

APPROVED
7-1998

Rockville, Maryland
February 2, 1998

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in a special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, February 2, 1998, 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

()indicates student vote does not count. Four votes needed for adoption.

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

Ms. Gutiérrez was not present at the beginning of the meeting and joined the meeting as indicated.

Re: **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mrs. King announced that two nights have been reserved for taking preliminary action on the budget. On Thursday, February 5, 1998, the Board will take final action on the budget request to be submitted to the County Council. The following procedures will be followed:

1. The Superintendent will present any revisions to his proposed budget.
2. The Superintendent's revised budget will be before the Board for its consideration.
3. Prior to proposing amendments to the Superintendent's budget, Board members are welcome to make brief remarks to help set the stage for consideration of the budget.
4. The President will entertain motions for amendments to the Superintendent's budget beginning with Chapter 1, K-12 Instruction, through Chapter 8, Enterprise Funds.

5. In an effort to expedite consideration, motions will be entertained if germane to any of the units within the chapter then under consideration. The Board will not proceed page by page. The maker of the motion should identify the section and page within the budget book that is at issue. A tentative vote will be taken on all motions that are seconded. Those that receive four votes among Board Members will be considered again on February 5, 1998. The Student Board member's vote does not count, however, she is free to indicate her support or opposition to a particular motion and it will be so recorded. Note that the Student Board member is free to make or second any motions.
6. The Superintendent and his staff will advise the Board, prior to any tentative vote, if a motion will result in the need to make a corresponding revision to any other part of the budget.
7. On Thursday, February 5, the Board will take final action on the budget to be submitted to the Council, subject to revision at another time to reflect any negotiated labor agreements. The Board will proceed by voting on all tentative actions taken. The Superintendent shall prepare, for use by the Board on February 5, a document listing all tentative actions, including the total costs, savings, or realignment between categories. The document will include a green sheet reflecting all amendments to the Superintendent's proposed budget.
8. One final vote on the proposed budget, as amended, will be taken on Thursday, February 5, 1998. At that time, any new amendments not considered and for which the Superintendent has not had time to cost out or comment upon their impact will be discouraged. Motions previously defeated should not be reintroduced and voted upon on Thursday.
9. On Monday, February 23, the Board will consider adoption of the list of non-recommended cuts to the extent necessary to comply with the spending affordability guidelines (SAG).

Dr. Vance commented that when the budget was introduced in December, he had stated that it would make significant improvements in achieving Success for Every Student. Those initiatives are aimed at improving: elementary school reading, secondary school mathematics, and class size throughout the system. Since the budget has been introduced the reaction of staff and the community had expressed support for the initiatives. He urged the Board to approve the budget, as amended.

Mr. Felton commended the Superintendent for the budget presented to the Board. Over the past four weeks, the Board has heard the overwhelming support for the

Superintendent's budget and its initiatives. He encouraged his colleagues to support the budget as presented by the Superintendent.

Mr. Ewing thought the Superintendent's proposed budget contains significant improvements in the reduction of class size and the focus on elementary reading and secondary mathematics. The budget proposes partial recovery for the many years of unwanted reductions in educational programs; however, it does not restore all that ought to be restored or add resources to address serious needs. As the school system faces the 21st century, those serious needs are that: (1) one child in four is eligible for Free and Reduces Meals (FARMS); (2) many students come into MCPS without a proficiency in English; (3) African-American and Hispanic students' test scores are still below average; (4) enrollment of students with disabilities has increased and the impact on the classroom; all-day kindergarten would increase student achievement; (5) there is a need for reading teachers, art and music teachers, musical instruments, magnet and special programs, textbooks and materials of instruction, and administration support. The County Council over the years has argued that the funding was all that the county could afford at that time. However, revenues have increased since that time, and the county can afford to make a substantial investment in the school system. The task of the Board is to be advocates for education and to make it possible for all children to learn and achieve.

Mrs. Gordon stated that the Superintendent had put forward a bold recommendation that was based on research and is defensible. The budget moves in the right direction for restoring reductions that have been made in the past. She stated that she would be supporting very few, if any, additional requests to increase the budget and goes beyond the Superintendent's recommendations. At this time, the budget was not complete because the negotiated agreements with three unions were not included in the request before the Board. Even before those funds were added to the budget, the Superintendent's budget request was above SAG. The Board must remain focused on support of the budget as presented by the Superintendent.

