MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

MONTHLY WORK SESSION

Tuesday, February 19, 2013
4:30 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 February 19, 2013

IV. SELECTION OF SPEAKERS

V. ADVISORY AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

VI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

VII. WORK SESSION REPORTS

A. Consideration of the proposed Board of Education policies (first reading): (Ms. Roddy)

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 3112 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Operating Budget
  Exhibit A

- Proposed Changes to Policy 3121 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES Funds Management and Classification of Expenditures
  Exhibit B

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 3122 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Classification of Expenditures
  Exhibit C

- Proposed Changes to Policy 4001 – PERSONNEL: Equal Employment Opportunity
  Exhibit D

- Proposed Changes to Policy 6200 – INSTRUCTION: School Libraries
  Exhibit E

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 6307 – INSTRUCTION: Patriotic Exercises
  Exhibit F
VII. WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 7120 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: Patterns of Participation  
  Exhibit G
- Proposed Changes to Policy 7240 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: School Site Selection and Acquisition  
  Exhibit H
- Proposed Changes to Policy 7310 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: Determination of School Design and Construction Costs  
  Exhibit I

B. Report on School Safety and Security  
   (Mr. Rauenzahn)  
   Exhibit J

C. Update on the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Process  
   (Dr. Grillo)  
   Exhibit K

VIII. INFORMATION

A. Update on Key School Legislation  
   Exhibit L

   Exhibit M

C. ISO-9001 Update  
   Exhibit N

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Board Meeting  
Tuesday, March 5, 2013  
7:00 PM  
Greenwood – ESS Building
DATE: February 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED DELETION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3112, OPERATING BUDGET

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Barbara Burnopp, Chief Financial Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 3112.
This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 3112
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3112

OPERATING BUDGET

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 3112 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 3112 establishes guidelines and target dates for the submission of the annual proposed and adopted operating budgets. Staff is recommending that the policy be deleted as the policy is simply a restatement of State law. As such, the policy is not needed.

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 3111, Budget Planning and Preparation
2. Board of Education Policy 3113, Transfers and Supplements
3. Board of Education Policy 8120, Purpose, Role, and Responsibilities of the Board of Education

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-205, Powers and duties of county superintendent
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-101, Annual school budget
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-102, Submission of and reductions to budget
4. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-103, Budget amount

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy DBB, Operating Budget
2. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy DBA, Capital Improvement Program and Budget
3. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy DAA, Fiscal Responsibility and Control
4. Prince George’s County Board of Education, Policy 3130, Fiscal Responsibility and Control – Annual Operating Budget

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
Staff considered revising the policy. No other alternatives were considered.
Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Fiscal Services

Budget: Operating Budget

1. Proposed Budget

   The budget document, as recommended by the Superintendent shall be submitted to the Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) in January, if possible. In their budget deliberations, the Board shall consider input from the community and other stakeholder groups through public hearings and/or other means. The Board shall approve an operating budget for submission to the County Executive of Baltimore County not less than 45 days before the date for levying local taxes or on an earlier date on or after March 1, as may be requested by the county fiscal authority.

2. Adopted Budget

   Following action by the Baltimore County Council, the Board shall adopt an operating budget for the fiscal year and forward a copy to the State Superintendent within 30 days after approval.

Legal Reference: Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article, §§4-205(k), 5-101, 5-102, 5-103
DATE: February 19, 2013
TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION
FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent
SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3121, FUNDS MANAGEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES
ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer
RESOURCE PERSON(S): Barbara Burnopp, Chief Financial Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 3121. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 3121
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3121

ACCOUNTING AND CASH MANAGEMENT: FUNDS MANAGEMENT
RENAMED AS “FUNDS MANAGEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES”

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 3121 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 3121 outlines the Board’s guidelines for receiving and depositing funds received. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) include a policy statement that reflects the Board’s commitment to proper accounting for all revenues received; (2) include an implementation section; (3) conform with 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 3113, Transfers
2. Board of Education Policy 3123, Reporting
3. Board of Education Policy 3125, School Activity Funds

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-102, County superintendent
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-105, Expenditure of revenues, transfer within and between major categories.

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Board of Education of Anne Arundel County, Policy DAA, Financial Management Priority Objectives
2. Board of Education of Howard County, Policy 4030, School Activity Funds
3. Board of Education of Montgomery County, Policy DAA (DAA-RA), Fiscal Responsibility and Control

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
POLICY 3121

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
[Fiscal Services]

[Accounting and Cash Management:] FUNDS MANAGEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES

I. POLICY STATEMENT

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) RECOGNIZES ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS ENTRUSTED TO IT FOR THE EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (BCPS) STUDENTS. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT SOUND FISCAL MANAGEMENT REQUIRES PROPER ACCOUNTING FOR ALL REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE BOARD.

II. STANDARDS

A. The Superintendent, as Secretary-Treasurer of the Board [of Education of Baltimore County (Board)], shall ESTABLISH [develop] procedures to ensure that:
1. [a] All funds due the Board are received and deposited in accordance with State law or regulation. [, and shall keep a full account of all monies received.]
2. THE EXPENDITURE OF REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE BOARD ARE SPENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MAJOR CATEGORIES OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET BY USING A CONSISTENT CHART OF ACCOUNTS AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FINANCIAL REPORTING MANUAL FOR MARYLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.
3. ALL GRANT BUDGETS INCLUDE INDIRECT COSTS.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

Legal ReferenceS: Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-102, COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-101, ANNUAL SCHOOL BUDGET
POLICY 3121

ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-105, EXPENDITURE OF REVENUES, TRANSFERS WITHIN AND BETWEEN MAJOR CATEGORIES.
[Annotated Code of Maryland, State Finance and Procurement Article, §6-222
Maryland Annotated Code of 1957, Article 95, §22]

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3113, TRANSFERS AND SUPPLEMENTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3123, REPORTING
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3125, SCHOOL ACTIVITY FUNDS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3330, FOOD SERVICE FINANCE

Policy Board of Education of Baltimore County
Adopted: 09/18/68
Revised: 01/14/03
Re-Adopted: 01/08/08
REVISED: __________
Baltimore County Public Schools

DATE: February 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED DELETION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3122, CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Barbara Burnopp, Chief Financial Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 3122.
This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 3122
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3122

CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 3122 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 3122 outlines the Board’s standards for classifying expenditures in compliance with financial reporting requirements established by the Maryland State Department of Education. Staff is recommending that the policy be deleted, because the proper handling of school system funds is already included in Policy 3121, Funds Management, as well as Policy 3125, School Activity Funds. As such, the policy is not needed.

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 3113, Transfer and Supplements
2. Board of Education Policy 3123, Reporting

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-101, Annual school budget

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy DAA, Financial Management Priority Objectives

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Classification of Expenditures

The code of accounts for the classification of expenditures shall be based on the approved budgets and shall be consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. The account structure shall permit compliance with the budgeting and financial reporting requirements established by the Maryland State Department of Education, as published in The Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools.

Legal Reference: Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article, §5-101

Policy
Adopted: 9/16/68
Revised: 6/19/80
Revised: 9/24/02
Readopted: 6/10/08]
DATE: February 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, 4001, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

ORIGINATOR: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Lisa Grillo, Chief Human Resource Officer

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 4001. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4001
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4001

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Board of Education Policy 4001 is scheduled for review during the 2012-2013 school year. Policy 4001 prohibits discriminatory employment actions against employees and applicants for employment in any manner prohibited by federal, state, and local laws. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) include a policy statement that includes the requirement that all employees be informed of the policy and receive training; (2) include an implementation section; and (3) conform with 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 4000, Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools
2. Board of Education Policy 4003, Recruitment and Selection
3. Board of Education Policy 4100, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
4. Board of Education Policy 4102, Sexual Harassment

Legal Requirements
5. 42 U.S.C. §2000e, et seq., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended
7. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §6-104, Discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, handicap, or sex prohibited

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy GAMM, Workforce Diversity
2. Frederick County Board of Education, Policy 309, Discrimination Unlawful
3. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 14-0001-000, Equal Employment Opportunity
4. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 1010, Discrimination
5. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy ACB, *Nondiscrimination*

**Draft of Proposed Policy**
Attached

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

**Timeline**
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
PERSONNEL: General

Equal Employment Opportunity

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) does not discriminate AGAINST EMPLOYEES OR APPLICANTS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN ANY MANNER PROHIBITED BY FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAWS. [on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, marital status, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, veteran status, or any other characteristic in its educational programs, services, or employment as provided in federal and state law.]

