TENTATIVE, SUBJECT TO CHANGE

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

OPEN SESSION

Tuesday, March 19, 2013
5:15 P.M.-Closed Session, 6:30 P.M.-Open Session
Educational Support Services (ESS Building)

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. SILENT MEDITATION IN REMEMBRANCE

III. AGENDA

Consideration of the agenda for March 19, 2013

IV. SELECTION OF SPEAKERS

V. ADVISORY AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Public comment on the following Board of Education policies (second reading):

- Proposed Deletion of Policy 3112 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Operating Budget
- Proposed Changes to Policy 3121 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Funds Management and Classification of Expenditures
- Proposed Changes to Policy 3122 – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES: Classification of Expenditures
- Proposed Changes to Policy 4001 – PERSONNEL: Equal Employment Opportunity
- Proposed Deletion of Policy 7120 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: Patterns of Participation
- Proposed Changes to Policy 7240 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: School Sites
- Proposed Changes to Policy 7310 – NEW CONSTRUCTION: Determination of School Design and Construction Costs
VII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

VIII. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

IX. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of consent to the following personnel matters: (Dr. Grillo)
   1. Transfers
   2. Retirements

B. Consideration of consent to Administrative Appointments (Dr. Dance)

C. Consideration of Actions Taken in Closed Session (Mr. Nussbaum)

D. Consideration of consent to the following contract awards: (Mr. Gay/Mr. Dixit)
   1. Contract Modification and Extension: Lease Extension – Meadowood Education Center
   2. Contract Modification and Extension: Lease Extension-9610 Pulaski Park Drive, Suites 118, 201-206, 207-222, and 9611 Pulaski Park, Suites 305-308, Baltimore, MD
   3. Contract for Information Technology Consulting Services and Staff Augmentation
   4. Construction Site Package Contract for New Lutherville Elementary School at Mays Chapel

XI. WORK SESSION REPORTS

A. Proposed Changes or Deletions to the following Board of Education Policies (first reading): Ms. Roddy
   • Proposed Change to Policy 1270 – COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Community Involvement-Parent and Family Involvement
   • Proposed New Policy 4010 – PERSONNEL: General-Nepotism
   • Proposed Changes to Policy 4104 – PERSONNEL: Conduct-Telecommunications Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks
XI. WORK SESSION REPORTS (cont)

- Proposed Changes to Policy 6202 – INSTRUCTION: Telecommunications Acceptable use Policy (AUP) for Students  
  Exhibit H

- Proposed Changes to Policy 6307 – INSTRUCTION: Schedules- Patriotic Exercises  
  Exhibit I

- Proposed Changes to Policy 6500 – INSTRUCTION: Research, Testing, and Evaluation-Research and Assessment  
  Exhibit J

- Proposed Changes to Policy 8130 – INTERNAL BOARD OPERATIONS: Formulation  
  Exhibit K

B. Update on Imagine Discovery Public Charter School  
  (Dr. Plunkett/Dr. Allie)  
  Exhibit L

XIII. INFORMATION

A. Education Foundation Update  
  Exhibit M

  Exhibit N

C. Update on Key School Legislation  
  Exhibit O

XIV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Board Meeting Tuesday, April 23, 2013
7:00 PM Greenwood
## RECOMMENDED TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRISTIN L. ANELLI</td>
<td>Assistant Principal Dundalk High School</td>
<td>Director of Academic Intervention Office of School Transformation (New Position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM S. BURKE</td>
<td>Executive Director Department of Professional Development</td>
<td>Executive Director Office of School Transformation (New Position)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baltimore County Public Schools
Towson, Maryland 21204

March 19, 2013

Retirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School/Office</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Gold</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Vincent Farm Elementary</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>07/01/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baltimore County Public Schools  
Towson, Maryland 21204  

March 19, 2013  

Recommended Appointments  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elizabeth M. Aitken</strong></td>
<td>Executive Director, Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Senior Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Chief Academic Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(New Position)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debra Y. Brooks</strong></td>
<td>Turnaround Principal</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Baltimore City Public Schools</td>
<td>Office of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(New Position)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joyce Colbert</strong></td>
<td>Acting Director, Division of Title I Programs</td>
<td>Specialist, Title I Mandatory Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools</td>
<td>Office of Title I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Replacing Merry Macer, retired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrea L. Derrien</strong></td>
<td>Acting Principal</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective March 20, 2013)</td>
<td>Campfield Early Learning Center</td>
<td>Campfield Early Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Replacing Lisa Sampson, resigned)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruth M. Doyle</strong></td>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>Pupil Personnel Worker (.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective March 20, 2013)</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Elizabeth Clary, retired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ryan J. Imbriale</strong></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Executive Director, Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Patapsco High School</td>
<td>Department of Accountability, Performance Management, Research and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(New Position)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANE E. LICHTER</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Lansdowne Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(New Position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARIA L. LOWRY</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Assistant Superintendent, High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>Chesapeake High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Replacing Edward Newsome)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NICOLE M. PRIESTLY</th>
<th>Executive Director, Central Elementary Zone, Title I Charlotte Mecklenburg Public Schools</th>
<th>Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Effective July 1, 2013)</td>
<td>putchar(char(10))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(New Position)</td>
<td>putchar(char(10))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AWARD OF CONTRACTS

ORIGINATOR: Michael G. Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Rick Gay, Manager, Office of Purchasing
Pradeep Dixit, Executive Director, Physical Facilities

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education approves the following contract recommendations.

*****

See the attached list of contract recommendations presented for consideration by the Board of Education of Baltimore County.