Dr. Cheung agreed with his colleagues in their assessment of the FY 1999 Operating Budget as presented by the Superintendent. This budget will start the restoration of some educational programs and initiatives. Now that the economy is better, it is time to support excellence in MCPS and invest in the future. He was satisfied with the Superintendent's recommendation, but he would support increased funding for staff development and initiatives and investments for the future.

Mrs. King looked at the budget in two ways: (1) the budget does not go as far as the Board would like in restoring past reductions, but (2) the budget was \$25.1 million over SAG before the negotiated contracts are added into the budget. Her frugal nature dictated that she would not support many, if any, amendments that would increase the Superintendent's recommendation.

Re: **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDED FY 1999
OPERATING BUDGET, AS AMENDED**

On recommendation of the Superintendent and on motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was placed on the table:

WHEREAS, The Superintendent of Schools recommended an FY 1999 Operating Budget of \$939,513,045 excluding grant funds and enterprise programs, and a total FY 1999 appropriation of \$1,017,650,965; and

WHEREAS, Additional federal revenue of \$100,000 is anticipated for the Medical Assistance project to be used for assistive technology for students with disabilities and compliance with federal medical assistance reimbursement requirements; and

WHEREAS, Additional federal revenue of \$1,000,000 is anticipated for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for FY 1999 to be used for additional services for students with disabilities based on revised enrollment projections, and to cover needs to be required because of IDEA reauthorization and the consequent revision of COMAR guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Transportation savings of \$42,000 are estimated due to the replacement of two early release days for Success for Every Student with one professional development day for all employees in the 1998-1999 school calendar; and

WHEREAS, Funds need to be set aside for the development and implementation of the new teacher evaluation system (\$250,000) in FY 1999; and

WHEREAS, Continued progress on the Year 2000 Computer Compliance Project requires funding of \$2,000,000 of high priority items to be recommended by the Office of Global Access Technology from subprojects not approved by the County Council as an FY 1998 supplemental appropriation; and

WHEREAS, The Superintendent's FY 1999 Recommended Operating Budget totals \$941,721,045 as amended excluding grants and enterprise funds, with a total requested appropriation of \$1,020,986,965 now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve the Superintendent's FY 1999 Recommended Operating Budget as amended of \$941,721,045 excluding grants and enterprise funds and a total appropriation of \$1,020,986,965; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education requests the Superintendent to present options for submission of nonrecommended reductions required by the spending affordability guidelines before its meeting on February 23, 1998.

**Re: RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999
OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST**

Mr. Bowers commented on the amendments and additional information received since the budget was recommended. The amendments would provide additional support for special education, Year 2000 computer technology, and the teacher evaluation system.

The amendments also recognize additional anticipated federal revenue related to special education. Approximately \$100,000 in additional revenue for medical assistance services will permit the purchase of \$72,304 in assistive technology devices for students with disabilities and \$27,696 to facilitate medical assistance reimbursement. Approximately \$1,000,000 in additional revenue anticipated from federal FY 1998 appropriations for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) will allow funding of \$323,903 for 11.6 additional positions and \$209,235 in contractual occupational therapy and physical therapy services to meet needs required by enrollment projections updated since submission of the budget. The balance of this anticipated revenue, \$494,862, can be reserved to cover the potential fiscal and programmatic impact associated with the reauthorization of IDEA. The full impact of the change in IDEA will be more evident once the Maryland State Department of Education completes revision of COMAR guidelines and more clearly defines implementation requirements.

A new teacher evaluation system will be designed to address performance evaluation criteria and processes for all members of the Montgomery County Education Association bargaining unit at an FY 1999 cost of \$250,000. This includes funds for the design, testing, and implementation of a pilot system to be fully implemented in FY 2000.

Additional savings of \$42,000 can be achieved in transportation due to the proposed FY 1998-1999 school calendar that will be based on 184 instructional days compared to the budgeted 185 instructional days. The October and December early release days for Success for Every Student will be replaced with a full day of professional development for all employees. Based on this calendar, it is estimated that transportation savings will total \$42,000 due to one less day of regular operations.