B. THE BOARD IS COMMITTED TO MAINTAINING A DIVERSE WORKFORCE AND A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT FOSTERS SENSITIVITY AND RESPECT FOR THE DIVERSITY OF ALL INDIVIDUALS. TO FURTHER THIS COMMITMENT, ALL EMPLOYEES WILL BE INFORMED OF THIS POLICY AND RECEIVE TRAINING REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY. [To promote student achievement and effective instruction of curriculum and services, the Board fosters equity, equal opportunity and excellence in education by recruiting, selecting, and retaining a diverse highly qualified pool of employees.]

II. IMPLEMENTATION

A. THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

Legal References:

29 U.S.C. §§621, ET SEQ., AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967, AS AMENDED
42 U.S.C. §2000d, et seq., Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended
42 U.S.C. §2000e, et seq., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended
POLICY 4001


Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §6-104, *Discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, handicap, or sex prohibited*

Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article §§20-601 to 20-609, *Discrimination in employment*

BALTIMORE COUNTY CODE, HUMAN RELATIONS ARTICLE §§29-2-201 TO 29-2-204, *EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION*

Related Policies: 
- Board of Education Policy 4000, *Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools*
- Board of Education Policy 4003, *Recruitment and Selection*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4100, *EMPLOYEE CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES*
- Board of Education Policy 4102, *Sexual Harassment*

Policy adopted: 01/27/77
Revised: 02/26/81
Revised: 01/22/08
Edited: 07/01/11
REVISED: ________

Board of Education of Baltimore County
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: February 19, 2013

To: Board of Education

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: Report on Proposed Changes to Board of Education Policy 6200, School Libraries

Originator: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

Resource Person(s): Patricia Lawton, Chief Academic Officer
John Quinn, Executive Director, Department of STEM
Della Curtis, Coordinator, Office of Library Information Services

Recommendation

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed revisions to Policy 6200, School Libraries. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6200
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6200

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 6200 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) include a policy statement; (2) include guidelines that reflect current library media program standards and expectations; (3) include an implementation section; (4) conform with 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 6002, Selection of Instructional Materials
2. Board of Education Policy 6202, Telecommunications Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks
3. Superintendent’s Rule 1120, Copyright

Legal Requirements
1. COMAR 13A.05.04.01, Public School Library Programs
2. COMAR 13A.12.03.03, Library Media Specialist

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
2. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 04-0016-000, Professional Library/Media Center
3. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 06-0022-000, School Media Centers
4. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy IIB, Evaluation and Selection

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered By Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
INSTRUCTION: Instructional Services

School Libraries

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) recognizes that school library media centers provide students and staff equitable access to the print and digital resources critical to supporting 21st century teaching and learning. THE BOARD FURTHER BELIEVES THAT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAM SUPPORTS STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT BY COLLABORATING WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE INSTRUCTION OF INFORMATION LITERACY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SKILLS INTO THE CONTENT CURRICULUM.

[The Board further recognizes that state certified library media specialists are critical partners with teachers in integrating information and technology literacy skills with all curricula by collaborating and co-teaching to positively impact the achievement of all students.

Hence, the schools shall provide and maintain adequate school libraries and ensure sufficient staffing. The Superintendent shall develop rules, regulations and procedures to insure the quality of content in these libraries and their systematic maintenance as current resources for teachers, students, and their families.]

II. GUIDELINES

A. BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (BCPS) SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAM SHALL MEET THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAMS IN MARYLAND. THE PROGRAM SHALL ALSO ADHERE TO THE MARYLAND STATE CURRICULUM IN INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS AND THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES STANDARDS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY LEARNER.

B. SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA COLLECTIONS WILL BE SELECTED AND EVALUATED CONSISTENT WITH POLICY 6002, SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.
[The Superintendent shall annually request sufficient funds to maintain these services, using the standards of the American Library Association and the Maryland School Library Media Program Standards as guides.]

III. IMPLEMENTATION

A. THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

Legal References: COMAR 13A.05.04.01, Public School Library Programs
COMAR 13A.12.03.03, Library Media Specialist

Related Policies: [Board of Education Rule 1120, Copyright]
Board of Education Policy [and Rule] 6002, Selection of Instructional Materials
Board of Education Policy [and Rule] 6202, Telecommunications Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks

RELATED RULE: SUPERINTENDENT’S RULE 1120, COPYRIGHT
DATE: February 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF POLICY 6307, READING

ORIGINATOR: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Patricia Lawton, Chief Academic Officer
Elizabeth Aitken, Executive Director, Liberal Arts
Rex Shepard, Coordinator, Secondary Social Studies

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of policy 6307. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6307
Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 6307 is scheduled for review in school year 2012–2013. Policy 6307 outlines the Board’s expectations that the American flag be displayed in each school and office. The policy also provides for conducting patriotic exercises in schools and for the daily recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance. Staff is recommending that Policy 6307 be deleted as it is simply a restatement of Maryland law. As such, the policy is not needed.

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 5600, Students’ Rights and Responsibilities
2. Board of Education Policy 6304, Commemorations and Observances

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-105, Display of flag; patriotic exercises

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy 610.01, Patriotic Exercises
2. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 9020, Students’ Rights and Responsibilities

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other options were considered.

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
INSTRUCTION

Patriotic Exercises

Provisions shall be made for the display of the flag of the United States of America on the site of each school, office, classroom or other installation of the Board of Education of Baltimore County and for the display of said flag in each classroom of every Baltimore County Public School.

It shall be the responsibility of the Superintendent to provide for appropriate patriotic exercises in the public schools. Exercises shall include the daily recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Any student or staff member, who wishes to be excused from the participation in a flag salute, shall be excused.

Legal Reference:  Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-105

Related Policies:  Board of Education Policy 5600, Students’ Rights and Responsibilities
                 Board of Education Policy 6304, Commemorations and Observances

Policy

Board of Education of Baltimore County

Adopted:  10/31/69
Revised:  4/22/08]
DATE: February 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DELETION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7120, PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Kara Calder, Executive Director, Planning and Support Operations
                    Pradeep Dixit, Executive Director, Physical Facilities

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed deletion of Policy 7120.
This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 7120
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7120

PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 7120 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 7120 outlines the process for planning, designing, and constructing school facilities. Staff is recommending that Policy 7120 be deleted, because the policy simply instructs that the Superintendent implement procedures to direct the planning for new construction projects. Policy 7110, Determining Needs, sets forth the Board’s criteria for planning school facilities. In addition, Policy 7250, School Building Design, establishes guidelines for the design of school buildings. As such, Policy 7120 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 7110, Determining Needs
2. Board of Education Policy 7250, School Building Design

Legal Requirements
None

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Frederick County Board of Education, Policy 202, Construction, Renovation and Maintenance.
4. Prince George’s County Public Schools, Policy 7100, New Construction, Capital Improvement Program.

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
Staff considered revising the policy.