Appendix I – Recommendations for Award of Contracts – Board Exhibit
### 1. Contract Modification and Extension: Lease Extension -- Meadowood Education Center

**Contract #:** RGA-146-08  
**Term:** 1 year  
**Extension:** N/A  
**Contract Ending Date:** 7/31/14  

**Estimated contract authority:** $1,837,832  
**Estimated modification amount:** $180,774  
**New estimated total contract authority:** $2,018,606

**Board meeting date:** March 19, 2013  
**Bid issued:** N/A  
**Pre-bid meeting date:** N/A  
**Due date:** N/A  
**No. of vendors issued to:** N/A  
**No. of bids received:** N/A  
**No. of no-bids received:** N/A

**Description:**

On September 18, 2007, the Board approved the second extension of this lease agreement through August 31, 2013.

This contract modification and extension is for continuation of the current lease agreement of the 14,721 square foot facility that houses the Meadowood Education Center located at 1849 Gywnn Oak Avenue, Baltimore County, Maryland. The extension for one more year is to evaluate additional space options.

**Recommendation:**

Award of contract modification and extension is recommended to:

- **Meadowood East Building, LLC**  
  **Baltimore, MD**

  **Responsible school or office:** Chief Operations Officer  
  **Contact person:** Michael G. Sines  
  **Funding source:** Operating budget

Contract #: RGA-112-10

Term: 5 years  
Extension: N/A  
Contract Ending Date: 6/30/20

Estimated contract authority: $5,913,685
Estimated modification amount: $6,787,317
New estimated total contract authority: $12,701,002

Board meeting date: March 19, 2013
Bid issued: N/A
Pre-bid meeting date: N/A
Due date: N/A
No. of vendors issued to: N/A
No. of bids received: N/A
No. of no-bids received: N/A

Description:

On August 11, 2009, the Board approved the lease extension of RGA-112-10 for Pulaski Park Suites 118, 201-207, 222, and 305-307 for five years ending June 30, 2014. On July 13, 2010 the Board approved the lease extension RGA-104-11 for Pulaski Park Suite 118 for five years with a five year extension ending June 30, 2020. This five and six year lease extension is part of the overall effort to eliminate the more costly lease at the Timonium campus. The vendor will renovate the office space to accommodate the Office of Transportation, Department of School Safety and Security, Office of Food and Nutrition Services, and the Department of Accountability, Performance Management, Research and Technology. The Department of Physical Facilities, already located at the same area, will be included in the lease extension.

Recommendation:

Award of contract modification and extension is recommended to:

Merritt Properties, LLC  
Baltimore, MD

Responsible school or office: Chief Operations Officer

Contact person: Michael G. Sines

Funding source: Operating budget
3. **Contract:** Information Technology Consulting Services and Staff Augmentation  
   **Contract #:** RGA-118-13 (State of Florida Department of Managed Services  
   Information Technology (IT) Consulting Services Contract #973-561-10-1)

   **Term:** 3 months  
   **Extension:** N/A  
   **Contract Ending Date:** 6/30/13  
   **Estimated contract authority:** $120,000

   **Board meeting date:** March 19, 2013  
   **Bid issued:** N/A  
   **Pre-bid meeting date:** N/A  
   **Due date:** N/A  
   **No. of vendors issued to:** N/A  
   **No. of bids received:** N/A  
   **No. of no-bids received:** N/A

**Description:**

The purpose of this contract is to provide information technology consulting services and staff augmentation on an as-needed basis. This is a time-and-material contract and encompasses IT planning, studies, and assessment to assist in both information technology capital planning and assessment.

Section §5–112 of the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland subparagraph (a) (3) states that, “…except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, a county board’s participation in contracts for goods or commodities that are awarded by other public agencies or by intergovernmental purchasing organizations if the lead agency for the contract follows public bidding procedures.” Further under the Education Article §4–123 Cooperative administration of programs (a) (1) states a “county board may enter into an agreement for the cooperative or joint administration of programs with one or more: (i) County boards; (ii) Other educational institutions or agencies; and (iii) Boards of county commissioners or county councils.” In §13-110 of the State Finance and Procurement Article, “Subject to §12-107 of this article, whenever a primary procurement unit procurement officer determines that it is in the best interest of the State to sponsor or participate in an intergovernmental cooperative purchasing agreement, with the approval of the unit head and subject to any other approval required by law, the primary procurement unit may become a party to or participate under the agreement.”

**Recommendation:**

Award of contract is recommended to:

   Presidio Network Solutions, Inc.       Greenbelt, MD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Responsible school or office:</strong></th>
<th>Office of Information Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact person:</strong></td>
<td>Camille Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding source:</strong></td>
<td>Operating budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Contract:** Construction Site Package Contract for New Lutherville Elementary School at Mays Chapel  
**Contract #:** MWE-863-13  

Term: N/A  
Extension: N/A  
**Contract Ending Date:** N/A  

Estimated annual award value: $5,174,675  
Estimated contingency amount: $517,467  
Estimated total award value: $5,692,142  

Board meeting date: March 19, 2013  
Bid issued: January 24, 2013  
Pre-bid meeting date: January 31, 2013  
Due date: February 19, 2013  
No. of vendors issued to: 17  
No. of bids received: 5  
No. of no-bids received: 0  

**Description:**  
This project consists of site work (building pads, construction of fields, and site utilities) for construction of the new elementary school.  