The budget requested was amended to include \$2,000,000 for the Year 2000 Computer Compliance Project. On January 13, 1998, the Board of Education recommended an FY 1998 supplemental appropriation of \$12,907,061 to continue needed work on this project. The County Council, based on the county executive's recommendation, is considering a supplemental appropriation of \$7,537,540 of a total recommendation for all county agencies of \$12,892,180. My proposed amendment would request \$2,000,000 to fund the highest priority items for FY 1999 not approved as part of the FY 1998 supplemental appropriation. Because of the tight timeframes to achieve Year 2000 compliance for key enterprise and instructional systems, we must continue this work according to the plan approved by the Board of Education in January.

Re: DISCUSSION

Regarding the medical assistance project, Mrs. Gordon asked when the account assistant would be hired for \$27,696 per year. Mr. Bowers replied that it would be soon after Board approval. Mrs. Gordon pointed out that NFUSSD had information regarding the collection of medical assistance funds. Possibly, that information could be utilized prior to hiring an account assistant, and the funds for that position could be used in another way.

Ms. Signer asked about the increase for the Year 2000 project. It may be necessary to increase the amount budgeted for the Human Resources Information System, and how much of the \$2 million would go for that purpose. Mr. Bowers indicated that it could be half that amount, but it will depend on the payment schedule. Ms. Signer pointed out that the County Executive recommendation reduces the supplemental request by \$5 million. She asked what lead the school system to believe that Mr. Duncan would look any more favorably on the \$2 million recommended for inclusion in the budget. Mr. Bowers stated that money was needed to assess the computing systems throughout the school system, and since the county has assessed their systems, there will be support for that request. Ms. Signer asked what the total amount would be to solve the Year 2000 problem. Mr. Bowers replied that it would cost approximately \$16 million.

CHAPTER ONE - K-12 INSTRUCTION

Ms. Signer asked about staff training and how much of the \$11.1 million would be focused on training regular classroom teachers who have mainstreamed special education students in their classrooms. Her concern was that MCPS does not have sufficient training opportunities for teachers who teach special education students. While she was not prepared to add money to the staff training budget, she was prepared to realign some resources for that purpose. If staff could assure her that staff training would be provided, she would not make a motion for that realignment. Dr. Seleznow replied that all principals were being trained in the reauthorization of IDEA, and training money had been shared between special and regular education teachers. Dr. Seleznow and Mr. Bowers volunteered to supply Ms. Signer with the actual costs of training those teachers.

Mr. Ewing observed that 43 schools were eligible for all-day kindergarten based on the Council's criteria when the program was reduced. He asked if all the schools that were eligible to have an all-day kindergarten using that criteria were funded to hire staff, would the facilities be able to accommodate those additional classes. Mr. Bowers responded that some schools could handle the extra classes within the building or by utilizing portable classrooms.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(All-day Kindergarten)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung to add 10 kindergarten teachers for all-day kindergarten in FY 1999 (\$384,750) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

* Ms. Gutiérrez joined the meeting at this point.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Art and Music)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung to add 11 art and music teachers for elementary schools in FY 1999 (\$423,225) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutiérrez, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Psychologists)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add two psychologists in FY 1999 (\$118,204) failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Ms. Signer, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Textbooks and Material)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add \$1,250,000 in FY 1999 across all levels of instruction for textbooks and materials failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Textbooks and Material)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add \$500,000 in FY 1999 across all levels of instruction for textbooks and materials failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative; (Ms. Wheat) abstaining.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Musical Instruments)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung to add \$75,000 in FY 1999 for the repair and replacement of musical instruments in all grade levels failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, Ms. Signer, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Class Size)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to reduce class size in elementary schools by one student in FY 1999 (\$3,347,325) failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, Ms. Signer, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the negative; Mrs. Gordon abstaining.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Class Size)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to reduce class size in elementary schools by ½ student in FY 1999 (\$1,673,663) failed with Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative; Mrs. Gordon abstaining.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Gutiérrez apologized for coming into the meeting late, but she was representing the Board at an NSBA Conference. She was concerned about the amendments proposed by the Superintendent and the significant amount of those additions. She asked if the Board could proceed as the County Council does. It could put items on a wish list and later balancing those items with reductions in the budget. She observed that there were not enough votes to add to the FY 1999 Operating Budget recommendation. If a proposal for an amendment warrants consideration, there could be a tradeoff within another area of the budget. Also, she had concerns about the level of spending in the Year 2000 project.

Mrs. Gordon suggested that any Board member at any time could offer an amendment that would result in an addition to the proposed budget and could suggest an offsetting reduction.

Ms. Gutiérrez was suggesting that if the Board goes straight through the budget, there could be additions that would later be offset with reductions.