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
NEW CONSTRUCTION: Planning

Patterns of Participation

The Superintendent shall establish administrative procedures to direct comprehensive planning for new construction projects.
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: February 19, 2013

To: Board of Education

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: Report on Proposed Changes to Board of Education Policy 7240, School Site Selection and Acquisition

Originator: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

Resource Person(s): Kara Calder, Executive Director, Planning and Support Operations
Pradeep Dixit, Executive Director, Physical Facilities

Recommendation

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed revisions to Policy 7240, School Sites. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 7240
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7240

SCHOOL SITES
RENAMED AS, “SCHOOL SITE SELECTION AND ACQUISITION”

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 7240 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 7240 establishes procedures and guidelines for obtaining necessary approvals for the selection and acquisition of new school sites. Staff is recommending Policy 7240 be revised to: (1) include a policy statement that charges the Superintendent with recommending sites for acquisition for new school facilities; and (2) conform with 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 7110, Determining Needs
2. Board of Education Policy 7120, Patterns of Participation
3. Board of Education Policy 8120, Purpose, Role, and Responsibilities of the Board of Education

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-109, Establishment of Public Schools
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-115, Acquisition and Disposition of Real Property; Construction, etc., of School Buildings
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-116, Selection of School Sites; Public Hearing
4. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-301, State Payment of Certain Public School Construction and Capital Improvement Costs
5. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-302, Interagency Committee on School Construction
6. Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article §§10-501 to 10-511, Meetings (Open Meetings Act)

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Frederick County Board of Education, Policy 202, Construction, Renovation and Maintenance
2. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 6000, Site Selection and Acquisition

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

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
NEW CONSTRUCTION: DESIGNING [Planning]

SCHOOL SITE SELECTION AND ACQUISITION [School Sites]

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) RECOGNIZES THE NEED TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE AND COORDINATED APPROACH TO THE SELECTION AND ACQUISITION OF SCHOOL SITES IN ANTICIPATION OF THE NEED FOR NEW SCHOOL FACILITIES.

B. THE SUPERINTENDENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RECOMMENDING SITES FOR ACQUISITION TO THE BOARD AND FOR DIRECTING STAFF ON ALL MATTERS RELATING TO THIS POLICY.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

[The Superintendent of Schools shall establish administrative procedures for the acquisition and development of school sites in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. These procedures shall be subject to such local intergovernmental agreements as may be entered into by the Board of Education.]

LEGAL REFERENCES: ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-109, ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-115, ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF REAL PROPERTY; CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-116, SELECTION OF SCHOOL SITES; PUBLIC HEARING
POLICY 7240

ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-301, STATE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COSTS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-302, INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, STATE GOVERNMENT ARTICLE, §§10-501 TO 10-511, MEETINGS (OPEN MEETINGS ACT)

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7110, DETERMINING NEEDS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7120, PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8120, PURPOSE, ROLE, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Policy
Adopted: 09/25/69
Revised: 04/24/07
REVISED: ________

Board of Education of Baltimore County
DATE: February 19, 2013
TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION
FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent
SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7310, DETERMINATION OF SCHOOL DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Pradeep Dixit, Executive Director, Physical Facilities

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed revisions to Policy 7310. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 7310
Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with the Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8310, Policy 7310 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 7310 outlines the procedures for determining school construction costs. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) rename the policy to more accurately reflect the intent of the policy; (2) include a policy statement that details the Board’s commitment to designing schools that support educational programs and promote student achievement; and (3) conform with 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 3210, Purchasing Guidelines
2. Board of Education Policy 3225, Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment
3. Board of Education Policy 7110, Determining Needs
4. Board of Education Policy 7250, School Building Design

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-115, Acquisition and Disposition of Real Property; Construction, etc., of School Buildings
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-107, Appropriations and Expenditures for Capital Projects
3. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-301, State Payment of Certain Public School Construction and Capital Improvement Costs
4. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-303, Renovation of Existing School Buildings
5. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §5-312, Application of High Performance Building Standards

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 6020, School Planning/School Construction Programs
2. St. Mary’s County Board of Education, Policy FEF, Construction Cost Estimates

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

Timeline
First reading – February 19, 2013
Public comment – March 5, 2013
Third reading/vote – April 23, 2013
NEW CONSTRUCTION: Financing  
Determination of School DESIGN AND Construction Costs

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) RECOGNIZES ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO BUILD EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, ADDITIONS, AND RENOVATIONS TO PROVIDE AN OPTIMUM LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN A COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

A. THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY. [establish administrative procedures for the determination of school construction costs. These procedures shall conform to pertinent laws and regulations of the state of Maryland Interagency Committee on School Construction, Baltimore County, and policies of the Board of Education of Baltimore County. Furthermore, these procedures shall be subject to such local intergovernmental agreements as may be entered into by the Board of Education.]

LEGAL REFERENCES:  
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-115, ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF REAL PROPERTY; CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-107, APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-301, STATE PAYMENT OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COSTS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §5-303, RENOVATION OF EXISTING SCHOOL BUILDINGS
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION
ARTICLE §5-312, APPLICATION OF HIGH
PERFORMANCE BUILDING STANDARDS

POLICY 7310

RELATED POLICIES:
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3210, PURCHASING
GUIDELINES
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 3225, FURNITURE,
FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7110, DETERMINING
NEEDS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 7250, SCHOOL
BUILDING DESIGN

Policy
Adopted: 09/25/69
Revised: 09/05/07
REVISED: _______

Board of Education of Baltimore County
Date: February 19, 2013

To: BOARD OF EDUCATION

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: REPORT ON SCHOOL SAFETY AND SECURITY

Originator: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

Resource Person(s): Dale R. Rauenzahn, Executive Director

Recommendation

That the Board of Education receives the report on school safety and security.

*****

Attachment I: Executive Summary
Attachment II: PowerPoint on School Safety and Security
Department of School Safety and Security
Executive Summary

The Department of School Safety and Security was created by Dr. Dance and approved by the Board of Education on October 9, 2012. Since then, a review of safety, security, and student behavior was conducted. Other school systems were visited: Harford, Anne Arundel, and Montgomery counties. Partnerships with key agencies including police, fire, and emergency management were enhanced. The department was organized as reflected in the organizational chart presented on February 5, 2013, to have four offices - the Office of School Safety, the Office of Security, the Office of Student Behavior, and the Office of Risk Management.

During these four months, the following has occurred:

- Continued monthly training of principals on the reduction of suspensions through the use of alternatives to suspensions.
- Collaboration with partners, police, fire, emergency operations, and health departments.
- Principals’ self survey of their facility for eight key security components. This identified 192 projects. The Department of Facilities has completed 81% of these to date. Also, 29, or 15%, of the 192 projects are new installation of systems. The department has reviewed numerous vendors, security companies’ products, demonstration of products, and has discussed decisions related to the needs of schools on systems to fill gaps in security.
- Developed a three-phase approach to meet the needs of schools for security systems.
  - Phase 1 – To be completed by the beginning of school 2013-2014.
  - Phase 2 – To be completed during the 2013-2014 school year.
  - Phase 3 – To be completed during the 2014-2015 school year.
- Phase 1 projects are funded through the county supplemental appropriation approved on February 5, 2013.
  - Electronic entry systems for schools that do not currently have systems (13 schools).
  - Camera system for elementary schools and special education schools that is specific to the entry and movement to the office of the schools (109).
  - Closing in an open space area at one school (Halethorpe Elementary) to assist with security of students and staff.
- An additional Phase 1 project, funded by the reallocation of school system funding, is the visitor identification system.
- Phase 2 planning continues, and the list of projected projects includes an identification system for all staff and students, the upgrade of cameras at middle
and high schools, and the use of a one-card-system. This will be funded, in part, by the 2.5 million dollars requested in the operating budget.