**Recommendation:**  
Award of contract is recommended to:  
Daisy Concrete Inc. of MD  
Edgewood, MD  

**Responsible school or office:** Department of Physical Facilities  

**Contact person:** Pradeep Dixit  

**Funding source:** Capital budget  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidders’ Names</th>
<th>Daisy Concrete Inc. of MD</th>
<th>Kinsley Construction, Inc.</th>
<th>Peak Inc.</th>
<th>Gray and Son, Inc.</th>
<th>P. Flanagan &amp; Sons, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,174,675</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>$5,377,000</td>
<td>$5,562,155</td>
<td>$5,752,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: March 19, 2013

To: Board of Education

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: Report on the Proposed Changes to Board of Education Policy 1270, Parent and Family Involvement

Originator: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

Resource Person(s): William Burke, Executive Director, Professional Development

Recommendation

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

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 1270
STATEMENT OF ISSUES OR QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 mandates that local education agencies develop a written parental involvement policy. Additionally, the Act requires each LEA to conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the policy in improving the academic quality of the schools served with Title I, Part A funds. Policy 1270 constitutes the Board’s parental involvement policy and compliance with this mandate.

During this year’s annual review, community stakeholders suggested minor changes to the policy: (1) In Paragraph I.A., the words “collaborate to” were substituted for the words “must work together to mutually.” The sentence will now read “The Board of Education (Board) recognizes that schools, parents, families, and communities must collaborate to support student achievement.” (2) In Paragraph I.A., the word “essential” was substituted for the word “integral.” The sentence will now read “The Board values and promotes school, parent/guardian, family, and community involvement as essential to the academic success of all students.” (3) Paragraph III.B. was moved to the policy statement. (4) The implementation section was edited to 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 1100, Communication with the Public
2. Board of Education Policy 1200, Community Involvement
3. Board of Education Policy 1210, Relationship with Parent-Teacher (Student) Associations
4. Board of Education Policy 1220, Citizens Advisory Committee
5. Board of Education Policy 1230, Area Education Advisory Councils (AEAC)
6. Board of Education Policy 1240, Visitors to Schools
7. Board of Education Policy 1260, School Volunteers
8. Board of Education Policy 4000, Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools
Legal Requirements
1. 20 U.S.C. §6301, et seq., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, as amended by Section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-112, Advisory Committees

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

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Community Involvement

Parent and Family Involvement

I. POLICY STATEMENT [Philosophy]
   
   A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) recognizes that schools, parents, families, and communities must COLLABORATE TO [work together to mutually] support student achievement. The Board values and promotes school, parent/guardian, family, and community involvement as ESSENTIAL [integral] to the academic success of all students.
   
   B. BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT 2001 AS IT RELATES TO PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND SUCH COMPLIANCE SHALL INCLUDE AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CONTENT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTING RULE.

II. Definition

   [A.] Consistent with Section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Board [of Education] Policy 1270, along with its implementing Superintendent’s Rule and school system procedures, shall constitute the school system’s Parental Involvement Policy.

III. Implementation

   A. The Board directs the Superintendent to [develop appropriate rules and procedures to] implement this policy.

   [B. The Baltimore County Public Schools shall comply with the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act 2001 as it relates to parent and family involvement, including an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of this policy and its implementing rule and procedures.]
*Annotated Code of Maryland*, Education Article §4-112, *Advisory Committees*

Related Policies: Board of Education Policy 1100, *Communication with the Public*
Board of Education Policy 1200, *Community Involvement*
Board of Education Policy 1210, *RELATIONSHIP WITH Parent-Teacher (Student) Associations*
Board of Education Policy 1220, *Citizens Advisory Committee*
Board of Education Policy 1230, *Area Education Advisory Councils (AEAC)*
Board of Education Policy 1240, *Visitors to Schools*
Board of Education Policy 1260, *School Volunteers*
Board of Education Policy 4000, *Precepts, Beliefs, and Values of the Baltimore County Public Schools*

Policy
Adopted: 05/23/91
Revised: 07/13/04
Revised: 05/20/08
Revised: 09/08/09
Revised: 09/07/10
Revised: 05/10/11
Edited: 07/01/11
Revised: 04/12/12
REVISED: ________
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED NEW BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4010, NEPOTISM

ORIGINATOR: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed new Policy 4010. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4010
Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
The Superintendent, in response to audit findings pointing out a potential conflict of interest, directed that a policy on nepotism be created. The policy establishes standards to ensure no conflict of interest exists or favoritism is shown for an immediate family member in the hire, retention, promotion, or other employment-related issues. The Policy Review Committee is recommending that the Board approve the policy.

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 8363, Conflict of Interest – Prohibited Conduct

Legal Requirements
1. None

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy GAF, Nepotism
2. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners, Policy GBEG, Nepotism
3. Calvert County Board of Education, Policy 6910, (Personnel) of the Board of Education Regarding Nepotism
4. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 7020, Nepotism
5. Montgomery County Public Schools, Regulation GCA-RA, Employee Conflict of Interest
6. Wicomico County Board of Education, Assignment of Close Relatives

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
POLICY 4010

PERSONNEL: GENERAL

NEPOTISM

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY (BOARD) ENCOURAGES THE PROMOTION AND RETENTION OF QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS AND PROMOTES HIGH STANDARDS OF ETHICAL BEHAVIOR IN THE EMPLOYMENT, EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND SELECTION PROCESSES.

B. THE BOARD BELIEVES THAT EMPLOYMENT, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION OF INDIVIDUALS SHOULD BE BASED ON QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE POSITION, PERFORMANCE, AND ABILITY. THE BOARD RECOGNIZES ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS THAT WILL ASSIST IN AVOIDING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, NEPOTISM, AND THE APPEARANCE OF FAVORITISM TOWARDS IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.

