superintendent asking for an update.

After Ms. Shoenfield's testimony, Mr. Felton asked the Superintendent for information regarding the staffing at Wayne Avenue Middle School. He asked for estimates of what it would cost to hire the full complement of staff suggested in the testimony and an indication of what MCPS' practice has been in other schools. Also, with regard to the security assistants at Wayne Avenue, he asked about the addition of two security staff and some information regarding alternatives, such as technology using monitors in those areas where there would not be a security assistant.

Mr. Ewing had grave concerns about Oak View Elementary School. In the boundary process, he heard that the community was focused on Oak View and its problems. The

magnet program at Oak View, which it shares with New Hampshire Estates, was not working at Oak View. Many families are leaving Oak View permanently. Those are families that MCPS should be keeping in that school. Mr. Ewing thought that the testimony is absolutely on target, and the school system must do something dramatic. Every other school in the Blair Cluster is successful and attractive. Oak View is having serious problems, and it is going to get worse if MCPS does not take dramatic action to repair the damage. He hoped that the Superintendent would focus on this situation and give the Board his views of what options there are for MCPS to address this problem. It is not going to be solved by boundary changes. It has to be solved by programs and reassurance to the community that this school is going to succeed the way the other schools are succeeding in the Blair Cluster.

In terms of Oak View, Ms. Gutiérrez asked for information on what kind of targeted interventions could be put in place for the next school year. This is a school that is paired with a very successful program at New Hampshire Estates. As the students go into the upper grades, there is not a continuation of the incredible effort and success begun in the primary grades. It is important for the school system to look at it and intervene in the progress when possible.

With the request to accelerate the supports at the middle school, Ms. Gutiérrez was concerned about MCPS' ability to do that in view of the timeframe. The setting of spending affordability guidelines and the maintenance of effort does not respond to the school systems' need for one-time funding. She urged the Blair Cluster community to provide reasons why having the anticipated funding is important and have it available before a school opens. She did not think they have understood the issues. The school system will have an enormous requirement to put many resources into the new schools. There should not be a concern for what it does to maintenance of effort because it is a one-time expenditure. It is a very necessary expenditure for the school system to be successful.

After Ms. Campbell's testimony, Ms. Signer referred to the user support specialists for Global Access and the sacrificing of an instructional aide position, and asked the Superintendent for information on what has been done in the past with middle schools in particular. Because of the testimony that the Board heard last week on Seven Locks Elementary School, she wanted to know the extent of the resources that the school system would provide to the school and the duration of that help.

Mr. Ewing asked if there was sufficient enrollment next year for two classes of the molecular biology course Winston Churchill High School, what extra funding would that require, if any, to make that offering.

After Ms. Turner's testimony, Ms. Gutiérrez asked the Superintendent to address discrepancies in staffing (FTE in signature programs). Mrs. Gordon asked for staffing in

all of the signature programs. Ms. Gutiérrez asked for clarification between signature programs and special programs.

After Ms. Fried's testimony, Mrs. King asked for an update on air quality at Kensington-Parkwood, and whether or not they had carpeting in that school and was it a problem.

Ms. Gutiérrez stated that the committee that was looking into environment issue had completed their report and had made recommendations concerning air quality, and she asked that the Superintendent's response could be put into the context of those recommendations.

After Ms. Vivari's testimony, Ms. Signer pointed out the issue of the 8-period day and where there was equitable funding. She wanted to know how many schools currently allow students to schedule an 8-period day; the extent to which those schools receive funding; the costs of equalizing the funding for schools currently offering an 8-period day; the cost of funding an 8-period day at all schools; how it is done; and what is the impact.

Along with the above response, Ms. Gutiérrez would like a cost estimate of allocating staff for a 7-period day for all schools: (1) what would be the cost; (2) attached to that, what , if any, accommodations are made for the 8-period day; (3) what are the staff pros and cons; (4) what is the benefit that MCPS gets; and (5) is it a monetary savings or programmatic differences that are sufficient from one school to another that would justify MCPS using the 6.8 as an average?

After Mr. Kijowski's testimony, Mrs. Gordon asked the Superintendent to indicate to the Board how he might use the \$100,000 to make sure that the Skills for Success are integrated into the program and update the Board on how it would be incorporated into the curriculum.

After Mr. Astrove's testimony, Mr. Ewing asked the Superintendent to respond to the questions on the back page of the testimony. Mr. Felton wanted the background information on the reclassification of the students from Intensity 5 to Intensity 4 at Mark Twain School.

After Ms. Karasik's testimony, Mr. Ewing asked the Superintendent for an explanation of the issue about the SED supervisor having the responsibility for special education supervision of a high school cluster.

After Mr. Riveria's testimony, Ms. Gutiérrez asked the Superintendent to specifically give the Board the dollar value of meeting the previous recommendations that it had from the ESOL Advisory Committees, particularly the one to expand the METS program. She would like some commentary on the recommendations made in each of those areas with a view

of what are alternative initiatives that could be put in place with the \$7 million increase in funding. These do not have to be in the ESOL department, but they must target ESOL students.

After Mr. Royster's testimony, Mrs. King asked for clarification on exactly how many students are attending Stephen Knolls and Longview.

After Ms. Boyle's testimony, Ms. Gutiérrez asked the Superintendent for a comparison of what the ratio has been as students have increased to PPWs and psychologists; what is the basis for determining the coverage they have; were some functions deleted; and is it the same position just serving more students.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:gr