The Department of School Safety and Security continues to work with the police department in a thorough assessment of all schools. This process started on February 5, 2013, and will continue through the end of the year with reports on each school, followed by a complete review of those reports to generate a systemic report of recommendations to assist in developing the full scope of Phase 2 and Phase 3.
SCHOOL SAFETY AND SECURITY

February 19, 2013

Dale R. Rauenzahn, Executive Director
Department of School Safety and Security
THE 30-90 DAYS

- Visited other school systems
- Held collaboration meetings
- Reviewed numerous public comments and suggestions
- Enhanced partnerships with agencies
- Planned strategically
- Provided ongoing engaging professional development
Self assessments in December
- 192 projects - 81% completed

Standards developed for security

Three-phase approach
- Phase 1 - Now until beginning of school, August
- Phase 2 - 2013-2014
- Phase 3 - 2014-2015

Tactical assessments of all schools
- Data to identify projects for Phases 2 and 3
Approved $3,740,000 for Phase 1 projects
- Camera systems for elementary and special education schools
- Electronic entry systems for remaining schools
Visitor identification system
- Checks sex offenders database system off of state-issued IDs
To establish a safe and orderly teaching and learning environment to promote personal well-being and student achievement.

To improve the BCPS safety and security through:

- Open communications
- Efficient training
- Strong partnerships
- Proactive policies
- Effective protocols and procedures
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: February 19, 2013

To: Board of Education

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: Update on Teacher and Principal Evaluation Process

Originator: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

Resource Person(s): Lisa Grillo, Chief Human Resource Officer
William Burke, Executive Director of Professional Development

Recommendation

That the Board of Education receives an update on the teacher and principal evaluation process.

*****

Attachment I: Executive Summary
Attachment II: PowerPoint
As part of the Race to the Top initiative, Baltimore County Public Schools in collaboration with the appropriate bargaining units has developed new teacher and principal evaluations. The new evaluations must be based on quantitative and qualitative measures which is a new requirement in State regulations. The teacher evaluation is being piloted this year in fifty schools. The principal evaluation is being piloted with fifteen principals within those fifty schools. The update to the Board of Education will include the components upon which both the teacher and principal evaluations are built.

To prepare for full implementation of the evaluation process, staff from the Departments of Professional Development and Human Resources will be providing professional development throughout the summer. Currently, BCPS is working with MSDE on the approval of the evaluation models.
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Models
### Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Explore Student Growth Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Pilot Evaluation Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal Qualitative Measures

- School vision and culture
- Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Improvement of instructional practices
- Integration of appropriate assessments
Principal Qualitative Measures

- Use of technology and data
- Sustained research-based professional development
- Engagement of community stakeholders
- Management of a school’s organization, operations, and resources
Quantitative Measures

- State Testing Data
  - Student Learning Outcomes
    - Percentage varies by teaching assignment
  - School Progress Index
Evaluation Criteria

- 50% Framework for Teaching or Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework
- 30% Student Learning Outcomes
- 10% - 20% School Progress Index
- 10% State Testing Data (when applicable)
• Measure student growth by establishing formal learning goals

• Apply to all teaching assignments

• Can be adapted to measure individual, group, or student performance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Grades K through 3</th>
<th>School Progress Index/SLO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Grades 4 through 8</td>
<td>2 years of consecutive MSA data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applies to 23% of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers 9 through 12</td>
<td>School Progress Index/SLO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area Teachers K through 12</td>
<td>School Progress Index/SLO’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Development

- Framework for Teaching – Online Modules
- Student Learning Outcomes – Face-to-face with pilot teachers and administrators
- Monthly Principals’ Leadership Development Meetings
- Summer Leadership Academy and Bootcamps
Voices from the Field

• Cheryl Thimm, Principal
  Bear Creek Elementary School

• Maria Lowery, Principal
  Chesapeake High School
Challenges

- Competition with other large-scale initiatives
- Scale of Professional Development
- Time Impact
• BCPS Teacher/Principal Evaluation Models are not approved by MSDE
• Lagging data
• Calculation of state testing data scores
• Additional pilot year
Next Steps

- Proposed legislation
- Bargaining units’ input
DATE: February 19, 2013
TO: Board of Education
FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON KEY SCHOOL LEGISLATION

ORIGINATOR: Edward J. Novak, Governmental Relations Liaison

INFORMATION

***
That the Board of Education receives information on Key School Legislation.
Background Information

The 433rd Session of the Maryland General Assembly began on January 9, 2013, and will meet until its Adjournment SINE DIE on April 8, 2013. Currently, there are a total of 2,265 legislative introductions: 907 Senate Bills, 1 Joint Senate Resolutions, 1,354 House Bills, and 3 Joint House Resolutions.

Discussion

The following bills are presented for the Board of Education’s consideration. The first section contains bills that the Board has considered and voted on position. The second section contains informational bills. The third section contains informational items only.

SECTION 1: BOE POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>POSITION/ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SECTION 2: BOE INFORMATIONAL BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 165</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education – Security – School Resource Officers</td>
<td>This bill would require that each local superintendent enter into an agreement with the Baltimore County Police Department to provide a School Resource Officer (SRO) in each elementary and secondary school. The bill requires that any additional required funds be provided from the state’s Education Trust Fund for any funds needed in excess of the school system’s FY 2013 operating budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Requiring each county superintendent of schools to enter into an agreement with an appropriate law enforcement agency to provide a school resource officer to each public elementary and secondary school; providing that additional funding required for school resource officers shall be paid from the Education Trust Fund from funds allocated from a specified source; and making the Act an emergency measure.