II. DEFINITIONS

A. IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER – THE SPOUSE, PARENT, SIBLING, CHILD, GRANDPARENT, GRANDCHILD, AUNT, UNCLE, NIECE, NEPHEW, ALL STEP-RELATIONSHIPS, OR ANY OTHER INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS LIVED REGULARLY IN THE EMPLOYEE’S HOUSEHOLD.

B. NEPOTISM – FAVORITISM SHOWN TO AN IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER WITH REGARD TO HIRING, RETENTION, PROMOTION, OR OTHER EMPLOYMENT-RELATED ISSUES.

III. STANDARDS

TO ENSURE THAT NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST EXISTS OR FAVORITISM IS SHOWN FOR AN IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER, THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS SHALL APPLY:
A. THE BOARD PERMITS THE EMPLOYMENT OF IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS, AS LONG AS THE EMPLOYMENT DOES NOT CREATE AN ACTUAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST OR THE APPEARANCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

B. AN EMPLOYEE MAY NOT HOLD A POSITION THAT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A DIRECT CHAIN OF SUPERVISION FOR ANOTHER EMPLOYEE WHO IS AN IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.

IV. EXCEPTIONS

A. ANY EXCEPTION TO THIS POLICY MAY ONLY OCCUR AFTER REVIEW BY THE CHIEF HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICER AND WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SUPERINTENDENT.

B. THE BOARD SHALL APPROVE ANY EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF AN IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER OF THE SUPERINTENDENT.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8363, CONFLICT OF INTEREST – PROHIBITED CONDUCT

POLICY ADOPTED: BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4104, TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR EMPLOYEES AND APPROVED NON-EMPLOYEES

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Camille Jones, Chief Information Technology Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 4104. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 4104
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4104
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS TO
ELECTRONIC INFORMATION, SERVICES, AND NETWORKS
RENAMED AS “TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR EMPLOYEES AND APPROVED NON-EMPLOYEES”

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Board of Education Policy 4104 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 4104 establishes standards for the acceptable use of electronic information, services, and networks by employees and authorized users. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) rename the policy to distinguish this policy for the acceptable use policy for students; (2) include a policy statement; (3) include an implementation section; and (4) conform with the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

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

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 1100, Communication with the Public
2. Board of Education Policy 1110, Media, Public Relations and Publications, Events, Television and Web site
3. Board of Education Policy 4002, Obligations of Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
4. Board of Education Policy 4008, Data Governance
5. Board of Education Policy 4100, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
6. Board of Education Policy 6202, Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy for Students
7. Board of Education Policy 8363, Conflict of Interest – Prohibited Conduct

Legal Requirements
1. 18 U.S.C. §§2510-2522, Electronic Communications Privacy Act
2. 20 U.S.C. §794d, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
3. 20 U.S.C. §1232g, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
4. 47 U.S.C. §254(h), Children’s Internet Protection Act
5. Annotated Code of Maryland, Labor and Employment Article §3-713, Employers prohibited from requiring disclosure of employee user names or passwords to personal accounts or services
6. COMAR 13A.05.04.01, Public School Library Programs

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Carroll County Board of Education, Policy IJND, Telecommunications Policy
2. Harford County Board of Education, Policy Number 20-0034-000, Acceptable Use of
Telecommunications Equipment by Employees/Volunteers
3. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 8080, Acceptable Use of Technology
4. Talbot County Board of Education, Policy Number 10.16, Student Conduct: Bullying, Harassment or Intimidation

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
PERSONNEL: Conduct

Telecommunications ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR EMPLOYEES AND APPROVED NON-EMPLOYEES [Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks]

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) BELIEVES [recognizes] that, as telecommunications and other new technologies change the ways that information may be accessed, communicated, and transferred, [by members of society, those] THESE changes ALSO provide [new] opportunities TO ENHANCE TEACHING AND LEARNING, COMMUNICATION AND RESOURCE SHARING, AND WORKPLACE EFFICIENCY. [and responsibilities for employees.] The Board IS COMMITTED TO PROVIDING [supports] access [by employees] to information resources IN ORDER TO FURTHER THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. [along with the development of appropriate skills to access, evaluate, and use these resources for assignments, projects, or job responsibilities].

B. THE BOARD EXPECTS THAT EMPLOYEES AND OTHER APPROVED NON-EMPLOYEES SHALL USE SCHOOL SYSTEM TELECOMMUNICATIONS IN AN ETHICAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND RESPONSIBLE MANNER. THE BOARD PROHIBITS THE ILLEGAL USE OF ITS TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

[For the purposes of this policy, employees shall be defined as any and all individuals employed by the Board in any position, including part-time and temporary assignments.

As employees learn to use telecommunications technologies, it is expected that they will apply them in appropriate ways to the performance of tasks associated with their responsibilities and positions.
The Board expects that employees will act in a considerate and responsible manner as specified in the Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy for Employees form (Rule 4104, Form A) prior to using telecommunications in Baltimore County Public Schools.

The Board authorizes the Superintendent to develop appropriate procedures for implementing this policy, to review and evaluate its effect on student achievement and employee productivity, and to develop appropriate discipline procedures.]