Mr. Felton understood the point Ms. Gutiérrez was raising. If a Board member wishes to offer a reduction in another chapter of the budget, that might be acceptable.

Mrs. Gordon had no problem with that procedure, but she did not want to go back over the amendments that had been offered and voted down.

Mrs. King asked the Board members if a motion was made for an addition to the FY 1999 Operating Budget and would not receive a favorable vote without an accompanying reduction, could those motions be put on a separate wish list for later offsetting reductions.

Ms. Gutiérrez did not know how sizable the vote would be to put an item on a wish list or whether there would be a vote specifically to put an item on the wish list.

Mrs. Gordon pointed out that the Board was proceeding as it had in the past. If an item gets four votes, which is tentative approval and, then, on the last night amendments were finalized with another vote. Therefore, a tentative vote signifies that it is on a wish list. However, if the motion was to reduce the budget by a certain amount in order to be able to fund another item, the Board would take that motion wherever it fails in the budget.

Mr. Felton stated that the other option would be that even though the Board was looking at Chapter One, if there was a motion and the offset item was in a later chapter, the Board members could do that now.

Ms. Gutiérrez stated that it was evident to her that without some temporary rule, the Board would be proceeding not to increase the budget. She wanted a mechanism that would give the Board some flexibility. She thought the Superintendent's proposed amendments could be used to offset any motions made by the Board, such as all-day kindergarten.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Signature Programs)**

On motion of Dr. Cheung and seconded by Mr. Ewing to add funding to support signature programs at eight schools, excluding the Northeast Consortium, (\$160,000) failed with Dr. Cheung and Mr. Ewing voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the negative; Ms. Gutiérrez and Ms. Signer abstaining.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mr. Ewing mentioned that the parents in the Blair Cluster whose children receive special education services are very concerned about Intensity 4 and 5 placements. The parents sent a letter to Dr. Bryant, but to date there had been no response. Mr. Ewing asked if there was a plan to serve these children or whether they were to be bused to other schools. If there was a program implemented within the Blair Cluster, he asked if it would

require any additional funding. Dr. Smith responded that all middle schools had Intensity 4 programs and have been staffed accordingly. Mr. Ewing asked what the school system needs to do to ensure that those students within the Blair Cluster receive appropriate services. Dr. Smith replied that the current budget had adequate resources to provide mandated services to special education students.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Magnet and Special Programs)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to restore release time for teachers at Montgomery Blair High School, Richard Montgomery High School, Eastern Middle School, and Takoma Park Middle School in FY 1999 (\$149,972) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutiérrez, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Mrs. King voting in the negative; Ms. Signer abstaining.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(All-day Kindergarten)**

On motion of Ms. Gutiérrez and seconded by Mr. Ewing to establish all-day kindergartens in all schools that meet the poverty indicator in FY 1999 (\$1,912,400) with an offset in transportation costs and an addition reduction to be identified at a later time. [This resolution was postponed until February 3, 1998, when additional data would be available.]

Re: GLOBAL ACCESS

Ms. Wheat asked if there was enough funding earmarked to assess the extent to which teachers are integrating technology into the curriculum. If so, please identify the resources in the budget, and, if not, how much funding would be required.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Leadership Training Institute)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung to add a .8 position at John F. Kennedy High School's Leadership Training Institute in FY 1999 (\$30,780) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, and Mrs. King voting in the negative; Ms. Signer and (Ms. Wheat) abstaining.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Visual Arts Program)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add one instructional assistant to the Visual Arts Program at Albert Einstein High School in FY 1999 (\$18,252) failed with

Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Assessment of Programs)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add funds to the Department of Educational Accountability to assess the (1) initiative in reading and math and (2) transition of special education graduates in FY 1999 (\$100,000) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Ms. Gutiérrez, and (Ms. Wheat) voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: **DISCUSSION**

For the record, Mr. Ewing did not want the Board's vote to indicate to the Superintendent that there was a lack of interest for such evaluations. He hoped that the school system would continue to pursue ways to fund such evaluations. Dr. Vance indicated there have been discussion with leadership staff, and he would provide the Board with a plan to proceed with evaluations of those programs.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Office of School Administration)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add one assistant for data collection to the Office of School Administration in FY 1999 (\$77,291) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: **AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Office of School Administration)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add \$40,000 for assessment in the Office of School Administration in FY 1999 failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

The Board of Education took a break from 9:55 to 10:07 p.m.