Effective Date – Date Enacted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 269</td>
<td>Public Schools – Requirements for Controlled Access</td>
<td>This bill would require that any new or renovated school project (essentially beginning on 01/01/14) that receives state funds be required to have a controlled access system installed; the system is required to include staff ability to lock school doors, use camera and intercom systems to see and speak to any visitors seeking access to the school, and to use a remote buzzer to allow building access. The bill would require the Board of Public Works to issue implementing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced by Delegates Luedtke, Clippinger, Cullison, A. Kelly, S. Robinson, Summers, and Waldstreicher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring a new school or a renovated school that receives State public school construction funds to be constructed or renovated to have controlled access to allow visitors to enter the school; providing for the application of the Act to the construction or the renovation of schools that have not initiated a specified Request For Proposal on or before January 1, 2014; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Date – July 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House – 01/23/13 – First Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 475</td>
<td>Public School Labor Relations - Renegotiation Procedures and Board Administration</td>
<td>Several years ago, the General Assembly enacted legislation that made changes in the collective bargaining process and created a Public Sector Labor Relations Board (PSLRB) to handle disputes arising from negotiations. The law contained a sunset provision and is set to expire on June 30, 2015. Under the law, the PSLRB has the authority to make recommendations for legislative action regarding this statute. This bill is based on PSLRB’s recommended changes. The bill would cover both certificated and non-certificated bargaining units and allow a school system and a labor organization to negotiate an alternative procedure for the Parties to use in situations where renegotiations are required IF the county does not approve sufficient funds to implement a negotiated agreement between the parties; any agreed procedure must comply with existing, relevant statutes regarding the fiscal relationship between a county and a local Board. While this bill does not require specific negotiations or agreements between the parties,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced by Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorizing a public school employer and an employee organization to use an alternative procedure regarding the renegotiation of allocated funds under specified circumstances; providing that, in connection with the Public School Labor Relations Board's administration of specified subtitles, references to written communications include electronic communications, time limits may be extended for good cause, and venues for judicial proceedings involving Board action shall be in a specified county; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House – 02/13/13 - Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0475F.pdf">http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0475F.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td><strong>Baltimore County Public Schools - Enrollment and Transfer - Parental Decision</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introduced by Delegates <em>Weir, Aumann, Boteler, Bromwell, Frank, Minnick, Olszewski, and Stein</em></td>
<td>It is likely that a challenge would arise if a school system refuses to consider and negotiate such procedure, potentially subjecting the Board to increased scrutiny before the PSLRB with regard to the need to demonstrate “good faith” in bargaining relationships. This provision is unnecessary because current law requires renegotiation in this situation prior to the local Board’s final determination regarding fund allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td>Authorizing the parent or guardian of a student eligible for enrollment in specified grades in Baltimore County public schools to decide to apply to enroll the student in a public school other than the public school to which the student was assigned by the Baltimore County Board of Education, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year; requiring all public schools to be open to specified students on a space-available basis under specified circumstances; etc.</td>
<td>This is a local bill that would allow parents/guardian to enroll their children in any BCPS school (with available space as published annually for BCPS middle and high schools) for students entering the 6th and 9th grades. If more students apply for transfer than there are available seats, a lottery system would be used to select students. Once a student enrolls under this bill, they will be able to continue their attendance for all grades offered at that school. Parents / guardian of students transferring to a school other than their assigned school must agree to assume the responsibility and cost of transportation to that school. This bill is a modified version of legislation previously introduced (the Board opposed it) that did not pass. The sponsor of the prior bill requested a study that was conducted by the MSDE in conjunction with BCPS and found that this transfer option was not viable. Although more limited in scope, the bill would still make it difficult for staff to adequate plan and project for school capacity, given the significant number of variables that affect school enrollment and attendance, including special permission transfers, magnet programs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td><strong>Bill Status:</strong>&lt;br&gt;House – 02/13/13 - Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 661</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques - Students with Special Needs and Limited English Proficiency</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introduced by Delegates Luedtke, Afzali, Carr, Frick, A. Kelly, Serafini, Summers, A. Washington, and Zucker</td>
<td>This bill would require that teachers that are newly certified as of July 1, 2015, and for all certified teachers as of July 1, 2017, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) shall require that each PreK-12 teacher receive instruction in techniques for teaching students with special needs, students with limited English proficiency and in appropriate behavior interventions regardless of the teacher’s area of certification. The required instruction may be provided through a teacher preparatory program, supplemental coursework, or professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 661</td>
<td>Requiring the State Department of Education to ensure that certified teachers receive adequate instruction in techniques for teaching students with special needs and students with limited English proficiency and in appropriate behavior interventions; applying the Act to teachers certified at specified times; and requiring the Department to adopt regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 661</td>
<td>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bill Status:  
House – 02/20/13 - Hearing | MSDE is required to adopt necessary regulations to implement this requirement. |
| **Baltimore County – Board of Education – Selection of Members** | SB 10 was pre-filed for the 2013 Session. A similar bill was previously introduced as SB 407 in the 2012 General Assembly. SB 407 was amended in the committee on Education Health and Environmental Affairs and again on the Senate floor during deliberations. The language contained in SB 10 reflects SB 407, as amended. The amended SB 407 was passed by the Senate but no action was taken by the House of Delegates. **Summary of SB 10 Provisions:**  
- Would retain the current 12-member size of the Board but would change its composition to include: 6 members elected on a nonpartisan basis, 5 members appointed by the Governor and 1 student member.  
- Elected members would be elected (based on affirmative “for” vote cast) from each of the 6 school districts to be established by the Baltimore County Council; members must be residents of the specific school district and a registered voter; districts must be substantially equal in population and will be redrawn by the County Council after each 10 year census, with consultation with the County Board and public input.  
- Authorizes the County Executive to appoint a member(s) if no qualified candidate runs for the office, with the agreement of the County Council.  
- Election of members would first occur at the November 2014 General Election; elected members’ term of 4 years would begin on December 8, 2014; 5 appointed members would be required to be appointed within 90 days of the general election; existing appointed members’ terms would expire no later than December 7, 2014.  
- All members (except the student member whose term is 1 year) are limited to not more than 3 consecutive terms.  
- All members (except the student | |  

**SB 10**  
Introduced by Senator **Zirkin**  
Establishing procedures for the election and appointment of the members of the Baltimore County Board of Education; repealing provisions governing the appointment of members of the county board; establishing the composition of the county board; requiring members of the county board to reside in, be a registered voter in, and be elected from specified districts; providing for a student member of the county board; providing for the removal of, and hearings and appeal procedures for, specified members of the county board; etc.  
**Effective Date – June 1, 2013**  
**Bill Status:**  
Senate – 01/24/13 - Hearing  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>member) are entitled to $100 annual compensation and allowances for travel and other expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Authorizes the Maryland State Board of Education to remove a Board member for any of 5 specified grounds, including failure to attend, without good cause, at least 75% of scheduled meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board members would elect a chair and vice-chair from among members at the Board’s first December meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 115 County Boards of Education – School Budget, Audit, and Procurement Information – Web site Publication</td>
<td>This bill would require each Board to create a searchable Web site (no later than 07/01/14) that would provide budget and audit data annually on an individual school basis as well as contractor payment data for a party who receives a total annual payment of $25,000 or more; the payment information would be required to include the payee name, zip code, payment amount, purpose, and whether the payee is a minority business enterprise. BCPS was required under HB 160 enacted in the 2011 General Assembly Session to provide information on its Web site regarding contractor payment information as proposed in SB 115. In addition to BCPS, prior local laws enacted require similar information in Montgomery and Howard counties and Prince George’s County is working on implementing a similar local law. Potential concern with this bill is the cost to provide the budget and audit information on an individual school basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced by Senator Benson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring county boards of education to develop and operate a searchable Web site that includes specified information relating to school budgets, audits, and procurement; specifying parameters of the Web site; and defining terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Date – July 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Status: Senate – 01/24/13 - Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 277 State Aid for Public Education – Certification of Net Taxable Income</td>
<td>This bill would alter the computation of net taxable income annually performed by the Comptroller and used to determine state education aid formulas that use a wealth factor in their calculations. Current law uses tax returns filed no later than September 1 of each year – this bill would require use of the greater of tax returns filed by September 1st or also by November 1st of each year. The bill would be effective beginning in FY 2014 and annually thereafter and would use a five-year phase-in for to provide any increased state education aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced by The President (By Request - Administration) and Senators Benson, Currie, Miller, Peters, Pinsky, Ramirez, and Rosapepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altering the definition of &quot;net taxable income&quot; for purposes of calculating specified State aid formulas for education; requiring the Comptroller to certify annually the amount of net taxable income in a specified manner; requiring State aid for education to be paid in a specified manner under specified circumstances; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Date – July 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Status: Senate – 02/27/13 Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0277F.pdf">http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0277F.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>02/13/13 Hearing</td>
<td>‘This bill would change current law to prohibit the appointment of a regulated lobbyist or spouse to the Baltimore County Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 300</td>
<td>Baltimore County – Board of Education – Prohibited Members</td>
<td>This bill would mandate that all school boards negotiate a &quot;required reasonable service or representation fee” (an agency fee) to be charged to nonmembers (both certificated and non-certificated employee) of collective bargaining organizations for the costs of the organization representing them.” If such a fee has been previously negotiated in a specific county before July 1, 2013, the fee shall be implemented pursuant to the negotiated Agreement, but it must be implemented “consistent with the requirements” of this new bill &quot;without the need for further negotiations.&quot; This is a collective bargaining issue desired by unions because they are legally required to represent all employees in a bargaining unit (regardless of whether they are members or not) in many matters that are intrinsic in the labor-management relationship, including negotiations and contract administration, including grievance representation. The “agency” shop model allows unions to recoup the costs of these representational duties by the imposition of a fee that would cover such expenses but would but less than the cost of full union membership because it does not include payment for expenses related to political or advocacy-related matters. Within the past year, the Board has taken action involving changes in the threshold level for modified agency fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 422</td>
<td>Public School Employees - Collective Bargaining - Representation Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 572</td>
<td>Maryland Early Learning Challenge and School Readiness Act (Race to the Tots)</td>
<td>This bill establishes an early learning challenge and school readiness grant in the Maryland Department of Education (MSDE) to increase the number of children in high-quality learning programs in locally determined enhancement projects to be funded in FY 2015 and FY 2016 by $10,000,000 appropriated from the Education Trust Fund. The local projects include preschool for all sites (where prekindergarten programs are integrated in child care, head start, or community hubs) to provide existing community services for families with children from birth through age 5 and professional development activities that increase the number of child care providers attaining the highest levels in the Maryland EXCELS Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 691</td>
<td>Education - Due Process Hearings for Children with Disabilities - Burden of Proof</td>
<td>This bill would shift the burden of proof in cases involving impartial due process hearings that are requested by any party challenging the appropriateness of a disabled child’s individualized education program from the party initiating the complaint to the party that is required to defend the challenged action. This bill seeks to negate the decision in a 2005 Supreme Court case involving Montgomery County, Maryland that upheld the general rule applicable in court cases that the burden of proof rests with the party initiating a legal challenge, absent a specific, applicable statute to the contrary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update: Status of Federal Budget & Funding Issues