Legal References: 18 U.S.C. §§2510-2522 [2701-2711], Electronic Communications Privacy Act
20 U.S.C. §794d, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
20 U.S.C. §1232g, FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT
47 U.S.C. §254(h), Children’s Internet Protection Act
ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT ARTICLE §3-713, EMPLOYERS PROHIBITED FROM REQUIRING DISCLOSURE OF EMPLOYEE USER NAMES OR PASSWORDS TO PERSONAL ACCOUNTS OR SERVICES
[COMAR 13A.05.02.13H, Local Public Agency Administration]
COMAR 13A.05.04.01, Public School Library Programs
[COMAR 13A.08.01.11, Disciplinary Action
COMAR 13A.08.01.14, Searches]

Related Policies: Board of Education Policy 1100, Communications with the Public
Board of Education Policy 1110, Media, Public Relations and Publications, Events, Television and Web site
Board of Education Policy 4002, Obligations of Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4008, DATA GOVERNANCE
Board of Education Policy 4100, Employee Conduct and Responsibilities
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6202, TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY FOR STUDENTS
Board of Education Policy 8363, Conflict of Interest – PROHIBITED CONDUCT
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6202, TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR STUDENTS

ORIGINATOR: Michael Sines, Chief Operations Officer

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Camille Jones, Chief Information Technology Officer
Dale Rauenzahn, Executive Director, School Safety and Security

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 6202. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6202
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6202
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS TO
ELECTRONIC INFORMATION, SERVICES, AND NETWORKS
RENAMED AS, “TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR STUDENTS”

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Board of Education Policy 6202 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 6202 outlines standards for students’ acceptable use of telecommunications and networks. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) rename the policy to clearly distinguish it from the employee acceptable use policy; (2) include a policy statement; (3) include an implementation section; and (4) conform with the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

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

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 1110, Media, Public Relations and Publications, Events, Television, and Web Site
2. Board of Education Policy 4008, Data Governance
3. Board of Education Policy 4104, Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) for Employees and Approved Non-Employees
4. Board of Education Policy 5230, Student Records
5. Board of Education Policy 5550, Disruptive Behavior
6. Board of Education Policy 5580, Bullying, Harassment, or Intimidation
7. Board of Education Policy 5590, Students’ Expressions
8. Board of Education Policy 5600, Students’ Rights and Responsibilities
9. Board of Education Policy 6002, Selection of Instructional Materials

Legal Requirements
1. 18 U.S.C. §§2510-2522, Electronic Communications Privacy Act
2. 20 U.S.C. §794d, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
3. 20 U.S.C. §1232g, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
4. 20 U.S.C. §§1400-1419, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
5. 29 U.S.C. 794, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
6. 47 U.S.C. §254(h), Children’s Internet Protection Act
7. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-305, Suspension and Expulsion
8. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-308, Searches of Students and Schools
9. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §26-101, Disturbing Activities at School or College; Molesting or Threatening Students
11. COMAR 13A.05.01, *Provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education*
12. COMAR 13A.05.02, *Administration of Services for Students with Disabilities*
13. COMAR 13A.05.04.01, *Public School Library Programs*
14. COMAR 13A.08.01.11, *Disciplinary Action*

**Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems**
1. Carroll County Board of Education, Policy IJND, *Telecommunications Policy*
2. Harford County Board of Education, Policy Number 24-0046-000, *Instructional Technology Acceptable Use Policy for Students*
3. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 8080, *Acceptable Use of Technology*
4. Prince George’s County Board of Education, Policy 0155, *Information Technology Services – Acceptable Usage Guidelines*
5. Talbot County Public Schools, Policy Number 10.32, *Acceptable Use of Technology and Internet Safety for Students*

**Draft of Proposed Policy**
Attached

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

**Timeline**
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
INSTRUCTION: Instructional Services

Telecommunications ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR STUDENTS [Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks]

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) BELIEVES [recognizes] that, as telecommunications and other new technologies change the ways that information may be accessed, communicated, and transferred by members of society, THESE [those] changes may also ENHANCE [alter] instruction and student learning. THE BOARD ENCOURAGES THE USE OF, AND PROVIDES ACCESS TO, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND NETWORK RESOURCES THAT WILL ENABLE STUDENTS TO CONNECT WITH GLOBAL INFORMATION RESOURCES AND TO COMMUNICATE WITH OTHER USERS.

B. The Board SUPPORTS THE [expects that the employees will integrate] thoughtful use of electronic resources throughout the curriculum TO PROVIDE STUDENTS WITH THE SKILLS NEEDED TO EVALUATE AND USE THESE RESOURCES FOR ASSIGNMENTS, PROJECTS, OR OTHER EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.

[The Board supports access by students to information resources along with the development by employees of appropriate skills to access, analyze, and evaluate such resources.]

II. STANDARDS

A. STUDENTS SHALL HAVE ACCESS TO SCHOOL SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES [For students, telecommunications in the Baltimore County Public Schools are] for educational purposes, such as accessing curriculum-related information, sharing resources, and promoting innovation in learning. Learning how to use this wealth of information and how to communicate electronically are fundamental to PREPARING [prepare] citizens and future employees for the 21st century.
B. AS PART OF THEIR ANNUAL STUDENT BEHAVIOR HANDBOOK TRAINING, STUDENTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO REVIEW THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP). PARENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED THE OPPORTUNITY TO WITHHOLD PERMISSION FOR A STUDENT’S ACCESS TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS.

C. STUDENTS WHO USE BCPS TELECOMMUNICATIONS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR USING THOSE RESOURCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEDERAL AND STATE LAW AND REGULATIONS, BOARD POLICIES, SUPERINTENDENT’S RULES, AND SCHOOL SYSTEM PROCEDURES.