CHAPTER TWO - OFFICE OF INSTRUCTION AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Academic Programs)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Dr. Cheung to add 50 SES days to assess the social studies' curriculum for the inclusion of teaching world history before 1492 and after World War II in FY 1999 (\$11,000) failed with Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Staff Development)**

On motion of Dr. Cheung and seconded by Mr. Ewing to add \$500,000 for staff development (this amount would be offset to increase from one to four percent the amount of tuition paid by international students) in FY 1999 failed with Dr. Cheung and Mr. Ewing, and voting in the affirmative; Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Ms. Gutiérrez, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: DISCUSSION

Ms. Signer had asked about the number of positions in early childhood education who do not work directly with students, and she verified that there were sixty of those positions within the budget. Within the Head Start budget, there is a projected reduction of forty students. She asked staff why there was an increase in two social services assistant positions, one-half psychologist position, and a community-based specialist position. Dr. Smith indicated the community-based specialist was part of a pilot grant with the Community Action Board. The psychologist position was required because the students enrolling in Head Start need more services, including psychological assessments. The social services assistants are based on ratios established by the federal government. Based on declining enrollment in Head Start, Ms. Signer asked if the ratio had changed and requested verification of the federal government's guidelines on staffing for Head Start.

Ms. Signer had received a reply to an earlier question about special education enrollment in Intensities 4 and 5. The updated enrollment figures showed an increase of 156 students beyond what was projected in the budget. She wanted to know to what extent the increase in the federal funding would cover those special education students. Dr. Spatz stated that Superintendent's amendment addressed that issue.

Mr. Felton asked about the transportation provided to the students attending the Maryland School for the Deaf. In the event the state does not support the \$53,000 for transporting

those students, he asked what was the school system's contingency plan. Mr. Bowers replied that the legislature was looking at this funding, and it was anticipated that it would be funded, as in the past. If that does not happen, the Superintendent would offer an amendment when the budget is finalized in June.

Mr. Ewing stated that the Superintendent's proposed \$500,000 in staff training was primarily focused on reading. He asked what was it, among the many options for the utilization of existing resources for training and development, that was most at risk of not being adequately funded. He was unclear about the priorities, and he wanted to know what the Superintendent would fund if there were more resources. He thought that training teachers to cope with classrooms impacted with students with diversity needs was an area where the school system was not meeting the demand. Dr. Seleznow replied that training was focused on the outcomes in SES, CRT, MSPAP, and SAT.

In assessing the priorities, Mrs. Gordon commented that the Board had received the work of the workgroup that was reviewing staff development and training. She asked if they were looking at priorities within the schools and systemwide. Dr. Seleznow replied that the workgroup is looking at priorities and would report in the spring. Mrs. Gordon pointed out that if there was a need for additional resources, it could be brought to the Board at that time.

Ms. Gutiérrez had an updated list of the final appropriations for federal government programs. She noted in the budget there were increases or decreases in federal dollars that did not match the federal appropriations. She would like staff to compare both documents and make corrections, where necessary. Mr. Bowers replied that it was explained in the budget based in different funding cycles.

**Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 OPERATING BUDGET
(Special Education)**

On motion of Mr. Ewing and seconded by Ms. Gutiérrez to add eight speech and language pathologists in FY 1999 (\$373,720) failed with, Mr. Ewing and Ms. Gutiérrez voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cheung, Mr. Felton, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. King, and Ms. Signer voting in the negative.

Re: DISCUSSION

Mr. Ewing asked if SED students got the same services regardless of the level of intensity. Dr. Smith responded that a student at Mark Twain School would have special educators throughout the day; however, a student receiving services in a regular school would not have a special educator throughout the day, especially for classes in art, music, and PE.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the budget had combined the supervisors for the visually impaired and deaf programs. Dr. Smith replied that there are the same number of supervisors, but they have additional responsibilities within the high school clusters.

With respect to Longview and Stephen Knolls schools, Mr. Ewing asked if all the vacancies were filled and all services were provided for students. Dr. Smith replied that the vacancies were filled, there was not a speech pathologist, the pool had been repaired, and the physical education position was being addressed. Mr. Ewing pointed out that when these schools had full-time principals, the school system did not run into these problems. One coordinator for two schools was a very difficult position.

Re: **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 p.m. and would reconvene on February 3, 1998, at 7:30 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:gr