



WHEREAS, The Board of Education conducted public hearings on November 16, 20, and 21, 1989, on these recommendations and Board-requested alternatives; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Capital Budget and Capital Improvements Program on November 29, 1989, and requested the opportunity to confirm the budget; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the FY 1991 Capital Budget request totaling \$112,722,000 as shown on the summary; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve an amendment to the FY 1990 Capital Budget for \$31,750,000 as shown on the summary; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the priority list for state-eligible projects in FY 1991 and the Six-year Capital Improvements Program FY 1991-1996; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of these actions to the County Council.

Re: RECOMMENDED PROPOSAL FOR CREATING A  
FOURTH ADMINISTRATIVE AREA AND  
REALIGNING SCHOOL AND OFFICE  
RESPONSIBILITIES

Dr. Pitt reported that MCPS had been growing in population for the last five years and would continue to grow for at least the next ten years. This year they had added over 2,000 students. At present Area 1 had 56 schools, 2 had 42, and 3 had 55, but by the year 2000, Area 1 would have 68 schools, 2 would have 46, and 3 would have 75 schools. He thought these projections were very conservative. When they had reduced the number of areas, they were dropping in population and there was debate about dropping down to three areas. At present the areas were larger than most school systems in the United States and, in fact, would be in the top 100 school systems. He was concerned about the span of control of the area associate superintendents and about vital communication links between the areas, principals, and PTAs. It was difficult for one area superintendent to communicate with 50 principals and 50 PTA presidents as well as cluster coordinators.

Dr. Pitt stated that the way the areas were set up now the major portion of the minority population was concentrated in one area. They were not recommending changing any cluster articulation; however the plan would change the schools within an area. The plan would provide better racial and socioeconomic balances in each area. Last spring some Board members had asked him to look at the possibility of increasing the number of areas. Dr. Pitt indicated that he had set one stringent parameter, not to increase the amount

of money they were spending for the areas. It was his intention to put every cent that he could recommend for improvements in the budget into direct access to schools, primarily in classrooms and within the schools themselves. With four areas, they would reduce the average number of schools per area to 39 in 1990 with the projected average for the year 2000 of 47. If they stayed at three areas, they would end up moving clusters of schools from one area to another to have some balance in terms of staff and communication.

Dr. Pitt stated that the new areas would be geographically related to each other. The proposal reduced by 12 the number of schools in each area. It increased the number of teacher specialists in each area. They had reduced the number of subject area specialists from 28 to 24, added some speech specialists, added LD project people, and put the four human relations specialists in the area. They would go from three to four parent specialists. It did not increase the number of administrators or the total costs. He had changed the original proposal as a result of 60 letters and memos from PTAs and staff.

For example, he had put all the teacher specialists back in the elementary level and had restored four elementary teacher specialists. Originally he had increased the number of special education supervisors and assistant supervisors, but he was now recommending the same number or 1.5 per area which was not a reduction.

In regard to the central office, Dr. Pitt emphasized that they were not decentralizing special education. All of the major special education functions remained central as they were before. In the learning centers, all psychologists were back in the learning centers. The transition-to-work program was now in OIPD rather than special education. The curriculum writing group in special education was now in OIPD. Head Start and Chapter I would be working with early childhood education in OIPD. He believed that they needed to focus in on early childhood and coordinate their efforts as much as they could without reducing the major roles of Head Start and Chapter I. He had originally moved ESOL/Bilingual to OIPD, but he was now restoring this to special education. He was leaving it there for the moment, but he would like to have Dr. Fountain and Mrs. Gemberling meet with groups interested in ESOL and talk about it a little more. The diagnostic and professional support teams were back in the office of special education. He had moved the Department of Information to the superintendent's office because he should be involved in communications with the public and press.

Dr. Pitt reported that there was some question about Q.I.E, Human Relations, and Magnet Programs all being in the deputy superintendent's office. He clarified that the responsibilities of these groups had not been reduced in any way, but they wanted to have better coordination of these programs. It was not that Human Relations dealt only with minority questions which was one of the concerns people had. Overall there was no change in the number of A&S positions, but there would be 3.1 more supporting services

positions and a net savings of \$41,000 in the plan.

Mr. Goldensohn asked if the savings included the costs of operating a fourth area office. Dr. Pitt replied that there was a cost in the capital budget of around \$125,000 to prepare the office and parking areas. Mr. Goldensohn assumed that on an annual basis there would be a slight increase in costs to operate a fourth office, and Dr. Pitt agreed that there would be a slight increase in utilities and custodial services.

Dr. Shoenberg asked about magnet schools, and Dr. Kenneth Muir explained that the coordinator of magnet schools who now reported to human services would be shifted into Q.I.E. along with Human Relations. Dr. Pitt noted that these would still be identified separately. Dr. Shoenberg asked for more information about the movement of the four human relations staff into the area offices.