D. Students shall be held responsible for THE appropriate USE OF BCPS TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR ANY VIOLATION OF THE ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY. [behavior as specified in the Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy for Students form (Rule 6202, Form A).

E. Telecommunications extend the classroom beyond the school building by providing access to information resources on local, state, national, international, and commercial electronic networks. Telecommunications, because they may lead students to any publicly available fileserver in the world, will open classrooms to electronic information resources that may change daily and which have not been evaluated by educators for use by students of various ages. The Board [of Education] expects that employees will provide guidance and instruction to students in the appropriate use of such resources as specified in the Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy for Students Form (Rule 6202, Form A) and the Telecommunications Acceptable Use Policy for Employees Form (Rule 4104, Form A).]

III. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY. [The Board authorizes the Superintendent to develop appropriate procedures for implementing this policy, to review and evaluate its effect on student achievement and instruction, and to develop appropriate discipline procedures.]
Legal References:

18 U.S.C. §§2510-2522, _Electronic Communications Privacy Act_


20 U.S.C. §1232g, _Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act_

20 U.S.C. §§1400-1419, _Individuals with Disabilities Education Act_


29 U.S.C. 794, _Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act_

47 U.S.C. §254(h), _Children’s Internet Protection Act_

[18 U.S.C. §§2701-2711, _Electronic Communications Privacy Act_

20 U.S.C. §1232g, _Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act_

20 U.S.C. §794d, _Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973_

Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-305, _Suspension and Expulsion_

Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-308, _Searches of Students and Schools_

Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §26-101, _Disturbing Activities at School or College; Molesting or Threatening Students_

Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article §§10-611 to 10-630, _Access to Public Records_

COMAR 13A.05.01, _Provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education_

COMAR 13A.05.02[.13H], _Administration of Services for Students with Disabilities_

COMAR 13A.05.04.01, _Public School Library Programs_

COMAR 13A.08.01.11, _Disciplinary Action_

[COMAR 13A.08.01.14]
Related Policies:

- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 1110, *MEDIA, PUBLIC RELATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS, EVENTS, TELEVISION, AND WEB SITE*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4008, *DATA GOVERNANCE*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4104, *TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY (AUP) FOR EMPLOYEES AND APPROVED NON-EMPLOYEES*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5230, *STUDENT RECORDS*
- Board of Education Policy 5550, *DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR*
  [Board of Education Policy 5570]
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5580, *BULLYING, HARASSMENT, OR INTIMIDATION*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5590, *STUDENTS’ EXPRESSIONS*
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, 5600, *STUDENTS’ RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES*
  [Board of Education Policy 5660]
- BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6002, *SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS*
DATE: March 19, 2013
TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION
FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent
SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6307, PATRIOTIC EXERCISES

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 changes to Policy 6307. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6307
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6307
PATRIOTIC EXERCISES

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. In February of 2013, staff recommended the deletion of the Policy. However, following additional review by the full Board and further discussion at the Committee level, the Policy Review Committee has rejected the staff recommendation and has directed staff to revise Policy 6307 to conform with its editing conventions. The Committee concurs with its other Board colleagues that patriotic exercises are important for students. No substantive changes have been recommended.

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 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
3. Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
Staff had recommended deleting the policy, as it was simply a restatement of the law.

Timeline
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
INSTRUCTION: SCHEDULES

Patriotic Exercises

I. POLICY STATEMENT

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 (BOARD) and for the display of said flag in each classroom of every Baltimore County Public School[s].

II. STANDARDS

A. 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.

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

III. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

Legal Reference: *Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-105, DISPLAY OF FLAG; PATRIOTIC EXERCISES*

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
REVISED: __________
Baltimore County Public Schools

Date: March 19, 2013

To: Board of Education

From: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

Subject: Report on the Proposed Changes to Board of Education Policy 6500, Research and Assessment

Originator: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

Resource Person(s): Yakoubou Ousmanou, Chief Accountability Officer

Recommendation

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 6500. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 6500
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 6500
RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 6500 is scheduled for review in school year 2012-2013. Policy 6500 outlines the standards to be followed for administration of assessments in Baltimore County Public Schools. Staff is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) include a policy statement; (2) clearly delineate Board standards; (3) include an implementation section; and (4) conform with the Policy Review Committee’s editing conventions.

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

Relationship to Other Board of Education Policies
1. Board of Education Policy 4002, Obligations of Employees of the Board of Education of Baltimore County
2. Board of Education Policy 4008, Data Governance
3. Board of Education Policy 5210, Factors Involved in Student Evaluation
4. Board of Education Policy 5250, Graduation Requirements
5. Board of Education Policy 5550, Disruptive Behavior

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §7-203, Education Accountability Program
2. COMAR 13A.03.04, Test Administration and Data-Reporting Policies and Procedures
3. COMAR 13A.05.01.05, Assessment
4. COMAR 13A.12.05, Suspension and Revocation

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy II, Test Administration and Data Reporting
2. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 8120, Testing: State and Local Responsibilities and Protocols
3. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy ILA-EA, Education Accountability Program (State Law)

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other alternatives were considered.
**Timeline**
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
INSTRUCTION: Research, Testing, and Evaluation

Research and Assessment

I. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (Board) recognizes the importance of research and assessment to the educational process. Research conducted shall be aligned with SCHOOL SYSTEM [the] goals [in the Blueprint for Progress] and shall be conducted in such a way as to safeguard the privacy of all individuals involved.

B. The Board recognizes its RESPONSIBILITY TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT SYSTEMWIDE ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND PRACTICES THAT ALIGN WITH COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS AND THAT ESTABLISH [accountability for providing for student and school success] The Superintendent shall be responsible for establishing] an assessment program that includes state-mandated, system-selected, and curriculum-embedded tests.

II. STANDARDS

[The] Assessments IN BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS (BCPS) shall be administered to:

A. [1.] Evaluate the progress of students and schools in meeting the goals of the SCHOOL SYSTEM [Blueprint for Progress];

B. [2.] Improve STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT [classroom instruction and curricular programs];

C. [3.] Provide information and feedback to students and parents; AND

D. [The Superintendent shall] Ensure that all standardized testing is administered and reported in accordance with all applicable federal and state mandates, BOARD POLICIES, SUPERINTENDENT’S RULES, AND SCHOOL SYSTEM PROCEDURES.
III. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY. [The Superintendent shall establish procedures for approving and conducting research for data collection, data analysis, and data reporting in order to fulfill federal and state requirements and to ensure the legal and ethical use of the resulting information.]

LEGAL REFERENCES: ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §7-203, EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
COMAR 13A.03.04, TEST ADMINISTRATION AND DATA-REPORTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
COMAR 13A.05.01.05, ASSESSMENT
COMAR 13A.12.05, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION

RELATED POLICIES: BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4002, OBLIGATIONS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 4008, DATA GOVERNANCE
BOARD OF EDUCATION 5210, FACTORS INVOLVED IN STUDENT EVALUATION
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5250, GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 5550, DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR

Policy Board of Education of Baltimore County
Adopted: 04/10/69
Revised: 07/12/94
Revised: 05/14/02
Revised: 06/10/08
REVISED: ____________
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8130, FORMULATION

ORIGINATOR: Margaret-Ann F. Howie, Esq., General Counsel

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Patricia S. Clark, Policy and Compliance Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Education reviews the proposed changes to Policy 8130. This is the first reading.

*****

Attachment I – Policy Analysis
Attachment II – Policy 8130
POLICY ANALYSIS FOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8130
FORMULATION

Statement of Issues or Questions Addressed
In accordance with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 8130, Policy 8130 is scheduled for review in school year 2012–2013. Policy 8130 establishes the process for the development of Board of Education policies as required by State law; reflects current Board practices concerning curriculum adoption; and outlines the Board’s commitment to review its policies, to the best of its ability, on a five year cycle. The Board’s Policy Review Committee is recommending that the policy be revised to: (1) include a policy statement; (2) move the “definition” of a policy to a separate section, consistent with the Board’s current formatting practice; 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 8132, Control and Communications
2. Board of Education Policy 8140, Administrative Operations

Legal Requirements
1. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-101, Control and Promotion of Education
2. Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article §4-108, Duties in General

Similar Policies Adopted by Other Local School Systems
1. Anne Arundel County Board of Education, Policy BF, Policysetting
2. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners, Policy BGA, Policy Development
3. Harford County Board of Education, Policy 22-0014-000, Policy Development and Review
4. Howard County Board of Education, Policy 2000, School Board Governance
5. Montgomery County Board of Education, Policy BFA, Policysetting

Draft of Proposed Policy
Attached

Other Alternatives Considered by Staff
No other options were considered.

Timeline
First reading – March 19, 2013
Public comment – April 23, 2013
Third reading/vote – May 7, 2013
INTERNAL BOARD POLICIES: Organization

Formulation

I. POLICY STATEMENT [Purpose]

A. The Board of Education of Baltimore County (BOARD) IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FORMULATING AND ADOPTING EDUCATIONAL POLICIES FOR THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM (BCPS) [representing the people of the county, is, in addition to its many other roles, the legislative body which makes policy to be employed by the county’s public schools. “Policies” are defined as those principles formally adopted by the Board of Education in order to manage the school system].

B. The Board shall, to the best of its ability, cause the provisions of state and federal laws and the bylaws and policies of the MARYLAND State Board of Education (MSBE) to be carried out.

C. The Board [of Education] shall, with the advice of the [county] Superintendent, set goals and expectations for the school system through the development, revision, and adoption of policies to guide the formulation and implementation of educational programs and the management of school system operations.

D. Unless legal or regulatory requirements demand otherwise, the Board shall to the best of its ability, review its policies within five years of adoption, amendment, or re- adoption.

E. THE BOARD SHALL APPROVE, PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OR DISCONTINUANCE, EACH course of study AND [ , ] revised COURSE OF STUDY [courses, required methods of teaching, and any significant program to be tested in one or more schools for the purpose of] being considered for use system-wide, EXCEPT WHEN THE COURSE OF STUDY IS MANDATED BY MSBE [shall be approved by the Board of Education prior to implementation or discontinuance].
II. DEFINITION

POLICIES – GUIDELINES AND STATEMENTS OF GOALS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD. POLICIES ASSIGN AUTHORITY, OUTLINE PRINCIPLES TO BE FOLLOWED WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIC MATTERS, AND SERVE AS A MEANS TO GOVERN AND MANAGE THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

III. [II.]PROCEDURE

A. The Board may request or receive a policy analysis from the Superintendent on revisions to existing policies or on the need for a new policy.

1. All policy analyses will include the following elements:
   a. Statement of issues or questions addressed by the proposed policy;
   b. Where appropriate, cost analysis and fiscal impact on school system;
   c. Relationship to other Board [of Education] policies;
   d. Legal requirements, such as federal, state, or local laws or regulations;
   e. Similar policies adopted by other local school systems;
   f. A draft of the proposed policy; and
   g. Other alternatives that were considered by staff.