**Background:**
- After numerous delays and last-minute posturing, in early January 2013, Congress enacted and the President signed a bill that addressed the federal “fiscal cliff.” The law delayed the implementation of sequestration (consisting primarily of an 8.2% across-the-board cut in most federal programs) for 60 days until March 1, 2013. The legislation also raised taxes on individuals earning in excess of $400,000 (for families the level is $450,000).
- To fund the budgetary effects of delayed sequestration, one-half of the costs (estimated to be $24 billion) will come from a $12 billion in discretionary cuts, equally split between defense and non-defense spending. The other half of the required spending will come from $12 billion in increased revenues, including taxing voluntary transfers of traditional IRAs to Roth IRAs.
- This law provides temporary relief, but will require additional Congressional action again on or near Match 1, 2013.

**Next Three Months:**

1. **Federal Debt Ceiling** (authorization to borrow monies to pay previously incurred expenses)
   - Current estimates indicate that the debt ceiling will need to be increased no later than the end of February 2013.
   - During the last significant debt ceiling increase debate (August 2011) Congress created and approved the current budget sequestration process that led to the recently averted “fiscal cliff” crises because of the linkage of an increase in the debt ceiling with mandatory spending cuts.
   - Current political confrontation includes some who argue that the President is empowered to increase the debt ceiling unilaterally (without Congressional approval) based on the authority contained in Article 14, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, specifically, “The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions . . . shall not be questioned.”; Republican Congressional leadership continue to argue that they will not approve an increase in the debt ceiling absent significant cuts in federal spending, including the Social Security and Medicare programs.

2. **Annual Congressional Appropriations**
   - In recent years, Congress has not enacted the 13 major annual appropriations bills needed to fund the federal government.
   - Funding has been provided through a series of Continuing Resolutions (CR) to fund government operations; much of the CR funding is based on prior spending levels and does not completely consider mandated cost increases in various programs.
   - Current federal funding has been based on a 6-month CR that will expire on March 27, 2013, unless acted upon previously.

**Potential Impact:**
- The combination of the three issues discussed above could result in increased chaos and uncertainty in the federal budgetary picture.
- This is of particular significance because of the 2013 General Assembly Session and its budget deliberation process and schedule. If additional Congressional action on any of these issues is delayed beyond early March 2013, the uncertainty could affect the 2014 state budget because the later part of March is the period when substantial budget determinations are made in anticipation of members taking legislative action to meet this Session’s April 1, 2013, budget approval deadline.

**Baltimore City Public Schools: Proposed Alternative Financing for Public School Construction**
**Background:**

- Baltimore City Public Schools has the oldest inventory of school buildings in Maryland with the average age of school buildings of almost 40 years. Estimates of the cost of addressing school capital program needs in Baltimore City have ranged up to $2.8 billion. Baltimore City Public Schools commissioned a study (Jacobs Report) to provide a current and specific assessment of school facilities needs and associated costs. The results of the report are expected to be finalized and released to the General Assembly and the public shortly. Critical construction needs are expected to require the expenditure of $1 billion over a 10-year period.

**Prior Legislation:**

- HB 304 was introduced in the 2012 General Assembly. The bill would have provided Baltimore City Public Schools a block grant of either the greater of 15% of the total state public construction capital program or $32 million (annually adjusted for inflation). The bill had a hearing in the House Appropriations Committee but no further action was taken. There was no cross-filed bill nor was any action taken by the Senate on HB 304.

**Proposed Financing:**

- Baltimore City Public Schools has indicated that its priority is to seek legislative approval from the General Assembly to change the way that public schools construction funding is provided to Baltimore City.
- Maryland currently allocates funds for school construction through an annual budget appropriations process that utilizes standards under the Public School Construction Capital Improvement Program administered by the Interagency Committee on School Construction.
- Baltimore City Public Schools is interested in obtaining its allocation of state construction funds in the form of an annual block grant of at least $32 million (potentially adjusted for inflation) instead of an annual appropriation (Baltimore City Public Schools indicates that capital funding received in the past 5 years from the state has averaged $36 million per year and capital funding received in the last 5 years from Baltimore City government averaged $19 million per year).
- Funding via a block grant is expected to allow the Baltimore City Public Schools to borrow by leveraging funds to accelerate progress on meeting critical school renovation/construction needs; Baltimore City Public Schools believes that it could borrow funds at a ratio of $15 million in 30-year term bond funds for each $1 million provided by the state in a block grant - thus $32 million yearly would yield about $480 million in borrowed construction funds.
- To provide such leverage, it has been reported that the block grant would have to be agreed to be provided by the state annually for at least a period of 20 years; this alternative approach would also require the creation of a non-profit corporation (under section 6320 of the Internal Revenue Code) expected to be known as the Baltimore City Schools Construction Authority that would issue bonds and solicit construction contracts (authority to use such an entity would need to be included in the authorizing legislation).
Pending Activities:

- Legislation has not yet been introduced this session.
- Baltimore City Public Schools is planning to brief key committees during the week of January 14, 2013.
- Initial reactions in Annapolis have ranged from cautious to negative; concerns expressed include the effects on the State’s credit and bond rating, total bonding capabilities, potential impact on other school systems, interest from other school systems in obtaining similar authority, level of local funding provided by Baltimore City Public Schools, potential for higher interest costs for the construction bonds because they would be issued by a separate bonding authority (not the city or state), and the capacity of the school system to manage significant, additional construction activities.
Attached is the general fund *Comparison of FY2012 and FY2013 Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances – Budget and Actual* for the periods ended December 31, 2011 and 2012.

*General Fund Comparison of FY2012 and FY2013 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 FY2012 and FY2013 general fund revenue budget. Figure 2 provides an overview of the FY2013 general fund expenditure budget. Figure 3 compares the percent of the budget obligated as of December 31, 2011 and 2012. Figure 4 is a comparative statement of budget-to-actual revenues, expenditures, and encumbrances.
Figure 1

**Year-to-Date Comparison**

- **Baltimore County** – The FY2013 county appropriation increased $21.2 million, a 3.2% increase over the FY2012 budget. Increased enrollment resulted in $5.4 million in additional funding for FY2013. Additionally, increased funding was also provided to support the new obligation of the Board to fund a portion of the Maryland State Teachers’ Retirement and Pension System employers’ pension contribution. County funds are drawn based on cash flow requirements. The year-to-date county revenue recognized is $222.3 million, 32.2% of the budget, as compared to $221 million, 33.1% of the budget for FY2012.

- **State of Maryland** – The FY2013 state appropriation increased approximately $19 million, 3.5% over the FY2012 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 December 2012, three of the state payments had been received.

- **Federal** – The FY2013 federal budgeted revenue is significantly reduced because of the ending of the Education Jobs Fund Bill, a part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The school system received approximately $4.1 million in funding from these stimulus funds in the prior year.

- **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 $2.5 million and are generally collected at year end, tuitions, and sundry revenues. The budgeted revenue increased significantly over the prior year because of an $8.4 million increase in the re-appropriated fund balance to approximately $17.7 million from the $9.2 million utilized in the prior year. The year-to-date revenue consists primarily of revenue from the re-appropriation of prior year balance of $17.7 million, revenue from the ERATE program, tuition and other revenues.
Total Expenditures and Encumbrances – Year-to-date expenditures and encumbrances through December 2012 are $619.2 million, 48.7% obligated, compared to $596.8 million, 48.6% obligated, for the same period in FY2012. The increase of $23 million in expenditures over the prior year is a result primarily of an encumbrance of $15.8 million for the contribution to the Maryland State Teachers’ Retirement and Pension System, which was not a required expenditure in prior years, and additional costs for health care and other fixed charges. Salary expenditures within categories that are primarily comprised of 12-month positions (e.g., administration, midlevel administration, operation of plant, maintenance of plant, and capital outlay) average 47.3% 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 41.5% of the budget, which is in line with the percentage of the school year that has elapsed.

Additionally, $5.9 million was added to the salary budget to provide for additional teachers because of increased enrollment and to provide other additional positions for special education. The budget increases were offset by reductions in non-classroom school staffing positions, decreases in projected overtime compensation, and other miscellaneous staffing strategies and program modifications.

The nonsalary expenditures are budgeted for an overall net increase of $29.5 million, or 6.7% over the prior year. The changes in these expenditures are in a number of categories throughout the budget. The nonsalary budget for transportation was increased by $1.1 million, a 4.4% increase, because of an expected increase for private bus operators and diesel fuel costs. An increase of $23 million is budgeted for fixed charges, an 8.6% increase, because of the addition of $15.8 million for the contribution to the teachers’ retirement and pension fund, and an increase of approximately $8 million in the contribution to the retired employees health benefit costs (OPEB). The nonsalary budget for operation of plant was increased by $1.2 million for projected increases in energy costs. Additionally, the nonsalary budget for
maintenance of plant was increased by approximately $5.3 million primarily relating to $5.2 million of additional funding for the Aging Schools Program.

Figure 3

- **Administration and Midlevel Administration** – The budget for nonsalary administration expenditures is essentially the same as the prior year. The decrease in nonsalary expenditures as compared to the prior year is attributed to a decrease in contracted services primarily relating to the human resource-payroll systems. Midlevel administration nonsalary expenditures are comparable to last year and in line with the budget.

- **Instructional Salaries** – The budget for instructional salaries had a net increase of $3.8 million in FY2013. The budget was increased for salary step increases for teachers.

- **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 FY2013 budget for this category is essentially unchanged from the prior year. 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, equipment, and other costs used to support the instructional programs. To date, $4.3 million, 56.7% of the FY2013 budgeted funds, have been committed. In the prior year, $5.1 million, 63.6%, 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 FY2013 salary budget increased by $5.6 million, 4.9% over the prior year, which included funding for salary step increases and funding additional positions. Additionally, 82 instructional assistant positions, and 4.7 additional positions were transferred to the operating budget. These positions had previously been funded by grant revenues from the federal stimulus program which were included in the special revenue budget. Of the FY2013 special education nonsalary budget of $41.5 million, $34.3 million (84%) is for
placement of children in nonpublic schools. To date, almost the entire nonpublic budget has been committed, which is comparable to the prior year.

- **Student Personnel and Health Services** – Year-to-date FY2013 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. The salary budget increased by $1.4 million over the budget in the prior year. This increase is primarily for additional funding for salary restructuring and substitute drivers and bus attendants. 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 $1.1 million, which is primarily attributable to an expected increase in cost for services provided by private bus contractors and diesel fuel costs. As of December 2012, 92.9% of the nonsalary budget has been committed, compared to 93.8% committed at December 2011.

- **Operation of Plant** – This category contains salary costs for personnel 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 salary budget increased by $1.7 million, 4% over the prior year. This increase is primarily for salary restructuring budgeted for school based custodians. The nonsalary expenditure budget for this category has increased $1.1 million, a 2.6% increase over the prior year. This increase is primarily attributable to an anticipated increase in the cost of utilities. Encumbrances for utilities have been established for approximately the full amount of the budgeted annual costs of $28 million. Other expenditures in this category include the cost of building rent, $5.5 million; supplies and materials, $2.4 million; trash removal, $1.2 million; and other related expenditures. As of December 2012, 85% of the nonsalary budget has been committed, compared to 88.1% committed at December 2011.

- **Maintenance of Plant and Capital Outlay** – The maintenance category consists of activities related to the service and upkeep of building systems. The salary budget for this area increased by $1.6 million, 13.7% over the prior year, due to salary restructuring and reallocation of projected turnover. The nonsalary expenditure budget for this category increased $5.3 million, a significant portion of this increase is related to increase funding for the state Aging Schools Program. Year-to-date nonsalary expenditures and encumbrances for Maintenance of Plant are $13.4 million, 63.6% of the budgeted amount, as compared with $13.6 million, or 86.6% in the prior fiscal year. Capital outlay nonsalary expenditures are 64.7% expended at December 2012, as compared to being over the budget in December 2011. The decrease in expenditures over the prior year is a result of a reduction in encumbrances for relocatable units for school renovation programs.

- **Fixed Charges** – This category includes the cost of employee benefits and other fixed costs. Health insurance, including the contribution to retired employees (OPEB) plan, and employer FICA, comprise 71% and 20% of the fixed charges budget, respectively. The FY2013 budget includes an increase of $23 million, which results primarily from an $8 million increase in health insurance contributions to OPEB and the new requirement for an employer contribution to the state teachers’ pension system of $15.8 million.
### Baltimore County Public Schools

**Comparison of FY 2012 and FY 2013 Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances**

**Budget and Actual**

**For the Periods Ended December, 2011 and 2012**

**General Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Remaining Budget as Earned or Obligated</td>
<td>Total Remaining Budget as Earned or Obligated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted as of 2/28/12</td>
<td>of 2/28/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>$668,495,342 $220,965,021 447,530,321 33.3%</td>
<td>$679,743,020 $222,348,865 467,934,834 32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Maryland</td>
<td>555,570,405 271,309,927 284,260,478 48.8%</td>
<td>760,000 286,025 473,975 37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>14,540,000 385,689 4,843,881 8.5%</td>
<td>12,082,398 5,122,641 70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17,822,394 12,082,398 5,122,641 70.1%</td>
<td>26,808,244 20,358,820 8,521,444 77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,226,742,597 $496,658,981 730,083,607 40.5%</td>
<td>$1,272,253,709 $514,302,958 757,950,751 40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures and Encumbrances:**