Dr. Vance explained that proposal established for the record what the situation was now. These people actually spent 80 to 85 percent of their time in the area office. Dr. Shoenberg asked if there was a difference in the way their work was administered, and Dr. Vance said the job descriptions and functions would not change.

Mr. Ewing commented that there were regulatory functions and functions that dealt with other than minority questions in the Department of Human Relations. He asked about the independence of those regulatory functions and why it was thought necessary to make that change. Dr. Vance replied that the regulatory functions would not change. He said that the "why" varied. He did not think they had gone far enough. Over the past years there had been far reaching legislative decisions on the national, state, and local level and in the courts. Now they needed creative ways to implement and reinforce the intent of that legislation. Human relations units were created at a time when that legislation did not exist. He felt that in Montgomery County they needed something that addressed urban growth, the internationalization of the adult and student population, and the implications of that for harmonious and productive living. Dr. Vance stated that the proposal wasn't anything near to that. Dr. Pitt indicated that he was not ready to do all that just yet.

Mrs. Praisner asked if they had eliminated the LD project director at the area, and Dr. Hiawatha Fountain replied that they had not. In regard to the rotation issue of supervisors, Mrs. Praisner asked if they were still suggesting a rotation. She asked that they discuss the rationale for the number of years and the rotation issue. Dr. Pitt replied that he had mixed feelings about this. The committee had recommended this, and it was not a key issue in the reorganization. He said that if he were to go to this organization, he would explore the possibility of rotation but would not make a commitment to have rotation as part of it unless the Board felt they wanted to do this.

Mrs. Praisner said they had received some communication about the position of assistant area building service supervisor. Dr. Muir

replied that the positions continued to be eliminated, but overall there was a net increase of two supporting services positions.

Mr. Ewing said he was concerned about the move of the internal audit staff. He knew that audit functions ought to be as independent as one could possibly make them. The charter of the Department of Educational Accountability had provided for a high degree of independence. The Department of Management, Budget and Planning was a policy office and was much more concerned than DEA was with carrying out the policy of the system. Budget might be a less desirable home for the audit function. He asked why the superintendent was making this recommendation. Dr. Pitt said this was a very important question to raise. It could be debated both ways. He commented that some of the audit function had to do with independent evaluation, and this was something they had to allow DEA to do. However, DMBP had two functions. One was to develop a budget, and the another was to manage that budget. They had to look at how well relatively independent managers with control over large sums of money handled that function. This was an auditing role. The auditors did more than count checks and receipts. DMBP had no funding responsibility or control of funds and, therefore, was independent in that sense. He would be willing to have the Board audit committee have some relationship there that might further the independence of it. Dr. Cronin suggested that they have a further discussion on this topic at the work session.

Mr. Ewing stated that the proposal was to shift the special education curriculum people to the Office of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction and Program Development. However, it ended up being assigned in the proposal to the Department of Student Support rather than to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, explained that there would be involvement on the part of special education as there was with the gifted and talented program which was there as well. She agreed that it could be shifted either way. However, if they put the unit into Curriculum and Instruction, it did not fit into any of the departments because it cut across all lines. The Student Support group would extend and adapt all types of curriculum to work with special student groups. Mrs. Praisner wondered whether they had

considered changing the title of the unit. Perhaps there was another term to refer to the elements within the Student Support Unit.

Dr. Shoenberg agreed that how the lines were drawn was beyond the Board's responsibility. However, the Board had to have some sense of how programs would work before they agreed to move the program. It would help him to know what kinds of regular planned contacts the various units would have. For example, would the special education people meet regularly with the people responsible for other aspects of the curriculum. Dr. Cronin said he would like to know about secretarial and other supports following the units being moved.

Mrs. Praisner commented that she had a question about something that was not proposed. The Board had had some discussions about the need

for a strong public presence as far as the school system was concerned and a coordinated presence to the public. She asked if they had considered reconstituting the Department of Information as a Public Affairs Office with broader functions. Dr. Pitt explained that this was an evolutionary process, and last year he had made some changes. They were in the process of selecting someone for the directorship of that department. He believed they needed to look at how that would evolve and that person selected would have broad abilities along those lines. He thought he might come back and talk to the Board about this in about six months.

In regard to the proposal for four areas, Mr. Ewing said there was an argument that this would reduce the span of control. He asked whether the proposal dealt with the matter of how area superintendents would be assisted in performing evaluations of principals aside from the fact they would have fewer to do. Dr. Vance replied that they had not proposed anything in terms of additional training, but with a new person in the fourth position they would have to give this thought. He remarked that the most frustrating aspect of trying to manage the school system was the time to spend with associate superintendents and to share the benefit of your knowledge. The area of evaluating, training, and monitoring principals was a driving reason behind their proposal for four administrative areas.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw