MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

MONTHLY WORK SESSION

Tuesday, March 22, 2011
5:15 P.M.-Closed Session, 6:30 P.M. – Work (Open) Session
Educational Support Services Building

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. SILENT MEDITATION IN REMEMBRANCE

III. AGENDA
Consideration of the agenda for March 22, 2011

IV. NEW BUSINESS
A. Consideration of the Negotiated Master Agreement for CASE (Mr. Duque) (exhibit to follow) 
(Mr. Duque) Exhibit A

V. WORK SESSION REPORTS
A. Report on the following Board of Education Policies (first reading): (Mr. Coleman)
   - Proposed Changes to Policy 1270 – COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Community Involvement-Parent/Guardian and Family Involvement (Exhibit B)
   - Proposed Changes to Policy 4002 – PERSONNEL: General-Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools (Exhibit C)
   - Proposed Deletion of Policy 4005 – PERSONNEL: General-Dating or Sexual Relations Between Staff and Students (Exhibit D)
   - Proposed Changes to Policy 4115 – PERSONNEL: Professional-Permanent: Responsibilities and Duties (Exhibit E)
   - Proposed Changes to Policy 4133 – PERSONNEL: Professional-Activities: Tutoring/Educational Services (Exhibit F)
   - Proposed Deletion of Policy 4145 – PERSONNEL: Professional-Compensation and Related Employee Benefits: Compensable Non-Duty Week Days (Exhibit G)
   - Proposed Deletion of Policy 4262 – PERSONNEL: Professional-Compensation Plan: Emergency Call-In (Exhibit H)
   - Proposed Deletion of Policy 5570 – STUDENTS: Student to Student Sexual Harassment (Exhibit I)
V. WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

- Proposed Changes to Policy 6100 – INSTRUCTION: Curriculum
  Exhibit J

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 6103 – INSTRUCTION: Reading
  Exhibit K

B. Report on the On-Line Public Comments for Policies (Ms. Howie)
  Exhibit L

C. Report on BCPS Graduates: College and Career (Dr. Rhoades)
  Exhibit M

D. Report on Strategic Planning (Ms. Calder)
  Exhibit N

E. Report on the Conceptual K-4/5-8 STEM Academy for the Northwest Area (Dr. Plunkett)
  Exhibit O

VI. INFORMATION

  Exhibit P

B. Audit of State Aid for Education Programs
  Exhibit Q

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Board Meeting  Tuesday, April 5, 2011
7:00 PM  Greenwood
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY 1270, PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

ORIGINATOR: Roger Plunkett, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S): William Burke, Executive Director, Professional Development

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 1270. This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 1270
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1270
PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 mandates that local education agencies (which would include the Board of Education of Baltimore County) develop a written parental involvement policy. Additionally, the Act requires each LEA to conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the policy in improving the academic quality of the schools served with Title I, Part A funds. During this year’s annual review, community stakeholders recommended that the policy explicitly reflect this annual evaluation requirement. Thus, the Implementation Section of the policy has been revised to include this legal requirement, as this has been requested by the community stakeholders. In addition, the policy’s title and the rule’s title remove the word “guardian,” because the term “parent” as defined in rule, includes legal guardians and custodians.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the revision of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 1100, Communication with the Public
2. Board of Education Policy 1200, Community Involvement
3. Board Of Education Policy 1210, Parent-Teacher (Student) Associations
4. Board of Education Policy 1220, Citizens Advisory Committee
5. Board Of Education Policy 1230, Area Education Advisory Councils (AEAC)
6. Board of Education Policy 1240, Visits to Schools
7. Board of Education Policy 1250, Participation in the Local School by Community Members
8. Board of Education Policy 1260, School Volunteers

Legal Requirements
1. 20 U.S.C. §6301, et seq., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, as amended by Section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-112, Advisory Committees

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy KH, Parent/Family/Community Involvement
2. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners, Policy KCA, Family and Community Engagement Policy
3. Calvert County Board of Education, Policy 8123, (Community) of the Board of Education Regarding Parent, Family, and Community Involvement
4. Carroll County Board of Education, Policy KC, Parent/Family/Community Involvement
5. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 10-0004-000, Parent/Community Involvement
6. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 10000, *Parent, Family, and Community Involvement*
7. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy ABA, *Community Involvement*
8. Prince George’s County Board of Education, Policy 0105, *Parent Involvement in Schools*

**Draft of Proposed Policy**
Attached

**Other Alternatives Considered by Staff**
No other alternatives were considered.

**Timeline**
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Community Involvement

Parent [/Guardian] and Family Involvement

I. Philosophy

The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) recognizes that schools, parents[/guardians], families, and communities must work together to mutually support student achievement. The Board values school, parent/guardian, family, and community involvement as integral to the academic success of all students [both in school and at home].

II. DEFINITION

CONSISTENT WITH SECTION 1118 OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1270, ALONG WITH ITS IMPLEMENTING SUPERINTENDENT’S RULE AND SCHOOL SYSTEM PROCEDURES, SHALL CONSTITUTE THE SCHOOL SYSTEM’S PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY.

III. Implementation

A. The Board directs the Superintendent to develop appropriate rules and procedures to implement this policy.
B. THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT 2001 AS IT RELATES TO PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT, INCLUDING AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CONTENT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTING RULE AND PROCEDURES.

POLICY 1270

Related Policies:

Board of Education Policy 1100, *Communication with the Public*

Board of Education Policy 1200, *Community Involvement*

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1210, *PARENT-TEACHER (STUDENT) ASSOCIATIONS*

Board of Education Policy 1220, *Citizens Advisory Committee*

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1230, *AREA EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCILS (AEAC)*

Board of Education Policy 1240, *Visits to Schools*

Board of Education Policy 1250, *Participation in the Local School by Community Members*

Board of Education Policy 1260, *School Volunteers*

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4002, *PRECERTS, BELIEFS, AND VALUES OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS*
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: March 22, 2011

To: Board of Education

From: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

Subject: Report on the Proposed Changes to Policy 4002, Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools

Originator: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

Resource Person(s): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
Frances Allen, Manager, Personnel Services

Recommendation

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 4002.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4002
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4002
PRECEPTS, BELIEFS, AND VALUES OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4002 has not been revised since its adoption in 1991. Policy 4002 sets forth the beliefs and values of the school system in fostering the Board of Education’s mission of providing a quality education for all students. Staff is recommending that the policy be edited to: (1) clearly define the Board’s mission through the philosophy statement; (2) articulate the Board’s expectation that all employees support the mission and goals of the school system; (3) reflect the school system’s focus on quality and continuous improvement under ISO; and (4) conform with the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by revising this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 1270, Parent and Family Involvement
2. Board of Education Policy 2370, Conduct
3. Board of Education Policy 3170, Quality Management System
4. Board of Education Policy 4000, Equal Employment Opportunity
5. Board of Education Policy 4008, Obligations of Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
6. Board Of Education Policy 4115, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
7. Board of Education Policy 5000, Students
8. Board of Education Policy 8361, General

Legal Requirements
None

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Allegany County Board of Education, Policy AD-R, Educational Philosophy
3. Prince George’s Board of Education, Policy 0118, Core Beliefs and Commitments

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
Policy 4002 was considered for deletion; however, staff determined that Policy 4002 is an important reference for employees in the school system and should remain an active policy.
**Timeline**
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: General

Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools

I. PHILOSOPHY

A. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING A QUALITY EDUCATION THAT DEVELOPS THE CONTENT, KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ATTITUDES THAT WILL ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH THEIR MAXIMUM POTENTIAL AS RESPONSIBLE, LIFE-LONG LEARNERS AND PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS. THE BOARD FURTHER BELIEVES THAT ALL EMPLOYEES PLAY A KEY ROLE IN ENSURING THAT ALL STUDENTS HAVE AN EFFECTIVE AND HIGH QUALITY EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS THAT ARE SAFE AND CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING.

B. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT ITS EMPLOYEES ARE ITS MOST IMPORTANT RESOURCE AND EXPECTS THAT THEY WILL EXHIBIT BEHAVIOR THAT DEMONSTRATES PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, AS WELL AS RESPECT FOR SELF, FOR OTHERS, AND FOR THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY. THE BOARD SUPPORTS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GUIDING PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE THE WORK OF ALL EMPLOYEES IN SUPPORTING THE MISSION AND GOALS OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

A. [1.] We strive to be OUR BEST [the "best"] as we pursue THE MISSION AND GOALS OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. [our "Challenge of Excellence."]

B. [2.] We believe in the importance of public education to a democratic and pluralistic society.

C. [3.] We shape every program to provide and support instruction of our students to enable them to be RESPONSIBLE, educated and productive citizens in a [democratic] GLOBAL ECONOMY AND MULTICULTURAL society.

D. [4.] We promote A [the] STRONG work ethic, set high performance standards, and expect all employees and students to strive to be the best they can be.
E. [5.] We care for every student and encourage the building of self-esteem.
F. [6.] We care for each other and cooperate in pursuing the mission of the BOARD [Baltimore County Public Schools].
G. [7.] We respect the worth of all individuals, VALUE DIVERSITY, and vigorously address equity issues.
H. [8.] We build bridges with our community and assertively communicate our pride in Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS).
I. WE ESTABLISH CLEAR STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION AND SUPPORT SERVICES, INDIVIDUAL COMMITMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT FOR THE BOARD THROUGH ITS QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.
J. [9.] We accept the responsibility of serving as role models in preserving and enhancing these precepts, beliefs, and values of [the] BCPS [Baltimore County Public Schools].

RELATED POLICIES:
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1270, PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 2370, CONDUCT
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3170, QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4000, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4008, OBLIGATIONS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4115, EMPLOYEE CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8361, GENERAL

Policy Adopted: 05/23/91
REVISED: _________
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 4005, DATING OR SEXUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN STAFF AND STUDENTS

ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
George Duque, Manager, Staff Relations
Frances Allen, Manager, Personnel Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 4005.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4005
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4005
DATING OR SEXUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN STAFF AND STUDENTS

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4005 has not been reviewed since its adoption in 1994. Policy 4005: prohibits school system employees from dating or engaging in sexual relationships with students; establishes reporting procedures; and mandates appropriate disciplinary action for violation of the prohibition. Staff is recommending that the policy be deleted, because Board of Education Policy 4115 and its implementing Superintendent’s Rule prohibit employees from dating and having inappropriate relationships with students. Lastly, Policy 4004 clearly advises employees of their responsibilities to report these types of inappropriate relationships and metes out requisite disciplinary action. As such, the policy is no longer needed and should be deleted.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No additional cost is anticipated by the deletion of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy, Board of Education Policy 4004, Child Abuse, Neglect and/or Inappropriate Behavior Toward a Student by an Employee of Baltimore County Public Schools
2. Board of Education Policy 4008, Obligations of the Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
3. Board of Education Policy 4115, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
4. Board of Education Policy 5440, Child Abuse and Neglect

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-205, Powers and duties of county superintendent
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §6-108, Immunity of school employees from civil liability for certain actions
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §6-202, Suspension or dismissal of teachers, principals and other professional personnel
4. Annotated Code of Maryland, Family Law Article §5-701, et seq., Child abuse and reporting
5. COMAR 13A.12.05, Suspensions and revocations

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy GBV, Dating Between Employees and Students
2. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 12-0002-000, Statement of Ethics
3. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 7030, Employee Conduct and Discipline

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached
Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: General

Dating or Sexual Relations Between Staff and Students

An individual employed by the Board of Education of Baltimore County may not date or have a sexual relationship with any student enrolled in the Baltimore County Public School System. The Superintendent of Schools will establish procedures for reporting such cases to the appropriate authorities and will administer disciplinary action, when necessary.
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY 4115, PERSONNEL: RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
George Duque, Manager, Staff Relations

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 4115.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4115
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4115
EMPLOYEE CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4115 has not been revised since 1998. Policy 4115, as written, outlines the responsibilities and duties of teachers. Staff is recommending that Policy 4115 be revised to clearly define the Board of Education’s expectations for all employees as it relates to employee conduct, responsibilities, and the belief that every employee conduct him/herself in a professional manner in the performance of their duties. The Policy has further been revised to conform to the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the revision of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 2372, Conduct: Tobacco
2. Board of Education Policy 4001, Drug-Free Workplace
3. Board of Education Policy 4002, Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools
4. Board of Education Policy 4003, Sexual Harassment
5. Board of Education Policy 4004, Suspected Child Abuse, Neglect, and/or Inappropriate Behavior Toward a Student by an Employee of the Baltimore County Public Schools
6. Board of Education Policy 4006, Telecommunications Access to Electronic Information, Services and Networks
7. Board of Education Policy 4008, Obligations of Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
8. Board of Education Policy 4133, Tutoring
9. Board of Education Policy 4400, Absences and Leaves
10. Board of Education Policy 5440, Child Abuse and Neglect
11. Board of Education Policy 8360, Definitions
12. Board of Education Policy 8361, General
13. Board of Education Policy 8363, Conflict Of Interest
14. Board of Education Policy, 8364, Financial Disclosure
15. Board of Education Policy 8410, Fraud Reporting

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-205, Powers and duties of county superintendent.
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §6-202, Suspension or dismissal of teachers, principals and other professional personnel.

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy 801.07, Duties and Responsibilities – Teachers
2. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 7030, Employee Conduct and Discipline
Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
None

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: [Professional] GENERAL

[Permanent:] EMPLOYEE CONDUCT AND Responsibilities [and Duties]

I. PHILOSOPHY

A. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) RECOGNIZES THE CRITICAL ROLE ITS EMPLOYEES PLAY IN MAINTAINING THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. THE BOARD FURTHER BELIEVES THAT ALL EMPLOYEES SHOULD CONDUCT THEMSELVES IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDARDS OF BEHAVIOR THAT REFLECT THE EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (BCPS).

B. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT EVERY EMPLOYEE MUST MODEL ETHICAL BEHAVIOR, EXHIBIT A STRONG WORK ETHIC, WORK PRODUCTIVELY, AND PERFORM HIS/HER DUTIES IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER.

[The professional tasks of teachers involve considerably more time than that devoted to actual class instruction, at all levels of teaching, kindergarten through grade 12. Some of these duties include but are not limited to: study and research to keep abreast of new knowledge and techniques; evaluation of students' work; record keeping; lesson planning and preparation; student, parent, and principal conferences; inservice training meetings; and pupil supervision outside the classroom, and other related duties.

Teachers are expected to be in their classrooms or at assigned duties prior to the beginning of their instructional day and after the close of their instructional day. This time is necessary for educational planning, preparation, and conferences with students, parents, and faculty members. Teachers whose effectiveness is impaired by a lack of lesson planning and participation in sufficient necessary activities before and after school should be dealt with as individuals. Rigid duty hours should not be imposed upon all teachers in order to discipline the few exceptions who take advantage of being treated as professional educators.]

C. All EMPLOYEES [staff members] are expected to maintain a standard of dress, personal appearance, and general decorum, as well as moral standards and behavior that reflect their professional status in the community.
II. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT APPROPRIATE RULES AND PROCEDURES TO ARTICULATE THESE EXPECTATIONS, INCLUDING PROVISION FOR TAKING APPROPRIATE DISCIPLINARY OR OTHER ACTION WHEN THIS POLICY HAS BEEN VIOLATED.

[It shall be the responsibility of the building principal to establish necessary regulations to accomplish effectively the goals of the instructional program in the school.]

Legal ReferenceS: [Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article § 6-201]

ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-205, POWERS AND DUTIES OF COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT.
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §6-202, SUSPENSION OR DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL.

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 2372, CONDUCT: TOBACCO
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4001, DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4002, PRECEPTS, BELIEFS, AND VALUES OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4003, SEXUAL HARASSMENT
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4004, SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND/OR INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR TOWARD A STUDENT BY AN EMPLOYEE OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4005, DATING OR SEXUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN STAFF AND STUDENTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4006, TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC INFORMATION, SERVICES, AND NETWORKS

5
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4008, OBLIGATIONS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4133, TUTORING
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4400, ABSENCES AND LEAVES
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5440, CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8360, DEFINITIONS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8361, GENERAL
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8363, CONFLICT OF INTEREST
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, 8364, FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8410, FRAUD REPORTING

Policy
Adopted: 08/29/68
Revised: 09/23/98
REvised: _________
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY 4133, TUTORING/EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
George Duque, Manager, Staff Relations

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 4133.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4133
Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4133 prohibits teachers from tutoring their assigned students for compensation. Staff has reviewed the Board of Education’s Ethics Review Panel decisions and is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) prohibit all teachers, as well as school-based staff members, from providing tutoring or other educational services for private gain to school system students whom they currently teach; (2) prohibit employees from using school system facilities and equipment to provide tutoring or educational services; (3) conform to the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the revision of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 4115, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
2. Board of Education Policy 8363, Conflict of Interest
3. Board of Education Policy 8366, Ethics Review Panel

Legal Requirements
None

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy 801.15, Tutoring for Pay
2. Frederick County Board of Education, Policy 315, Tutoring/Educational Services Offered by FCPS Staff
3. Prince George’s County Board of Education, Policy 4116, Conflicts of Interest

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
Staff considered deleting the policy and transferring the contents of the policy to Board of Education Policy 4115, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: Professional

[Activities:] Tutoring/EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

I. POLICY STATEMENT

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY’S (BOARD) ETHICS CODE POLICIES PROHIBIT SCHOOL SYSTEM EMPLOYEES AND VOLUNTEERS FROM BENEFITING FROM BUSINESS WITH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AND FROM RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS. IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST ARISES, THE BOARD INSTITUTES THE FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS.

II. RESTRICTIONS

A. EMPLOYEES SHALL NOT PROVIDE TUTORING OR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES OF ANY TYPE FOR PRIVATE GAIN TO BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM (BCPS) STUDENTS WHOM THE EMPLOYEES CURRENTLY TEACH. [With the exception of school-sponsored programs, teacher[s] regularly employed in a school shall not tutor for compensation any student whom he or she is currently teaching.]

1. THIS RESTRICTION DOES NOT APPLY TO SCHOOL-SPONSORED PROGRAMS.

B. BOARD EMPLOYEES SHALL NOT USE BCPS FACILITIES OR EQUIPMENT TO PROVIDE TUTORING OR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR PRIVATE GAIN.

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4115, EMPLOYEE CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8363, CONFLICT OF INTEREST
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8366, ETHICS REVIEW PANEL
[Also see the Board of Education Policy and Rule 4115 “Responsibilities and Duties” and Board of Education Policy 8363 Ethics Code: “Conflict of Interest.”]
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 4145, COMPENSABLE NON-DUTY WEEK DAYS

ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
George Duque, Manager, Staff Relations

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 4145.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4145
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4145
COMPENSABLE NON-DUTY WEEK DAYS

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4145 has not been reviewed since 1993. Policy 4145 deals with those days included in the 10-month payroll calendar when 10-month teachers do not report to work, but for which they receive compensation (“compensable non-duty weekdays”). These compensable non-duty weekdays occur during the winter and spring breaks and at the end of the school year. Staff is recommending that the policy be deleted, because the formula for calculating these days is an internal process of the Office of Payroll. As such, the policy is not needed and should be deleted.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the deletion of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
None

Legal Requirements
None

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
None

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered by staff.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: Professional

Compensation and Related Employee Benefits: **Compensable Non-Duty Week Days**

1. Compensable Non-Duty Week Days are those weekdays falling within the 217 weekdays in the school year, commencing with the first duty day for teachers, which are not holidays or ten-month employee duty days.

2. A ten-month professional employee shall accrue Compensable Non-Duty Week Days for each of the twenty (20) specified biweekly pay periods in which at least 60% of the normal biweekly pay has been received by the employee. The accrual rate will be determined each year by dividing the number of Compensable Non-Duty Week Days by twenty (20).

3. A ten-month professional employee will receive pay for each Compensable Non-Duty Week Day provided he/she has accrued sufficient days. Employees who separate will be paid for unused accrued days, except in violation of contract.

Policy

Adopted: 6/12/75
Revised: 10/27/77
Revised: 3/25/93

Board of Education of Baltimore County
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 4262,
EMERGENCY CALL-IN

ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Donald Peccia, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
George Duque, Manager, Staff Relations

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 4262.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4262
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4262
EMERGENCY CALL-IN

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 4262 has not been reviewed since 1982. Policy 4262 briefly outlines when classified employees are entitled to compensation for emergency work that extends beyond the normal duty day. Staff is recommending that this policy be deleted, because compensation beyond the forty-hour work week is governed by federal law, and the procedure for emergency call-ins is found in the AFSCME Master Agreement. As such, the policy is no longer needed and should be deleted.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the deletion of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 4260, Compensation Plan

Legal Requirements

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
None

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered by staff.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
PERSONNEL: Classified

Compensation Plan: Emergency Call-in

When an employee is called in to perform unanticipated extra work and the work is not an extension of his/her normal workday, he/she shall be compensated for the hours worked. Such compensation shall be for a minimum of four (4) hours in the event the employee works less than this amount of time. However, only actual time worked will be considered for the computation of overtime.

Also see Master Agreement between Council 67/Local 434 of AFSCME, AFL-CIO and the Board of Education.

Policy Adopted: 7/12/79
Revised: 3/25/82]
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 5570,
STUDENT TO STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT

ORIGINATOR: Michele Prumo, Chief of Staff

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Dale Rauenzahn, Executive Director, Student Support Services
Patsy Holmes, Director, Student Support Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 5570.
This is the first reading.

***

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 5570
Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 5570 has not been reviewed since its adoption in 1993. Policy 5570 prohibits student on student sexual harassment, provides for the implementation of procedures to address this behavior, and provides for disciplinary action. Staff is recommending that Policy 5570 be deleted; because, the prohibition against, and sanction for, harassment – including student-on-student sexual harassment – is included in Board of Education Policy 5580, Bullying, Harassment, or Intimidation, and its implementing Superintendent’s Rule. As such, the policy is no longer needed and should be deleted.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the deletion of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 5000, Conduct
2. Board of Education Policy 5510, Positive Behavior
3. Board of Education Policy 5550, Disruptive Behavior
4. Board of Education Policy 5600, Students’ Responsibilities and Rights
5. Board of Education Policy 5560, Suspensions, Assignment to Alternative Programs, or Expulsion
6. Board of Education Policy 5580 Bullying, Harassment, or Intimidation

Legal Requirements
1. 20 U.S.C. §1681 (Title IX of the Federal Education Amendments (1974))
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-424, Reporting incidents of harassment or intimidation against students.
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-424.1, Model policy prohibiting bullying, harassment and intimidation.
4. COMAR 13A.01.04.03, School Safety.

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 1020, Sexual Harassment
2. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy ACF, Sexual Harassment

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered by staff.
**Timeline**
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
STUDENTS: Student to Student Sexual Harassment

Sexual Harassment is unwanted and unwelcome behavior of sexual nature which interferes with a student’s right to learn, study, work, achieve, or participate in school activities in comfortable and supportive atmosphere.

Under federal and state laws and policies, sexual harassment is illegal and is prohibited in school settings. Students are protected against sexual harassment by Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972, a Federal law prohibiting discrimination in schools on the basis of sex. Sexual assault is also covered under the Criminal Code of Maryland.

Students have a right to participate in all school and classroom activities in an atmosphere free from sexual harassment and a responsibility not to engage in behaviors of a sexual nature that are unwelcome or offensive to others.

Therefore, student to student sexual harassment will not be tolerated in the Baltimore County Public Schools. Retaliation against a complainant will also not be tolerated.

Harassment and sexual abuse of student by adult, within or outside of school, is illegal and is to be reported directly to the Department of Social Services or the police by the individual to whom the offense is made known. School personnel follow the direction of these agencies in such matters. (See Policy 4003).

Legal Reference: Title IX of the Education Amendments 1972, 20 U.S.C. 1681-1688
Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 27, Section 461, 464A, 464B, and 464C

Policy Adopted: 11/23/93

Board of Education of Baltimore County
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY 6100, CURRICULUM

ORIGINATOR: Roger Plunkett, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S): John Quinn, Executive Director, STEM

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 6100.
This is the first reading.

* * * * *

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6100
STATEMENT OF ISSUES OR QUESTIONS ADDRESSED
Board of Education Policy 6100 was last revised in 2007. Policy 6100 provides the foundation for the school system’s educational program. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to clearly define the Board of Education’s mission through its philosophy statement. The policy has further been revised to conform to the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

COST ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT ON SCHOOL SYSTEM
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the revision of this policy.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICIES
1. Board of Education Policy 3170, Quality Management System
2. Board of Education Policy 6000, Curriculum and Instruction
3. Board of Education Policy 6102, Teaching Controversial Issues
4. Board of Education Policy 6002, Selection of Instructional Materials
5. Board of Education Policy 6501, Evaluation of the Instructional Program
6. Board of Education Policy 8120, Purpose, Role, and Responsibilities of the Board of Education
7. Board of Education Policy 8130, Formulation

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-101, Control and Promotion of Education.
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-111, Curriculum guides and courses of study; study of sign language.
4. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-205, Powers and duties of county superintendent.
5. COMAR 13A.04, Specific Subjects

SIMILAR POLICIES ADOPTED BY OTHER LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy 604, Curriculum
2. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy 603, Organization of Instruction
3. Carroll County Board of Education, Policy I, Assessment and IKAB, Communicating Student Progress
4. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 8000, Curriculum
5. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy IFB, Curriculum

DRAFT OF PROPOSED POLICY
Attached
Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered by staff.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
INSTRUCTION: CURRICULUM

Curriculum

I. PHILOSOPHY

A. The Board of Education OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES SO THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN LEARN AND [is committed to producing graduates who have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to] reach their FULL potential as responsible, productive citizens IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY AND MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY [,to be successful in college and the work place, and to be competitive in the global economy]. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT ALL BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS’ (BCPS) GRADUATES SHOULD BE COLLEGE AND CAREER READY, WITH THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO BE SUCCESSFUL BOTH PERSONALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

B. To accomplish THESE GOALS [this vision], the Board [of Education recognizes that curriculum in Baltimore County Public Schools] EXPECTS THAT THE BCPS CURRICULUM BE ROBUST AND RIGOROUS. THE CURRICULUM must [delineate a] PROVIDE THE APPROPRIATE COURSES OF STUDY FOR ALL STUDENTS IN GRADES PRE-K THROUGH 12 [course of study for all grades and courses to identify what students should know and be able to do]. The Board affirms the need for THE articulation and coordination of curriculum across content areas and grade levels.

C. The Board RECOGNIZES THAT THE WRITTEN, TAUGHT, AND ASSESSED ASPECTS OF THE BCPS CURRICULUM BE ALIGNED TO MEET STATE AND NATIONAL STANDARDS AND DEMONSTRATE INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT CURRICULA MUST BE DESIGNED TO INCREASE STUDENT PERFORMANCE, BASED ON MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

A. THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO DEVELOP RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DESIGN, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW, AND EVALUATION OF THE BCPS CURRICULA.
B. IN ACCORDANCE WITH BOARD POLICIES, THE BOARD SHALL APPROVE ALL SCHOOL SYSTEM CURRICULA.

[Consistent with the goals outlined in this policy and the Blueprint for Progress, the superintendent shall devise standards or procedures for the design, delivery, and evaluation of the curriculum.]

Legal References: Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-101, Control and Promotion of Education.
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-108, DUTIES IN GENERAL.
Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-111, Curriculum guides and courses of study; STUDY OF SIGN LANGUAGE.
Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-205, Powers and duties of county superintendent.
COMAR 13A.04, SPECIFIC SUBJECTS
[COMAR 13-A.04, State Board of Education]

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3170, QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6000, CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6002, SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6102, TEACHING CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6501, EVALUATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8120, PURPOSE, ROLE, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8130, FORMULATION

Policy Board of Education of Baltimore County
Adopted: 11/21/68
Revised: 09/05/07
REVISED: ________
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 6103, READING

ORIGINATOR: Roger Plunkett, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Sonja Karwacki, Executive Director, Liberal Arts
Karen Gieron, Supervisor, Elementary English Language Arts

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of policy 6103, Reading. This is the first reading

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6103
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6103
READING

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
Board of Education Policy 6103 has not been revised since its adoption in 1968. Policy 6103 outlines the Board of Education’s guidelines for the development and implementation of the school system’s reading program. Staff is recommending that the policy be deleted as its content is obsolete and the mandatory requirements for Reading, English and Language Arts programs are outlined in State statute and MSDE regulation. The Board has consistently stated that a policy should be deleted if it merely restates the law. Therefore, staff is recommending that the policy be deleted.

Cost Analysis and Fiscal Impact on School System
No fiscal impact is anticipated by the deletion of this policy.

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 6000, Curriculum and Instruction
2. Board of Education Policy 6100, Curriculum

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-202, Minimum Reading Levels Required
2. COMAR 13A.04.14, Program in English Language Arts

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy IFB 605.02, Reading, Language Arts, and English Instructional Program for Grades Prekindergarten-12
2. Charles County Board of Education, Policy 6411.7, Instruction: General Curricula: Curriculum Development: Specific Curricular Programs: Reading

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 22, 2011
Public comment – April 5, 2011
Third reading/vote – May 10, 2011
INSTRUCTION

Reading

The Board of Education shall support the development and implementation of a reading program based upon the following guiding principles:

- Personal needs and the demands of society determine the planned instruction in reading.
- A strong desire to read promotes effective reading instruction.
- Home, school, and community combine to influence success in reading.
- A reading program capitalizes on the maturing and expanding interests of children.
- A program provides for the systematic development of all reading skills in sequential order.
- The purposes, experiences, and types of material determine the skills the reader uses and the rate at which he reads.
- A balanced program includes instruction in the basal, curricular, and recreational reading skills.
- Experiences with literature are a planned part of the reading program.
- A program provides instruction for the varying abilities and needs of all pupils.
- Evaluation is continuous in a reading program.
- The school provides leadership in interpreting the reading program to the public.
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM WEB SITE TO ALLOW PUBLIC COMMENT BY EMAIL

ORIGINATOR: Mr. James Coleman, Chairperson, Policy Review Committee (PRC)

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Margaret-Ann F. Howie, Esq., General Counsel
Michele O. Prumo, Chief of Staff

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the Policy Review Committee’s recommendation, permitting the receipt of public comment via the school system’s web page on the Policy Review Committee’s recommendations for adoption, revision, or deletion of policies.

*** ***
To further the Board of Education of Baltimore County’s philosophy of encouraging public participation and input concerning Board policy, the Policy Review Committee is recommending that the public be given the opportunity to comment on policies that are currently before the Board for adoption, revision, and/or deletion. Links to policies currently available for public comment will be provided on the school system’s main web page, as well as on the Policies and Rules home page. The Policy Review Committee is recommending that the Board consider this request.

I. The layout pages for this process may be found at the following links:

A. Policies Available for Public Comment
   http://uat.bcps.org/system/policies_rules/openForComment.asp

   1. When a policy is added to the Board’s agenda, the policy will be added to
      the public comment page, along with the dates that the policy will also
      be presented to the Board for first reader (board report), second reader (public
      comment), and third reader (board action).

   2. The policy number/title will be linked directly to the policy and policy
      analysis exhibit for the Board’s meeting agenda.

   3. The public may comment on the policies by clicking on the “comment on
      xxx” button below each policy.

   4. Community members will be able to comment on policies until 12:00
      midnight of the public comment date. After that time, no further
      comments will be accepted.

B. Public Comment Form
   http://uat.bcps.org/system/policies_rules/comment.asp

   1. The following sections will be “required” fields: Name, address, email
      address. These required fields, with the exception of email address, mirror
      the sign up sheet for commenting on policies at the Board’s public
      meeting. The email address is required in order to send an automated
      “thank you.”

C. Automated Thank You
   http://uat.bcps.org/system/policies_rules/thankyou.html

   1. An automated thank you will be sent to the email address, noting that the
      comments will be shared with the Board for its consideration.
II. Comments Received

A. All comments -- received via email and during the public comment period at the open meeting of the Board -- will be presented to the full Board during third reader in the Policy Review Committee’s report.

III. Similar Comment Options Offered by Maryland LEAs

A. Anne Arundel County
B. Howard County
C. Montgomery County

IV. Timeline

A. PRC Report to Full Board: March Work Session
B. Testing of Site: March – April
C. Implementation: May
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE BCPS GRADUATES: COLLEGE AND CAREER

ORIGINATOR: Thomas Rhoades, Executive Director, Research, Accountability, and Assessment

RESOURCE PERSONS: Tamela Hawley, Director, Research, Accountability, and Assessment
Tim Hayden, Supervisor, School Counseling Services

INFORMATION

That the Board of Education is informed of the results of two studies on student outcomes after graduation. The National Student Clearinghouse: Student Tracker study and the Jacob France Workforce Outcomes study both inform BCPS administrators about college and career outcomes for graduates and non-graduates. This report will share the process of how this information is acquired, what some of the results look like, and how the information is used to ensure positive outcomes for students.

Attachment I – PowerPoint Presentation – Where Are They Now? College and Workforce Outcomes for BCPS Students After Graduation
Attachment II – Summary of Jacob France Study
Attachment III – National Student Clearinghouse – 2010 Data Summary
Attachment IV – National Student Clearinghouse – 2010 Data Reports (CDs)
WHERE ARE THEY NOW? COLLEGE AND WORKFORCE OUTCOMES FOR BCPS STUDENTS AFTER GRADUATION

Department of Research, Accountability, and Assessment
OBJECTIVES: WE WILL SHARE...

- Results of College and Career Ready Data
- How the Data are obtained
- How the Data fit into BCPS information flow
- How the data will be used
DATA AND INFORMATION FLOW
The National Student Clearinghouse collects information on student achievement in higher education on a national level.

Baltimore County Public Schools procured the Clearinghouse to track college attendance rates, first and second year college retention rates, and degree completion rates for our graduates.

Today’s report represents data collected from 2002 through 2009 graduates.
Jacob France Institute (JFI) at the University of Baltimore to investigate the transition of BCPS high school graduates and non-graduates into the workforce and post-secondary education.

Since 1989, JFI has maintained a historical archive file of Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR)’s quarterly Maryland Unemployment Insurance Wage Records which cover over 97% of Maryland wage and salary employment.
Data comes in from external data sources
Data are cleaned and added to data warehouse
Data are analyzed and turned into information
People use information to help students
Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Understanding the workforce and social implications, it is all the more important for all students to obtain the diploma.

Students who complete high school are not only better off socially, they contribute to the economic stability of Baltimore County, Maryland and the nation at large.
College attendance increased by 8% from 2003 to 2010
BCPS graduates continue to have high college persistence.
TOP 5 LOCAL COLLEGES

1. Community College of Baltimore County
2. Towson University
3. University of Maryland-College Park
4. University of Maryland-Baltimore County
5. Stevenson University
1. York College of Pennsylvania
2. University of Delaware
3. West Virginia University
4. Pennsylvania State University
5. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Looking at the 2002 cohort we compared college and workforce outcomes for graduates and non-graduates
2002 COHORT OUTCOMES; N=7,901

By 2009 Graduates...
- Work Full-time: 38.2%
- Entered College: 68.7%
- College Graduate: 33.1%

By 2009 Dropouts...
- Work Full-time: 17.7%
- Entered College: 20.1%
- College Graduate: 1.5%

Graduates □ 92%
Dropouts □ 8%
2002 Graduates and Non-Graduates
Percent with Maryland Workforce Affiliation from 2002 to 2009

- As time goes by, the employment gap between graduates and non-graduates increases
- Over 38% of graduates are employed full-time in Maryland
- 17.7% of non-graduates are employed full-time in Maryland
- The recession of 2008 seems to have affected the non-graduates more than the graduates
As time goes on, the gap in earnings between graduates and non-graduates is greatly increased.

In 2002, graduates and non-graduates made on average very similar annual salaries.

By 2009, the median annual income for graduates was $10,000 more than for non-graduates.
Regardless of high school completion status, graduating college provides a great advantage to students in terms of long-term earnings. After 7 years, the median annual earnings of students with some college look very similar to those who have had no college.
From 2003 to 2009, the industries of Retail/Trade and Accommodations/Food decrease and Health/Social Assistance and construction increase.

Retail/Trade and Accommodations/Food are consistently high industries over time for non-college attendees.
From 2003 to 2009, the industries of Retail/Trade and Accommodations/Food decrease and Health/Social Assistance, Professional/Tech and Educational Services increase.

There is no Construction industry for these college graduates.
ECONOMIC DIVERSITY

Government
Manufacturing
Construction
Trade, Transportation, Utilities
Information
Financial Services
Professional and Business Services
Education and Health Services
Leisure and Hospitality
Other
**Implications**

- **Workforce Implications**
  - Without at least a high school diploma, the long-term job and earnings prospects are poor
  - Completion of a college degree improves not only the likelihood of obtaining a job, but the kind of work obtained is much different than those without the degree
  - Having some college is very similar to not going to college at all
  - It is important to complete high school and either go into a trade/career or attend and complete college

- **Social Implications**
  - Without the high school diploma, the likelihood that students will be earning below minimum wage or be on welfare is much larger than those who do complete high school
  - The impact of recession is felt much harder in people who did not have a high school diploma but were almost not felt by those who had completed college
Share and work with C&I staff to tie into current college-ready initiatives.
Share this information with administrators at all levels. (Drop out behavior begins in the elementary schools with poor attendance).
Present the information to all school counselors K-12.
Share information with CTE teachers and staff so that they can share it with students.
Train PPWs so they can share the information with parents as they make home visits related to attendance.
Train alternative education staff so they can share this information with students.
Create a student friendly PowerPoint for use with middle and high school students.

Share information with parents at Early College Awareness evenings.

Create a brochure to share with parents at all grade levels.

Brochure might be named something like, “Why YOU Need to Go to College” or “Why YOU Need an Education Beyond High School.

Place brochures in all alternatives schools (programs), counseling offices, PPW offices, and other public areas.

Put some of the information on the Web.
2002 BCPS Graduates and Non-Graduates
Post-secondary and Workforce Outcomes

Summary of Jacob France Study

January 6, 2011

Department of Research, Accountability, and Assessment
Dr. Thomas Rhoades
Executive Director

Office of Research
Dr. Tamela H. Hawley, Director
Dr. Renard A. Adams, Coordinator
Dr. Gary L. Brager, Supervisor
Samantha Murray, Specialist
Everett Elliott, Resource Teacher
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Executive Summary

In response to a growing interest within the BCPS administration in tracking the long-term outcomes of its graduates and drop-outs, the Office of Research partnered with the Jacob France Institute (JFI) at the University of Baltimore to investigate the transition of BCPS high school graduates and non-graduates into the workforce and post-secondary education.

Since 1989, JFI has maintained a historical archive file of Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR)’s quarterly Maryland Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Records which cover over 97% of Maryland wage and salary employment.

Highlights of the summary report include:

- Of those students who should have graduated with a high school diploma in 2002, by 2009 over 38% of graduates were employed full-time in Maryland while only 17.7% of non-graduates were employed full-time in Maryland
- 4.1% of graduates work for the federal government while 5.3% work outside of Maryland in other capacities
- 2.1% of non-graduates work for the federal government while 4.5% work outside of Maryland in other capacities
- Of the 2.1% of non-graduates who work in the government—all of them are in the department of defense.
- In 2002, graduates and non-graduates made on average very similar annual salaries, but by 2009, the median annual income for graduates was $10,000 more than for non-graduates
- 20.1% of the non-graduates had entered post-secondary education between 2003 and 2009, but by 2009 only 8 of them earned a post-secondary diploma
- By 2009, those BCPS former students who had completed college earned on average 30% more than those who had some college or who never attended college.
- For those students who received a diploma in 2002, their most likely career field in 2009 is health professional, technology, or educational services. For those who did not receive diplomas (drop-outs) their most likely career field is retail or food/accommodations.
- By 2009, 4.3% of the non-graduates were on welfare, while only 0.8% of the graduates were on welfare. This means that non-graduates are 186% more likely to be on welfare than those who graduated from BCPS with a high school diploma.
Introduction

In response to a growing interest within the BCPS administration in tracking the long-term outcomes of its graduates and drop-outs, the Office of Research partnered with the Jacob France Institute (JFI) at the University of Baltimore to investigate the transition of BCPS high school graduates and non-graduates into the workforce and post-secondary education.

Since 1989, JFI has maintained a historical archive file of Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR)’s quarterly Maryland Unemployment Insurance Wage Records which cover over 97% of Maryland wage and salary employment. They also conduct quarterly secure data exchanges with the departments of labor in the District of Columbia, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia. Quarterly secure data exchanges are also conducted with the federal Office of Personnel Management. Consequently, JFI is able to examine employment patterns in Maryland, regional states, and the federal government. JFI also maintains secure historical unit-record databases for welfare recipients and employees covered by Maryland’s unemployment compensation law, through data sharing agreements with the Maryland Department of Human Services and DLLR, respectively.

The BCPS Department of Research, Accountability and Assessment contracted with the National Student Clearinghouse to use their Student Tracker service to track former BCPS high school students for college attendance and graduation. Data from the Student Tracker were merged with the workforce data from Jacob France in order to assess how college attendance and completion would impact the workforce outcomes of both high school graduates and non-graduates.

The main hypothesis for this research was that BCPS high school graduates would have higher participation rates in the workforce and post-secondary education than non-graduates. In addition, students who graduated from high school would have higher wages and would be affiliated with higher paying industry sectors than non-graduates.
Methodology

BCPS provided Jacob France via secure server with the names and social security number (SSN) for students in grade 12, spanning cohorts from 1997-98 to 2007-08. These data were cleaned to purge any invalid SSNs and to allow for consistent definitions of drop-out and graduation. For the purposes of this research, graduates were defined as students who received a diploma or certificate. Drop-outs were defined as students who received a code of “W” (meaning withdrew) but did not transfer to another system or program. This strict definition of graduate and drop-out resulted in cohorts that were smaller in number than originally reported to the Maryland State Department of Education. For this reason, any analysis done based upon these databases should not be compared to other BCPS data sources. This study looks at the cohort of 12th grade students from school year 2001-2002. This file contained 7,901 records with valid SSNs, of which 6,504 were high school graduates and 537 were classified as drop-outs.

Student SSNs were matched with Maryland UI wage records, regional state UI wage records, Federal employment records, and Maryland welfare records. In addition, these data were matched to the National Student Clearinghouse data to track post-secondary education involvement. When analyzing the wage records, a threshold was used to approximate full-time earnings. The full-time employment threshold was working 40 hours a week at a minimum for 52 weeks a year for least the minimum wage for the year being analyzed.

The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) was used to classify the type of employment sectors that former students were participating in. NAICS codes classify industries by employer, not by the individual worker. For instance, a person working in data processing may be employed by a school system. Their industry affiliation would be “educational services” rather than “information”. These employment complexities must be taken into account when examining industry affiliations.

Outcomes for the 2002 Cohort

Of the 7,901 students that comprise the 2002 Cohort for this study, 6,504 (or 92%) graduated in 2002 and 537 (or 8%) had dropped out before the official 2002 graduation date. Most of this document will discuss higher education and workforce outcomes for these graduates and drop-outs for the period of 2002 through 2009. By 2009, 38.2% of the high school graduates in the 2002 cohort were working full-time while only 17.7% of the drop-outs had full-time jobs. Even more dramatic differences exist between the graduates and drop-outs for the post-secondary outcomes. By 2009, 68.7% of the high school graduates had entered college at some point during the 8 year period and 33.1% of them had a

---

1 For cohort 2002, the accuracy of social security numbers yielded 84% clean records ready to use for the analysis.
college degree. However, of the high school drop-outs, only 17.7% had entered college by 2009 and only 1.5% (a total of 8 out of 537) had graduated from college.

The following pages discuss the workforce and post-secondary outcomes for the high school graduates and drop-outs in cohort 2002 in more detail.
Results

Workforce Participation of High School Graduates and Non-graduates

Figure 1 shows the affiliation of 2002 Baltimore County Public School High School graduates and non-graduates with the Maryland workforce. The figure shows that as time goes by, the employment gap between graduates and non-graduates increases. In 2002, right after graduation, 10.2% of the high school graduates were employed full-time in Maryland as compared to 7.3% of non-graduates. By 2009, over 38% of graduates are employed full-time are compared to 17.7% of non-graduates. These figure represent a large difference in the growth in employment rate between the graduates and non-graduates over the seven year period: 38.2% growth versus 17.7% growth respectively.

The recession of 2008 seems to have affected the non-graduates more than the graduates based on a drop of 7.1 percentage points in employed non-graduates from 2008 to 2009 compared to 3.1 percentage points among high school graduates.
Figure 2 indicates the number of 2002 BCPS high school graduates employed in adjacent states and with the Federal Government. In 2008, 4.1% of graduates work for the federal government while 5.3% work outside of Maryland in other capacities. On the other hand, in 2009 2.1% of non-graduates work for the federal government while 4.5% work outside of Maryland in other capacities.

Federal employment could not be broken down by agency and year due to the small numbers of students, but of the students with federal employment, 50.6% were affiliated with the Department of Defense, 42.6% with the Office of Personnel Management, and 6.8% with the United States Postal Service. Interestingly, of the 2.1% of non-graduates who work in the federal government, all of them work in the department of defense. This suggests that, other than the military, it is difficult for non-graduates to obtain employment within the federal government without the high school diploma.

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 3 shows that as time goes on, the gap in earnings between graduates and non-graduates is greatly increased. In 2002, graduates and non-graduates made on average very similar annual salaries, but by 2009, the median annual income for graduates was $10,000 more than for non-graduates. Furthermore, after seven years in the workforce, the graduates had almost doubled their salaries from 2002 to 2009, whereas the drop-outs’ salaries increased by about 42% on average in the 7 years since leaving BCPS.
Post-secondary Participation between High School Graduates and Non-graduates

Based upon data from the National Student Clearinghouse, the percentage of 2002 BCPS graduates who attended college within their first year after high school was 59%. By 2009, 31% of the 2002 graduates had attained a college degree. By contrast, by 2009, only 20% of non-graduates in the 2002 cohort (89 students) attended college at any time during their years out of high school. Out of those, only 10% (or approximately 8 students) had attained a college degree. In the next sections, it will become clear what the additive benefits are of attaining a college education for former BCPS students.
The Additive Benefits of a College Education

Figure 3 looks only at students who did not graduate from high school (non-graduates) and compares median annual earnings for those who had some college versus those who never attended college during the seven years since leaving high school. The data show the clear, long-term earnings advantage those non-graduates who attend at least some college against those who did not attend any college. In 2002, both groups of non-graduates had very similar median annual earnings at just above $16,000 per annum. At time goes on and some of the non-graduates begin attending college, those non-graduates who do not attend college make more money on average than those who are participating in college. However, by 2008, those non-graduates who are able to say that they have acquired at least some college begin making more money and in 2009 their salaries continue to climb and surpass those who did not attend college.
Figure 5 shows the median annual earnings for all students in the 2002 cohort, regardless of their high school graduation status. This figure shows that regardless of high school completion status, graduating college provides a great advantage to students in terms of long-term earnings. In fact, after 7 years, the median annual earnings of students with some college look very similar to those who have had no college, but those students who graduated from college make a full $9,000 on average than the other groups.

![Figure 5 Median Annual Earnings by College Participation](image)

Differences in the “Quality” of Work

An analysis of employment patterns by industry sector (based upon NAIS employment affiliation codes) was performed on those students in the 2002 cohort who were employed in Maryland either full- or part-time. This analysis showed major differences in the type of work that students do based upon their educational status. Students who graduate from high school work in very different industries than those who drop-out of high school. Students who go to college and obtain a degree obtain different type of work than those who finish high school. Indeed, the analyses speak clearly to the need to obtain as
much education as possible, but at the very minimum, completing a high school diploma is critical to obtaining adequate and rewarding work.

Table 6 shows the top employment industries for students in the 2002 cohort who obtained a high school diploma. The table shows employment trends from 2003 (a year after graduation) to 2009 (seven years after graduation). When you look at the trends, immediately after high school, students are working mostly in retail/trade and the food industry. As time goes on, fewer of these high school graduates are working in the food industry and their employment seems to be balanced between health/social assistance and retail/trade. For high school graduates, the profession/science/technical industry grows over the seven years. Other industries where high school graduates are employed include construction, educational services, and administrative support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Serv</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Sc</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Social As</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative S</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Trade</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomodations/Fo</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Top Employment Industries for High School Graduates
2003 to 2009
Table 7 shows the employment NAIS affiliations for those students who did not graduate from high school. For the entire seven year period, the majority of the group remained employed primarily in two industries: food and retail trade. Administrative support/waste management also remained large for this group. Two industries that grew over the seven years from 2003 to 2009 were construction and health/social assistance. It appears that high school drop-outs are working primarily in service industries.

![Table 7: Top Employment Industries for Non-Graduates 2003-2009](chart)

- **Health/Social Assistance**: 6.7% to 13.3%
- **Construction**: 7.1% to 10.2%
- **Admin. Supp/Waste Mgmt.**: 11.5% to 13.8%
- **Retail Trade**: 28.1% to 21.9%
- **Accomodations/Food**: 22.5% to 19.9%
Table 8 shows the industry affiliations for those students who never attended college, regardless of whether or not they graduated from high school. What’s interesting about this graph is that it look quite the same as the graph for the high school dropouts. The majority of the group is employed in retail trade, food, and construction. This trend remains stable throughout the seven year period. One difference that may be unique to this group is the incidence of retail trade decreasing over the years. What’s interesting about that is the fact that as this industry decreases, so does the percentage of those members of this sub-group who are actually employed. This implies that it might be difficult for students, whether or not the graduated from high school, to “break out” of the retail industry without at least a minimal college education.
Table 9 shows the top employment industries for BCPS graduates and non-graduates who attended some college, but did not graduate from college. For these students, starting out being employed in retail/trade and food industries is not uncommon. However, by 2009, about the same percentage of students are employed in retail trade as are employed in health/social assistance. In fact, over time as the sector of retail trade decreases, the health trades increases.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Scientific/Tech Svc.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Supp./Waste Mgmt.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Social Assistance</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomodations/Food</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 indicates the top employment industries for BCPS graduates and non-graduates who graduated from college. As most of the students, regardless of their educational outcomes, these students started out their employment histories working in retail trade and food industries. However, by 2009, after receiving a college degree, the employment industries are split between those who work in health/social assistance, professional/science/technical, and educational services. Unique to this group compared to all of the previous groups are the fact that no-one is employed in the construction industry, retail trade and accommodations/food are among the lowest fields of employment for 2009, and educational services is among the top employment fields in 2009. This implies that students who go on to complete a college education have a higher potential for obtaining employment in professional fields than those who do not. At a time in our society where the economic forecast is not the best, having a professional career becomes a symbol for having better job stability as well as higher salaries.

Table 10
Top Employment Industries for Graduates and Non-graduates Who Received a College Degree: 2003-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Educational Services</th>
<th>Professional/Science/Tech</th>
<th>Health/Social Assistance</th>
<th>Retail Trade</th>
<th>Accommodations/Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Implications of Dropping Out of High School

The results of an analysis of the Maryland welfare records revealed that a larger percentage of non-graduates than graduates ended up on welfare between 2003 and 2009. That is not surprising. What is startling is the increase in welfare recipients over time among the non-graduates compared to the graduates. In 2003, two-thirds of one percent of the graduates was on welfare compared to 1.6% among the non-graduates. By 2009, the differences stand out immensely. Only 0.8% of the graduates were on welfare compared to 4.3% of the non-graduates. For the non-graduates, the percent increase from 2003 to 2009 was 169%, meaning that the percentage of non-graduates who were on welfare more than doubled within seven years. This is extraordinary and speaks to the importance of educational completion for the larger, societal implications. Clearly, attaining a high school education has a direct impact upon poverty for students.

![Table 11](image_url)
Conclusions and Implications

Workforce Implications

This study has highlighted the importance of educational completion through pointing out the stark differences in employment and salary outcomes between those students who dropped out of high school as well as those students who went forward with education beyond high school. According to the data, without at least a high school diploma, the long-term job and earnings prospects for students are poor.

This research clearly indicates that the more education students obtain, the more likely they are to obtain full-time employment and earn the higher annual salaries. Completion of a high school diploma increases a student’s long-term earnings potential and completion of a college degree improves the likelihood of obtaining and sustaining employment over the long-term as well as improves prospects for the kind of work that students are able to sustain.

Social Implications

Without the high school diploma, the likelihood that students will be earning below minimum wage or be on welfare is much larger than for those who do complete high school. In addition, it appears that these students continue to make low wages over time. While a very small percentage (less than five percent) of former Baltimore County students are on the welfare rolls, the data present a story that is very sad for those who do not obtain the high school diploma. Compared to high school graduates, drop-outs are four times more likely to be on welfare seven years after leaving high school. In addition, after seven years out, the percentage of drop-outs found on the welfare rolls more than doubles, while that of high school graduates remains at almost zero. Students clearly obtained employment immediately following their departure from high school. However, the longer they stayed out, and the older they became, they feel behind their peers and their employment outcomes fell well below where they could have been had they obtained the high school diploma.

The impact of recession is felt much harder in people who did not have a high school diploma but were almost not felt by those who had completed college. The data show that from 2008 to 2009, when the recession was at its peak, the drop-outs were more likely to lose employment than were those who graduated from high school. During this period, not only did employment decline for drop-outs, so did their annual earning. At this same time, the annual earnings of high-school graduates increased! The social implications here are clear. When students persist in their educational goals, among the benefits are career and financial sustainability.

The BCPS Blueprint for Progress indicates in Goal 5 that all students will graduate from high school. For those students for whom this did not come true, after five, six, and seven years out of high school they begin to realize the problems associated with dropping out. These results of this analysis of workforce outcomes for BCPS graduates and non-graduates make it clear why this goal is so important. For long-term financial stability as well as social and economic well-being, it is important for students to maintain and attain their educational goals.
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Executive Summary

The National Student Clearinghouse is a nonprofit organization that collects and verifies student academic achievement in higher education on a national level. The Clearinghouse provides school districts, universities, and agencies information about students’ educational outcomes.

The Clearinghouse has developed a partnership with Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) to track the post secondary achievement of our students. These outcomes include college attendance rates, first and second year college retention rates, and degree completion rates.

Highlights of the summary report include:

- The percentage of students who enrolled in college immediately after graduating from high school increased from 54% in 2003 to 62% in 2010.
- The percentage of students who enrolled in college within one year of graduating from Baltimore County Public Schools increased from 62% in 2005 to 67% in 2009\(^1\).
- Of the students who enrolled in college within the first year after graduating high school in 2008, 87% returned for a second year of college.
- The top five colleges of initial enrollment are: Community College of Baltimore County; Towson University; University of Maryland-College Park; University of Maryland-Baltimore County; and Stevenson University.
- The college attendance rate increased for African American students by 8.6 percentage points from 49.0% in 2004 to 57.6% in 2008. For Hispanic students the college attendance rate increased by 10.8 percentage points from 41.3% in 2004 to 52.1% in 2008.
- Of students who have been out of high school since 2003, 33.5% have earned a college degree.
- The degree type earned most by BCPS graduates is the Bachelor of Science.

---

\(^1\) Cohort 2009 had not been out of high school a full year at the time of this report and therefore should not be compared.
National Student Clearinghouse Student Tracker Study
Summary of 2010 Data for Baltimore County Public Schools

The National Student Clearinghouse is a nonprofit organization that collects and verifies student academic achievement in higher education on a national level. The Clearinghouse provides school districts, universities, and agencies information about students’ educational outcomes.

The Clearinghouse has developed a partnership with Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) to track the post secondary achievement of our students. These outcomes include college attendance rates, first and second year college retention rates, and degree completion rates.

The following report represents data collected from BCPS graduates starting with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2010.

**District Level Results**

The percentage of students from BCPS enrolling in college immediately following high school graduation has increased over the span of eight years from 54% for the graduating class of 2003 to 62% for those who graduated in 2010. In 2010, 54% of those who enrolled immediately following graduation entered a 4-year college or university. In addition, 23% of those who enrolled immediately following graduation went to school at an out-of-state institution.

![Percent of Students Enrolled in College the Fall Immediately Following Graduation From High School (District Wide)](chart.png)
As the year after high school progresses, more BCPS graduates enroll in college. The percentage of students who enroll in college during the first year after high school increased from 62% in 2005 to 67% in 2009\(^2\).

Moreover, BPCS graduates who enroll in college within the first year after high school demonstrate high levels of retention entering their sophomore year. For the class of 2004, 85% of BCPS graduates who enrolled in college within the first year after high school returned for a second year. For the class of 2008, the second year retention rate increased to 87%, as it has been since 2008.

\(^2\) Cohort 2010 had not been out of high school a full year at the time of this report and therefore should not be compared.
BCPS graduates enroll in a variety of schools, both in- and out-of-state. The top five colleges that BCPS graduates enroll in initially are:

1. Community College of Baltimore County
2. Towson University
3. University of Maryland-College Park
4. University of Maryland-Baltimore County
5. Stevenson University

The top five out-of-state colleges in which graduates enroll initially are:

1. York College of Pennsylvania
2. University of Delaware
3. West Virginia University
4. Pennsylvania State University
5. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

**Attendance Rates by Demographic Characteristics**

The college attendance rates have increased over the years for certain demographic groups. The percentage of female graduates that attended college within one year after graduating from high school...
has increased from 60.9% in 2003 to 67.85% in 2010. Similarly, the attendance rates for males increased from 48.98% in 2003 to 63.00% in 2010.

Dramatic increases in the percentage of BCPS graduates who attended college within the first year were documented for students of different ethnic backgrounds from 2003 to 2010. For African American graduates, the percentage who attended college within the first year increased from 44.6% in 2003 to 57.7% in 2010. Similar increases were documented for American Indian students (48.15% to 68.00%), White students (58.69% to 66.42%), and Hispanic students (39.81% to 45.53%).
College Completion Outcomes

In the 8 years since the 2003 cohort has graduated from high school, 33.5% of those who enrolled in college have completed and attained some sort of college degree or certificate. The table below shows the most popular degree earned by Baltimore County Public Schools graduates in cohorts 2003 through 2010. Of those graduates who had obtained a degree by 2010, the degree type earned most often was the Bachelor of Science at 37.9%. A substantial number (24.8%) of degree holders earned a Bachelor of Arts degree. This is followed by the Associate of Arts (14.3%) and Associate of Applied Science (4.7%). Smaller percentages of students earned Bachelor’s degrees in Business Administration (2.9%) and Engineering (2.5%). Others received Nursing degrees (0.8%) and Teaching credentials (0.6%). Not shown in the table below are a small percentage of students who received MBA, MD, Ph.D., MFA, MSW, and JD, among other, degrees.
Degree Fields with the Highest Percentage of Graduates*
By High School Graduation Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>37.77%</td>
<td>42.01%</td>
<td>39.07%</td>
<td>37.01%</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>37.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>26.15%</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>28.56%</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
<td>11.15%</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>60.54%</td>
<td>77.46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Applied Science</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor in Business Administration</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Engineering</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Nursing</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages won’t add to 100 since those degree fields with total percentages lower than .6 are not shown.
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That the Board of Education receives an update on Strategic Planning.

*****

Attachment I – Executive Summary
Attachment II – PowerPoint presentation
Strategic Planning Update
Executive Summary

Over the past ten years, many variables have impacted the way school systems deliver services and the instructional program to meet the expanding and evolving needs of students and community expectations.

The objective of the strategic planning process of Baltimore County Public Schools is to plan for and help the school system manage enrollment growth, decline, and programmatic changes. Strategic planning activities are managed through the Office of Strategic Planning within the Department of Planning and Support Operations. As a function of the Business Services Division of the school system, many strategic planning activities are collaborative efforts among departments within the division as together we fulfill the BCPS Service Model and strive to achieve Goal 8 of the Blueprint for Progress: *all students will receive a quality education through the efficient and effective use of resources and the delivery of business services.*

The Office of Strategic Planning is responsible for:

- Development of timely and accurate enrollment projections.
- Coordination of the school boundary change process.
- Collaboration with external partners that benefit schools and support system priorities.
- Coordination of short- and mid-term capacity relief efforts
- Alignment of the Education Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) with comprehensive strategic plans with capital and operating budgets.

In fulfillment of its responsibilities, the Office of Strategic Planning produces a number of reports such as the annual Enrollment, Capacity, and Projections report and the Education Facilities Master Plan and spearheads projects such as utilization studies and yield factor studies.

The 2010 system wide student enrollment (as of September 30, 2010) is 104,331. Student enrollment is projected to gradually increase over the next five years to 107,309 and then in ten years to 109,316. The Office of Strategic Planning calculates projections using both live birth data and actual trend experience for student enrollment and grade level advancement (termed cohort survival). BCPS projection accuracy has met the Blueprint for Progress standard of 99.0% for the past five years. Enrollment projections are used across the school system in important forecasting and decision making processes including establishing the school system budget and advancing the capital improvement program.

Within five years system wide available capacity as calculated by the Maryland State Department of Education State Rated Capacity (SRC) formula will be insufficient to meet projected enrollment needs at the elementary school level. At the middle school level, total projected enrollment is expected to be within 80% of capacity and high schools within 92% of capacity. SRC does not include relocatable classroom units, which are utilized as part of the school system’s overall capacity relief program.
The Baltimore County Board of Education owns 13 sites around the county in addition to properties where schools, program, centers, and offices may be located. Of these 13 sites, previous site bank studies have identified eight as potentially viable for the construction of a school and five that may be used as leverage for the acquisition of other properties.

In his presentation of the FY2012 budget, Dr. Hairston stated, “As we remain steadfast in our delivery of the highest quality education regardless of a child’s zip code, race, culture, or economic circumstances, these variables have, without a doubt, impacted all aspects of our operations. As we manage changing variables, our focus is persistent on delivery of service to all students, which strategically positions Baltimore County Public Schools as one of the most successful school systems in our state and nation!”
Blueprint For Progress

Performance Goal 8

All students will receive a quality education through the efficient and effective use of resources and the delivery of business services.
Mission: to promote and support a quality of education for all students through the effective, efficient, and integrated planning and delivery of services and resources.

- Fiscal Services
- Human Resources
- Information Technology
- Physical Facilities
- Planning and Support Operations
BCPS Planning Process

Objective: to plan for and help the school system manage enrollment growth, decline, and programmatic changes.
Responsibilities:

• Development of timely and accurate enrollment projections
• Coordination of the school boundary change process
• Collaboration with external partners that benefit schools and support system priorities
• Coordination of short- and mid-term capacity relief efforts
• Alignment of Education Facilities Master Plan with comprehensive strategic plans with capital and operating budgets
PROJECTS

HIGH SCHOOL FACILITY UTILIZATION STUDY

Carver Center
Catonsville
Chesapeake
Dulaney
Dundalk
Eastern Tech.
Franklin
Hereford
Kenwood
Lansdowne
Loch Raven
Milford Mill
New Town
Overlea
Owings Mills
Parkville
Patapsco
Perry Hall
Pikesville
Randallstown
Sollers Point
Sparrows Point
Towson
Western Tech.
Woodlawn

November 19, 2003

DEJONG
an educational planning firm

Baltimore County Public Schools

2009 Pupil Yield Factor Study: Update

August, 2009
## Current and Projected Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current 2010</th>
<th>5 Year 2015</th>
<th>10 Year 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104,331</td>
<td>107,309</td>
<td>109,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>49,314</td>
<td>51,272</td>
<td>52,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>22,272</td>
<td>23,094</td>
<td>23,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31,202</td>
<td>31,437</td>
<td>32,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment History

BCPS Enrollments 1940-2010 and Projected 2011-2020
Blueprint For Progress Goal 8.5: “The student enrollment projections will have a 99.0% accuracy rate”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Official Enrollment</th>
<th>+/- Projection</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Indicator Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>107,100</td>
<td>106,182</td>
<td>-918</td>
<td>99.14%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>105,330</td>
<td>104,714</td>
<td>-616</td>
<td>99.42%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>103,380</td>
<td>103,643</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>99.75%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>104,155</td>
<td>103,832</td>
<td>-323</td>
<td>99.69%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>104,012</td>
<td>104,331</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>99.69%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Birth Data

Baltimore County Births and Kindergarten Enrollments

- Live Births 5 Years Prior
- Kindergarten Enrollments

Birth Data Source: Baltimore County Health Department
Birth Data by Planning Region
### “Cohort Survival” data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>BIR</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>1ST</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>2ND</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>3RD</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>4TH</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>5TH</th>
<th>TTL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>74.74%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91.94%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>111.11%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>107.41%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>102.86%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96.25%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73.53%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>104.23%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101.75%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>101.72%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>105.56%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101.33%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85.53%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>101.69%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102.35%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>103.95%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98.57%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.69%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86.24%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91.95%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>101.27%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111.59%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98.21%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Methodology required by the MSDE Public School Construction Guide.
- Examination of progression (graduation) from year to year.
- Analysis of ratios over 2-3 years.
Variables That Influence Public Education in America

Local Government
Local School Board
Superintendent
Central Office
Principals
Schools

Public Confidence
National Defense
Legislative Congress
Executive
President
Secretary of Education
Courts
National Policy
Judicial
Federal Courts
Global Society
Economic Forecast
Employment Needs
Future Work Force
Business Schools
Social Trends
International Market
International Trade
State Economy
Higher Education
Higher Education
Community Values
Community Values
Family Values
Family Values
Equity Issue
Equity Issue
Global Economy
Global Economy
National
State
Community
Local School Board
All Means All: Demographic Inversion & Implications for Student Achievement
Total Population Trend for Baltimore Metropolitan Region

Source: Baltimore Metropolitan Council
Economic Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$38,837</td>
<td>$64,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Household Units</td>
<td>268,280</td>
<td>308,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baltimore Metropolitan Council
Minority Enrollment

* Categories for Multiracial and Hawaiian/Pacific Island were not tracked in 1980.

BCPS in 1980 *

BCPS in 2010

* Categories for Multiracial and Hawaiian/Pacific Island were not tracked in 1980.
English Language Learners

124.1% increase

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010

1,787 2,030 2,189 2,162 2,407 2,893 2,944 3,285 3,365 4,005
Homeless Students

* 2010 data is year to date

- 2001: 314
- 2002: 659
- 2003: 685
- 2004: 805
- 2005: 971
- 2006: 1230
- 2007: 1388
- 2008: 1441
- 2009: 1738
- 2010: 1662

429.3% increase

* 2010 data is year to date
Prekindergarten Program

217.62% increase
Total Schools, Centers, and Programs

2010

- Schools
  - Elementary 106
  - Middle 27
  - High 24
  - Sub-total 157

- Special Education Schools 4
- Centers 10
- Programs 2
- Total 173
State Rated Capacity (SRC)

“Maximum number of students that reasonably can be accommodated in a facility without significantly hampering delivery of the educational program.”

Public Schools Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide

- Formula determined and all changes approved by MSDE
- Based on building design and classroom utilization
- Relocatable classrooms are not included in SRC
## Schools and School Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State Rated Capacity</td>
<td>116,716</td>
<td>111,532</td>
<td>-5,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary School Enrollments and Capacity

Capacity Analyses

SRC Changes

Full Day K Complete

Enrollment (FTE)
High School Capacity Trends

High School Enrollments and Capacity

SRC Changes

Capacity and Enrollment trends from 2000 to 2020.
Managing Capacity and Enrollment

• Increasing levels of enrollment/capacity trigger progressive responses and considerations for providing relief:
  • 90% of capacity – BCPS considers strategies for providing relief
  • 95% of capacity – MSDE requirement for capital budget consideration
  • 115% of capacity (15% over capacity) - Baltimore County Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance
Relief Strategies/Managing Resources

Strategies For Providing Relief

- Capital construction
- Permanent/Modular Addition
- Renovations
- Purchase additional relocatable units
- Enrollment caps/Annexing/Redistricting
- Use of existing relocatable units
- Room use recommendations
- Capacity analysis
Examples of Hypothetical Analysis

9/30/2010 BCPS Elementary Schools Over and Under Capacity

BCPS Elementary Schools
Over and Under Capacity

Number following school name indicates amount over or under capacity. Negative numbers indicate under capacity.

9/30/2010 BCPS Middle Schools Over and Under Capacity

BCPS Middle Schools
Over and Under Capacity

Number following school name indicates amount over or under capacity. Negative numbers indicate under capacity.

TABLE: 2020-2027 BCPS Elementary and Middle Schools Over/Under Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Over/Under Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School A</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School B</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Under 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School C</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Over 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School D</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Under 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baltimore County Public Schools
Office of Strategic Planning, October 2010
Examples of Hypothetical Analysis

**Hypothetical September 30, 2010 Elementary School Enrollments with In-Boundary 5th Graders Attending Home Middle Schools**

**Hypothetical September 30, 2010 Middle School Enrollments with In-Boundary 5th Graders Attending Home Middle Schools**

**Methodology:**
All 2010 Grade 5 students assumed to attend home middle school.

Prepared by the Baltimore County Public Schools
Office of Strategic Planning, November 2010
Examples of Hypothetical Analysis

Regional/systemwide redistricting considerations:
- Feeder patterns
- Community school concept
- Geography
- Accuracy of predictive analysis
- Special permission options and programmatic placements
Residential Development Potential

Approved plans and Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)

- Excludes senior housing and non-residential development
- Excludes development with less than 5 lots available yield

Source: Baltimore County Office of Planning, SLIST Database, March 1, 2011
# Planning Priorities

## Capital Planning Priorities and Recommended Timelines FY 2012 - FY 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 seats New NW Area ES</td>
<td>500 seats New NW Area ES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>200 seats Stoneleigh ES</td>
<td>200 seats Stoneleigh ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td>300 seats Hampton Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 seats Sparks Cluster</td>
<td>200 seats Sparks Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 seats Lutherville Cluster</td>
<td>500 seats Lutherville Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Phase:**
- Hampton Cluster - Timonium ES, Lutherville ES
- Sparks Cluster - Fifth District ES, Prettyboy ES, Seventh District ES, Sparks ES
- Lutherville Cluster - Lutherville ES, Pinewood ES, Pot Spring ES, Padonia, ES, Timonium ES, Riderwood ES, West Towson ES

**Planning Funding:**

Prepared by the Baltimore County Public Schools, Office of Strategic Planning, 09/2010
BCPS Site Bank Properties

Total Number of Sites: 13

Site studies conclude:
- 5 “leverage” sites
- 8 viable sites
- All sites subject to MSDE approval
“As we remain steadfast in our delivery of the highest quality education regardless of a child’s zip code, race, culture, or economic circumstances, these variables have, without a doubt, impacted all aspects of our operations.

As we manage changing variables, our focus is persistent on delivery of service to all students, which strategically positions Baltimore County Public Schools as one of the most successful school systems in our state and nation!”

Joe A. Hairston
FY 2012 Budget Presentation
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE CONCEPTUAL K-4/5-8 STEM ACADEMY FOR THE NORTHWEST AREA

ORIGINATOR: Roger Plunkett, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S):

RECOMMENDATION

To inform the Board of Education of the opportunity to provide a K-4/5-8 STEM Academy in the Northwest area.

*****

Attachment I – Executive Summary
Attachment II – PowerPoint Slide
Baltimore County Public Schools has a unique opportunity to provide a comprehensive and focused STEM instructional program that will include grades kindergarten through eighth grade. The proposed instructional program includes a strong focus on science, math, and technology. To continue this strong focus and to provide the Northwest area students with an elementary and middle school with a strong focus on these subjects, staff has been directed to explore a K-4/5-8 STEM Academy.

STEM education plays a critical role in our country’s competitiveness and future economic prosperity. In his “Educate to Innovate” campaign, President Obama stated “Reaffirming and strengthening America’s role as the world’s engine of scientific discovery and technological innovation is essential to meeting the challenges of this century.” During President Obama’s visit to Parkville Middle School on February 14, 2011, he emphasized the importance of STEM education and that improving STEM education is one of his top priorities. Baltimore County Public Schools under Dr. Hairston’s leadership has been, and continues to be, a leader in focusing on a quality instructional program that results in all students doing better in math, the sciences, and language arts as stated in Performance Goal 1 in the Blueprint for Progress. Developing the K-4/5-8 STEM Academy for students in the Northwest area will provide a quality STEM academic program.

As educational leaders, we must be proactive in expanding our academic programs while addressing our growing student population. As the enrollment in the Northwest elementary schools continues to grow in these challenging fiscal times, exploring the possibility of moving a fifth grade into a middle school with the provision of a seamless instructional program focused on STEM is an outstanding opportunity.

In adherence to the Belief Statement in the Blueprint for Progress: We believe that improved student achievement requires families and communities to be partners in the educational process,” parents, teachers, and community stakeholders will be included in the development of this exciting and unique opportunity in the Northwest area as staff explores the K-4/5-8 STEM Academy, the operational changes that will need to occur, and the fiscal implications of this innovative strategy.
Ensuring Student Success Through STEM Education

Proposed Northwest K-4/5-8 STEM Academy

**CURRICULUM**
- Integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math
- Research Driven
- Engineering Is Elementary
- 21st Century Skills
- Gateway to Technology
- Inquiry Based Science
- Environmental Education
- Reading/Writing Initiative

**INSTRUCTION**
- Project Based Learning
- Exploring
- Inventing
- Cooperative Learning
- Researching/Data Collecting
- Higher Order Thinking
- Connecting to Real Life Experiences
- Student Centered Activities

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**
- Inquiry Science
- Gateway to Technology
- Engineering is Elementary
- Project Based Learning
- Cultural Proficiency
- Project SEED

**PARTNERSHIPS**

**ASSESSMENT:** Formative & Summative, Progress Monitoring, Data Driven Decisions
DATE: March 22, 2011

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent


ORIGINATOR: Joe A. Hairston, Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON (S): Barbara S. Burnopp, Chief Financial Officer
Patrick M. Fannon, Controller

INFORMATION


General Fund Comparison of FY2010 and FY2011 Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances-Budget and Actual

These data are presented using Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) categories. Amounts included reflect actual revenues, expenditures, and encumbrances to date and do not reflect forecasts of revenues and expenditures. Figure 1 presents an overview of the FY2010 and FY2011 general fund revenue budget. Figure 2 provides an overview of the FY2011 general fund expenditure budget. Figure 3 compares the percent of the budget obligated as of January 31, 2010, and 2011. Figure 4 is a comparative statement of budget-to-actual revenues, expenditures, and encumbrances.
**Year-to-Date Comparison**

- **Baltimore County** – The FY2011 county appropriation decreased $7.4 million, a 1.1% reduction from the FY2010 budget. This decrease is because the FY2011 county appropriation is the minimum funding required under the state maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements. In FY2010, county appropriation exceeded MOE by 4.9%. County funds are drawn based on cash flow requirements. The year-to-date county revenue recognized is $337 million, 50.8% of the budget, as compared to $328.7 million, 49% of the budget for FY2010.

- **State of Maryland** – The FY2011 state appropriation increased $12 million, 2.4% over the FY2010 budget. The increase in the budgeted revenue is a result of an overall increase over the prior year in aid to education. The majority of state funds are received bi-monthly in equal installments. As of January 2011, four of the state payments had been received.

- **Federal** – The FY2011 federal budgeted revenue resulted primarily from funding received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. These State Fiscal Stabilization Funds are from a federal stimulus program to provide funding stabilization for stressed state budgets. These funds are to be received on a reimbursement basis. These funds are not expected to continue in FY2012.

- **Other Revenues** – The other revenue budget is comprised of re-appropriations of funds from the prior year’s fund balance, out-of-county living arrangement payments from other local education agencies, which are estimated to be $3.3 million and are generally collected at year end, tuitions, and sundry revenues. The budgeted revenue increased significantly over the prior year because of a $5 million increase in re-appropriated fund balance to $16 million from the $11 million utilized in the prior year. The year-to-date revenue consists of the re-appropriated funds, tuition and other revenues.
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances – Year-to-date expenditures and encumbrances through January 2011 are $684.4 million, 56.5% obligated compared to $670.3 million, 56% obligated, for the same period in FY2010. Salary expenditures within categories that are primarily comprised of 12-month positions (e.g., administration, mid-level administration, operation of plant, maintenance of plant, and capital outlay) average 55.3% of the budget amount and are in line considering the percent of the fiscal year that has elapsed. Salary expenditures in categories with large concentrations of 10-month school-based personnel (e.g., instructional salaries, special education, student personnel, health services, and transportation) average 50.5% of budget, which is in line with the percentage of the school year that has elapsed.
The salary budget had a net increase of approximately $25.8 million, which included $27.6 million to provide step increases and to fund a full year of salary adjustments implemented mid-year in FY2010. Other increases include additional salaries and benefits for West Towson Elementary, Imagine Discovery Public Charter School, the Infants and Toddlers program, and special education bus routes. The budget increase was offset by a reduction of $3 million for anticipated salary turnover.

The nonsalary expenditures are budgeted for an overall decrease of $11.6 million, or 2.6% less than the prior year. The decreases in these expenditures are in a number of categories throughout the budget. The budget for administration was decreased by $2.3 million, primarily because of a reduction for contracted services relating to changes in computer systems for fiscal services and human resources. The budget for mid-level administration increased by $1.2 million, a 17% increase; this increase relates primarily to additional funding for the charter school and for BCPS office budget realignments. The instructional textbook category budget was decreased by $3.2 million, which included a reduction in budgeted textbook expenditures of approximately $7.6 million, and an increase in the budget for other classroom supplies of approximately $5.6 million, which had been included in the other instructional costs category as equipment in prior years. The reduced budget for other instructional costs reflected the reclassification of the equipment to the instructional textbook category. The significant changes in other categories includes an increase of $1.2 million for expected cost increases in diesel fuel in the transportation budget; a decrease in operation of plant of $1 million for the expected overall decrease in fuel oil; and a decrease of $1.9 million in workers’ compensation expenditures in fixed charges, which is a result of plan experience.
Administration and Mid-Level Administration – The budget for nonsalary administration expenditures decreased $2.2 million, or 18.2%, from the amount budgeted last year primarily because of a decrease in consulting expenditures and equipment purchases related to the computer system upgrades in human resources and fiscal services expected to be completed this year. Mid-level administration nonsalary expenditures are budgeted for an increase of $1.2 million, or 17% over the prior year. This increase is primarily related to a $500,000 increase in the budget for the charter school for costs related to the addition of a Grade 6. The increase of $1.5 million in expenditures in mid-level administration over the expenditures of the prior year is primarily the result of the timing of an encumbrance for software products, which was recorded in August 2010. The same software cost for the previous year was not encumbered until June 2010.

Instructional Salaries – The budget for instructional salaries was increased by $19.4 million in FY2011 primarily to provide funding for salary increases and for the salary cost of the new West Towson Elementary School, which opened in August.

Instructional Textbooks and Supplies – A significant portion of the instructional textbooks and supplies category is spent early in the fiscal year as orders are placed with vendors for textbooks and classroom supplies needed for the opening of school. The FY2011 budget for this category was decreased by 11.7%, or approximately $3.2 million. This budgetary decrease is the result of a decrease in the central budget for textbooks. Significant textbook purchases were made in the prior year, and no additional funds were provided for this year.
The textbook decrease was offset by the reassignment of equipment purchases to this category by MSDE; these purchases were included in the other instructional costs category in past years. To date, $14.7 million, 61% of the FY2011 budgeted instructional textbook and supplies funds, has been committed; the remaining budget will be spent during the school year to purchase additional consumable classroom supplies, textbooks, and other media.

- **Other Instructional Costs** – This category is comprised of commitments for contracted services, staff development, and other costs used to support the instructional programs. The budget for this category decreased $6.3 million, or 44.1%, from that of the prior year. This is due to the change by MSDE in the definition of equipment, which resulted in costs moving from this category to the instructional textbooks and supplies category. To date, $5.6 million, 70.6% of the FY2011 budgeted funds, have been committed. In the prior year, $5.6 million, 39.4%, had been committed. It is expected that the remaining funds will be utilized by year end.

- **Special Education** – The special education category includes costs associated with the educational needs of students receiving special education services. The FY2011 salary budget includes funding for salary increases of approximately $1.2 million. Of the FY2011 special education nonsalary budget of $41.4 million, $34.7 million (84%) is now estimated for placement of children in nonpublic schools. To date, $31.5 million of the funds for nonpublic placement have been committed, compared with $28.3 million committed at January 2010. This change is due to earlier encumbrance of projected nonpublic services.

- **Student Personnel and Health Services** – Year-to-date FY2011 expenditures for student personnel and health services are currently in line with the budget.

- **Transportation** – This category includes all costs associated with providing school transportation services for students between home, school, and school activities. Much of the transportation nonsalary budget is committed early in the fiscal year to reflect the anticipated annual expenditures for contracts with private bus operators, fuel for vehicles, cost of bus maintenance, and other nonsalary expenditures. The nonsalary budget increased by approximately $1.6 million, which is primarily attributable to an expected increase in diesel fuel costs. As of January 2011, 90.6% of the nonsalary budget had been committed compared to 92.2% committed in the prior fiscal year.

- **Operation of Plant** – This category contains personnel salary costs for care and upkeep of grounds and buildings. Additionally, costs of utilities (including telecommunications costs, gas and electric, fuel oil, sewer, and water) are also included. The nonsalary expenditure budget for this category has decreased $1.9 million, a 3.9% decrease over the prior year. This decrease is primarily attributable to an anticipated decrease in the cost of fuel oil. Encumbrances for utilities have been established for approximately the full amount of the budgeted annual costs of $29 million. Other expenditures in this category include the cost of building rent, $5.2 million; custodial supplies, $1.7 million; trash removal, $1.3 million; and other related expenditures. As of January 2011, 92.1% of the nonsalary budget has been committed, compared to 92.2% committed at January 2010.
• **Maintenance of Plant and Capital Outlay** – The maintenance category consists of activities related to the service and upkeep of building systems and grounds. The nonsalary expenditure budget for this category increased 3.3% over the prior year. Year-to-date nonsalary expenditures and encumbrances are $14 million, 86.5% of the budgeted amount, as compared with $14.3 million, or 91.5%, in the prior fiscal year. Capital outlay nonsalary expenditures are over the budgeted amount as of January 2011, as compared to 66.9% expended in January 2010. The amount in excess of the budget resulted from encumbrances relating to repairing greenhouses at two schools that were damaged by the storms last winter. The budget overage will be resolved by a supplemental appropriation for insurance proceeds which will occur subsequent to the final repair costs being determined.

• **Fixed Charges** – This category includes the cost of employee benefits and other fixed costs. Health insurance and employer FICA consume 70% and 22% of the fixed charges budget, respectively. The FY2011 budget includes a decrease of $1.9 million resulting from a change in the workers’ compensation plan experience. The additional costs of FICA expenses related to increased salaries are offset by a decrease in health care costs.
## Baltimore County Public Schools
### Comparison of FY 2010 and FY 2011 Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances
#### Budget and Actual
##### For the Periods Ended January, 2010 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>Adjusted as of 01/31/10</td>
<td>Remaining as of 01/31/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baltimore County</strong></td>
<td>$670,539,211</td>
<td>$328,701,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Maryland</strong></td>
<td>498,627,524</td>
<td>327,422,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td>8,439,290</td>
<td>3,163,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>19,125,468</td>
<td>13,514,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,196,731,493</td>
<td>$672,801,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures and Encumbrances:
- **Administration**
  - Salary: $23,197,419
  - Non-Salary: $12,123,528
  - Subtotal: $35,320,947
- **Mid-Level Administration**
  - Salary: $7,469,087
  - Non-Salary: $4,040,082
  - Subtotal: $11,509,169
- **Instruction**
  - Instructional Salaries
    - Salary: $441,427,940
    - Non-Salary: $27,320,909
  - Other Instructional Costs
    - Non-Salary: $14,308,242
- **Special Education**
  - Salary: $105,222,816
  - Non-Salary: $40,611,980
  - Subtotal: $145,834,796
- **Student Personnel**
  - Salary: $8,152,546
  - Non-Salary: $212,582
  - Subtotal: $8,365,128
- **Health Services**
  - Salary: $13,143,736
  - Non-Salary: $494,111
  - Subtotal: $13,637,847
- **Student Transportation**
  - Salary: $31,578,328
  - Non-Salary: $22,157,671
  - Subtotal: $53,735,999
- **Operation of Plant**
  - Salary: $39,274,589
  - Non-Salary: $50,092,041
  - Subtotal: $89,366,630
- **Maintenance of Plant**
  - Salary: $11,637,912
  - Non-Salary: $15,690,679
  - Subtotal: $27,328,591
- **Fixed Charges**
  - Non-Salary: $252,688,706
- **Capital Outlay**
  - Salary: $2,865,121
  - Non-Salary: $426,665
  - Subtotal: $3,291,786

### Total Revenues:
- **2010:** $1,196,731,493
- **2011:** $1,210,897,859

---


---

**Figure 4**
March 1, 2011

Dr. Joe A. Hairston  
Superintendent  
Baltimore County Public Schools  
6901 Charles Street  
Towson, MD 21204

Dear Dr. Hairston:

The Maryland State Department of Education Audit Office has scheduled an audit of State Aid to Education Programs of the Baltimore County Public Schools. The scope of the audit was included in the letter dated February 22, 2011.

The audit will encompass program financial activities and compliance with Federal and State laws, MSDE bylaws, internal controls, and guidelines regarding program administration and enrollment reporting.

An entrance conference has been scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on March 22, 2011 in your office. The meeting will be for the purpose of discussing the scope of the audit and the procedures. The auditors plan to begin the audit immediately following the entrance conference. We respectfully request that the attached financial and statistical data be made available at the start of the audit.

If the above mentioned date and time is not convenient, please notify myself at 410-767-0104 or Mr. Johnson Boadu at 410-767-0113, (Fax: 410-333-6012) as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Preston D. Alderman, Jr., CPA, MBA
Director of Audit

PDA/JB/dgn

Attachment

c: Mr. Jason Geisinger  
Ms. Frances B. Parker  
Mr. Johnson Boadu  
Mr. Derwin Lilly

Maryland Public Schools: #1 in the Nation Three Years in a Row

marylandpublicschools.org
1. Financial Records

   A. General

      1. Operating Budget
      2. Chart of Accounts/Codes
      3. Organizational Chart showing area of responsibility
      4. Board Minutes when needed
      5. Procedures for purchases and disposal of equipment
      6. Procedures for maintaining control and accounting for fixed assets
      7. Policy and procedures for bidding
      8. Physical observation of equipment purchased with State categorical and Perkins funds in FY2010 and FY2009.
      9. Written computer security policies and procedures.

   B. State Share of Bridge to Excellence – Grant #s 104003; 900003

      1. Revenue Status Report showing local appropriations for FY2010 and FY2009.
      2. Year to Date Revenue Audit Trail for listed state grants.
      3. FY2010 and FY2009 operating budgets for budget analysis.

   C. Student Transportation – Grant #s 104177; 900161

      1. Roster of Driver Instructors and Driver/Aides.
      2. Documentation to support School Vehicle Driver’s eligibility to drive a bus.
      3. MVA annual physical examination for drivers.
      4. Documentation on driver evaluations, pre-service and in-service requirements.
      5. Insurance Records (premium, endorsement, self-insurance, etc.)
      6. Vehicle Inspection records (pre-operational checks, safety inspections, etc.)
      7. Documentation on Alcohol and Controlled Substance Use testing.

   D. Students with Disabilities – Nonpublic Placements – Grant #s 104129; 900266

      1. Expenditure report.
      2. Purchase orders and invoices.
      3. Refunds and credits (if any).
      4. Check vouchers.
2. Student Data

A. Student Enrollment as of 9-30-10 and 9-30-09 (List of sample students to be downloaded from MSDE’s Secured Server under Files aud201003 and aud201103)

1. System for accumulating and reporting students for the Foundation Program.
2. Control procedures for processing student enrollment and attendance.
4. Copies of manual classroom attendance registers, attendance roster cards, and bubble sheets, etc. for 1st day of school through October 31, of the reporting year with selected students highlighted.
5. Copies of student immunization records.
6. Student Record Card Side 1 and Side 2.
7. Copies of part-time students’ schedule of courses (students should be part of enrollment sample)
8. Computer controls – both logical and physical access to computer resources.
9. Copy of residency documentation for all students in the sample.
10. Copy of Baltimore County residency policy and procedures.

B. State Compensatory Education (FRPM Counts)

1. List of students eligible and ineligible for funding as of October 31, 2009 and October 31, 2008.
2. LSS verification process to verify approved applications.
3. Copies of applications selected for verification and supporting documentation.
4. Copies of documentation submitted for income eligibility or annotations made by the determining official.

C. Special Education

1. Sample students to be downloaded from MSDE’s Secured Server (Files BaltCoOct08_020811 and BaltCoOct09_020811)
2. Proof of age for sample students.
3. Attendance and service records such as IEPs; roll books; attendance cards, etc., for selected students.
4. Out-of-County or non-local resident students list (if any in sample).

D. Limited English Proficient Students Census

2. Description of services received by the LEP students.
3. October attendance for the selected students.
4. Program goals, objectives and selection criteria.
5. Teachers’ schedules or rosters.
6. Sample of selection and service documents (e.g. registration form, home survey, etc).
E. Disabled Student Transportation

2. Request for special transportation for sample students.
3. Request for transportation from MSD and the MSB.
4. Reimbursement request for private vehicle use—September and October of the reporting period.
5. Public carrier information (if any).

3. State Fiscal Stabilization Funds – Grant # 114069

Required Documentation

1. Award application
2. Assurances
3. Quarterly expenditure report
4. Support for reported expenditures for reimbursement

4. Comparability of Services – September 2010

1. School's enrollment report for schools on Comparability Report
2. Title I Schools staff report.
3. Explanation of difference between total students in LSS and total students in Comparability Report.
4. Comparability sample worksheet outlining school positions excluded from instructional staff.
5. Human Resource documentation of transfers/new hires to meet Title I comparability.
6. Payroll documentation supporting compensation of transfers, new hires, and selected additional instructional staff.
7. Title I Comparability Policy/Procedures.