| Administration                             | Salary: 25,079,503 11,955,086 13,124,417 47.7%  | Non-Salary: 12,030,213 6,177,120 5,853,093 51.3%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 37,309,716 18,132,206 8,977,500 48.9%  |                                           |
| Mid-Level Administration                   | Salary: 78,799,778 36,717,670 42,082,888 46.6%  | Non-Salary: 9,727,079 5,170,877 2,562,760 65.2%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 86,526,857 41,888,547 44,838,310 48.3%  |                                           |
| Instruction:                               | Instructional Salaries: Salary: 451,832,533 82,006,247 269,826,286 40.3%  | Non-Salary: 20,977,566 10,811,799 10,167,767 51.5%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 472,810,109 92,818,046 370,993,053 63.6%  |                                           |
| Special Education                          | Salary: 133,758,610 49,760,969 36,997,642 43.7%  | Non-Salary: 41,470,784 39,219,202 2,252,582 94.6%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 175,229,394 89,980,171 59,244,224 57.3%  |                                           |
| Student Personnel                          | Salary: 8,388,579 3,931,746 4,556,633 45.7%  | Non-Salary: 177,711 54,315 116,796 31.7%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 8,566,290 4,086,061 3,763,829 45.4%  |                                           |
| Health Services                            | Salary: 13,427,920 5,704,184 7,723,736 42.5%  | Non-Salary: 467,181 371,923 95,858 20.5%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 13,915,101 9,076,007 8,783,694 43.8%  |                                           |
| Transportation                             | Salary: 33,290,893 13,845,347 19,435,846 41.6%  | Non-Salary: 24,979,624 23,439,583 1,540,041 93.8%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 58,269,517 37,293,930 20,975,887 64.0%  |                                           |
| Operation of Plant                          | Salary: 41,374,772 19,476,527 21,898,245 47.1%  | Non-Salary: 46,215,315 40,699,805 5,517,210 88.1%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 87,590,087 60,174,362 27,415,557 68.8%  |                                           |
| Maintenance of Plant                        | Salary: 11,942,283 6,086,396 5,855,887 51.0%  | Non-Salary: 15,759,831 13,643,961 2,115,222 86.6%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 27,702,114 19,730,357 7,971,897 71.2%  |                                           |
| Fixed Charges                               | Non-Salary: 267,632,772 210,785,822 146,846,950 45.1%  | 290,727,530 243,140,880 147,587,330 49.2%  |
| Capital Outlay                              | Non-Salary: 2,820,491 1,322,457 1,498,034 46.9%  | Non-Salary: 397,232 610,638 (214,406) 154.0%  |
|                                           | Subtotal: 3,217,723 1,934,095 1,283,628 60.1%  |                                           |
| **Total Salary**                            | $780,704,663 $330,715,798 $449,988,894 42.4%  | $796,586,751 $333,014,763 $463,572,988 41.8%  |
| **Total Non-Salary**                        | 446,037,934 266,080,217 179,957,721 59.7%  | 475,736,898 286,875,352 189,661,546 60.2%  |
| **Total Expenditures and Encumbrances**     | $1,226,742,597 $496,658,981 730,083,607 40.5%  | $1,272,253,709 $514,302,958 757,950,751 40.4%  |

Figures 4
ISO Model Chosen for BCPS Quality Management System Implementation

International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 9001:2008 Standards

- Most widely accepted and implemented quality standards in the world.
- Organizational certifications are provided by independent auditing organizations (Registrars).
- BCPS achieved certification on June 15, 2010 after a rigorous on-site systems review by external auditors.

✓ To maintain its certification, BCPS has successfully completed five surveillance audits by external auditors since June, 2010.

✓ A QMS recertification audit is scheduled for March, 2013.
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Quality Management means the organization:

a) establishes clear standards and expectations for the delivery of quality products and services to its customers,

b) holds itself accountable for demonstrating its ability to consistently provide products or services that meet customer needs and applicable regulatory requirements, and

c) aims to enhance customer satisfaction through the effective application of the QMS and continual improvement of the system.
What are the Products and Services?

Currently the BCPS QMS scope is limited to products and services provided in the central office areas of:

- Technology Development, Implementation, & Support
- Human Resources – School-based Employee Recruitment, Hiring, Appraisals, Discipline, and Position Allocations
- Purchasing
Customer Focus: Who is the QMS “Customer”?

ISO Clause 5.2 Top management shall ensure that customer requirements are determined and are met with the aim of enhancing customer satisfaction.

- Can be an internal or external customer
- Can be used to address concerns of other system stakeholders

Consistent with Board of Education Policy 3170, the focus of central office work is on providing products and services to support the principals and their schools as the primary QMS customers.
Overall Requirements for the System

Establish a quality management system: develop it, implement it, and improve it

Document the quality management system:
- Have a quality manual – the system framework
- Create documents including a quality policy, core processes, objectives, procedures, and records
- Control documents - Ensure that the right documents are being used at the right time by the right people.
- Create and maintain records of the system – keep records as evidence of performance and conformity with standards.

✓ QMS documentation can be found on the BCPS web site:

http://www.bcps.org/offices/accountability_research_testing/quality_management_system.html
Upper Management Commitment

Demonstrate commitment to the QMS

- Communicate the importance of quality.
- Establish measurable target objectives for products/services.
- Plan and do reviews of the system.
- Satisfy the customers and meet their needs and requirements.
- Make available adequate resources.

Since initial implementation, the Superintendent’s Management Review Team has met quarterly to ensure that planned results for the QMS are being achieved and to identify opportunities for improvement.

Quality goals and process objectives have been established for the central office processes and communicated to staff.
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Customer Focus

- Identify and meet customer, regulatory, and system requirements.
- Talk to customers about products/services quality and complaints.
- Enhance customer satisfaction.

Since implementation, customer input has been received from:
- Annual principal satisfaction surveys.
- Regular principal focus group meetings concerning school needs.
- All BCPS employees have been given opportunities to identify any QMS problems and are encouraged to submit suggestions on how to improve the system.
Responsibility, Authority, and Communication

To meet standards, QMS process documents must:

- Identify who has what responsibility and authority.
- Make sure everyone knows their duties and roles.
- Have effective means of communicating internally and keep everyone informed on system effectiveness.

- New QMS process documents, procedures, and work instructions have been established for central office employees.
- Regular meetings are held with employees to review quality objectives and performance. All employees understand their responsibilities and roles in meeting the principals’ needs.
Resource Management

- Identify and provide the resources needed to implement, maintain, and improve the system, and enhance customer satisfaction.
- Decide what competencies are required for personnel and ensure everyone working in the system is competent.
- Train and evaluate personnel and recognize their contributions.
- Provide adequate facilities, equipment, and support services for product/service conformity.

✓ The staff and resources necessary to implement the QMS have been identified, provided, and maintained.
✓ Employee professional and organizational development needs are being identified and met to ensure workforce competency requirements are in place to achieve planned results.
Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement

- Plan, measure, analyze, evaluate, and improve processes.
- See if processes are achieving planned results.
- Collect and analyze data to demonstrate effectiveness and identify opportunities for improvements.

- ✓ Measureable objectives and targets for process services and products have been established.
- ✓ Data is gathered to monitor, measure, analyze, and improve the central offices’ support of principals.
Continual Improvement of the System

- Have a systematic approach to fixing a nonconformity and stopping it from recurring.
- Have a systematic approach to preventing a potential nonconformity from happening.
- Implement and maintain documented procedures required by the standards.
  - Corrective Action Requests (CAR) are instituted to identify the root cause of a problem, fix it, and ensure it does not recur.
  - Preventive Action Requests (PAR) are instituted to investigate potential problems and ensure that they do not occur.
  - Any inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in central office services are confronted and solutions are implemented.
QMS Internal Audits

- Purpose - Are you doing what you say you are doing?
- Emphasis on performance rather than simple compliance.
- Trained QMS auditors from existing personnel.
- Performed on a scheduled basis throughout the year.
- Evidence of compliance with ISO standard requirements, BCPS QMS requirements, and customer requirements.

✓ Since implemented, over fifty internal audits have been conducted on central offices within the scope of the QMS.
✓ Audit findings have resulted in over one hundred documented corrective or preventive action plans to investigate and resolve quality process issues.
QMS Standards – The Benefits

- ISO 9001:2008 registration has demanded the active commitment and participation of all central office process employees to identify and meet the needs of principals.

- Staff must be able to demonstrate that they are doing their jobs consistent with quality standards and striving to improve performance.

- Increased customer focus and process documentation has improved the clarity and transparency of communication between the central offices and the principals.

- Ongoing process audits ensure continuing commitment and discipline needed to improve the system and more effectively manage resources.

- Registration has allowed BCPS to gain national and international recognition for developing, implementing, and maintaining a quality management system.
Future QMS Initiatives

✓ Ensure that QMS processes are in alignment with the performance indicators and focus of the forthcoming *Blueprint 2.0* strategic plan.

✓ Continue to develop quality measures for process activities to better achieve employee efficiency and effectiveness.

✓ Expand offerings for professional and organizational development.

✓ Provide more opportunities for input from BCPS employees and other stakeholders on where problems may exist and how the QMS can be improved.

✓ Increase the control of critical process documents and records to ensure consistency in the quality of products and services.

✓ Utilize the QMS to identify methods to improve transparency, clarity, and timeliness of communications to customers and stakeholders.