B. The policy analysis will be presented to the Board as an item for discussion.

C. If limited revisions to existing policies are necessary, the Superintendent will present the proposed changes to the Board with an accompanying rationale. There shall be no need for a policy analysis.

D. When a Board member or the Superintendent presents a proposed policy, a time line for adoption will accompany the policy, and will include, where appropriate:

1. Opportunity for citizen comment;
2. Opportunity for Superintendent and staff to provide advice and recommendations;
3. Proposed date of adoption.
E. The Superintendent shall, where necessary, develop administrative rules for the implementation of the Board’s policies. Such rules will be presented to the Board for information purposes, but do not require an affirmative vote of the Board.

F. Following discussion, the Board shall adopt policies, in public session, and such adoption shall be recorded in the minutes of the Board.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

THE BOARD DIRECTS THE SUPERINTENDENT TO IMPLEMENT THIS POLICY.

LEGAL REFERENCES:

*ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-101, CONTROL AND PROMOTION OF EDUCATION*
*ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, EDUCATION ARTICLE §4-108, DUTIES IN GENERAL*

Related Policies:

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8132, *CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS*
BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY 8140, *ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS* [– Formulation of Administrative Regulations]

Policy
Adopted: 04/13/72
Revised: 07/13/78
Revised: 10/08/96
Revised: 12/04/01
Revised: 10/02/07
REVISED: ___________
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON IMAGINE DISCOVERY PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

ORIGINATOR: Kevin A. Hobbs, Deputy Superintendent

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Patricia Lawton, Chief Academic Officer
Roger Plunkett, Executive Director, Student Support Services
Catherine Allie, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Schools, Zone 2

INFORMATION

That the Board of Education receives the results of the joint mid-year evaluation between Baltimore County Public Schools and the Imagine Discovery Public Charter School.

****
On November 7, 2012, the Board of Education signed an amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding for Imagine Discovery Public Charter School (IDPCS). The amendment states that a joint mid-year evaluation between Baltimore County Public Schools and IDPCS will be completed by January 15, 2013, and an end-of-year evaluation by an outside evaluator will be conducted by June 30, 2013.

Both evaluations will focus on student achievement and will include the following components:
- Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) Criteria
- Suspension Data
- Special Education
- School Progress Plan
- Gifted and Talented Students
- Data Point Chosen by Imagine Discovery Public Charter School

At the March 19, 2013, Board of Education meeting, the Board will receive the results of the joint mid-year evaluation conducted by Baltimore County Public Schools staff.
IMAGINE DISCOVERY CHARTER SCHOOL MID-YEAR EVALUATION

March 19, 2013

Presenters
Catherine Allie, Ed.D.
Roger L. Plunkett, Ph.D.
BACKGROUND:

August 2012 - Board of Education Meeting

- Student Achievement
- Special Education
- Gifted and Talented Services
UPDATE ON EVALUATION CRITERIA

• Suspension Data
• MAP Data
• Stanford Achievement Test (Data Point Chosen by Imagine Discovery)
• Gifted and Talented Students
• Special Education
• School Progress Plan
Two-Year Elementary Suspension Comparisons: Imagine Discovery and BCPS (August-February)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imagine Discovery</th>
<th>BCPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-Year Middle School Suspension Comparisons:
Imagine Discovery and BCPS (August-February)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of Students Suspended</th>
<th>Imagine Discovery</th>
<th>BCPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Dark Blue</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
READING SCORE COMPARISONS
ELEMENTARY GRADES

Fall MAP Reading Score Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average RIT Score</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Discovery</td>
<td>184.7</td>
<td>196.9</td>
<td>204.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPS</td>
<td>188.1</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>205.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATH SCORE COMPARISONS
ELEMENTARY GRADES

Fall MAP Mathematics Score Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average RIT Score</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagine Discovery</td>
<td>BCPS</td>
<td>BCPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>189.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>201.1</td>
<td>204.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fall MAP Reading Score Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average RIT Score</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Discovery</td>
<td>206.9</td>
<td>212.4</td>
<td>218.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPS</td>
<td>209.4</td>
<td>213.5</td>
<td>217.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATH SCORE COMPARISONS
MIDDLE GRADES

Fall MAP Mathematics Score Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average RIT Score</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Discovery</td>
<td>210.5</td>
<td>214.3</td>
<td>221.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPS</td>
<td>216.8</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>225.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Reading Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Curve Equivalent</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Mathematics Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Curve Equivalent</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOCUS AREAS

- School Progress Plan
- Identification of Gifted and Talented Students
- Special Education
NEXT STEPS
DATE: March 19, 2013

TO: BOARD OF EDUCATION

FROM: S. Dallas Dance, Superintendent

SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOUNDATION, INC.

ORIGINATOR: Deborah S. Phelps, Director, Education Foundation
              Donald L. Arnold, President, Education Foundation

RESOURCE PERSON(S):

INFORMATION

That the Board of Education receives an update on the Education Foundation.

*****
OVERVIEW OF THE EDUCATION FOUNDATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, INC.

The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools Education, Inc. was organized on October 26, 1992, under Section 501 (c) (3) to attract and direct public financial contributions to programs and activities of the school system in support of quality education for all children. Since that time, parents, alumni, retirees, community members and businesses are among the groups selecting to contribute in support of their local public schools. Contributions to the foundation may be donor designated for specific projects or programs, or they may be offered for more general systemic support.

VISION:
To provide community and corporate funding in support of Public Education in Baltimore County and to manage those resources for continuous student improvement of all students in partnership with the Baltimore County Public Schools.

MISSION:
The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc. is an independent, 501(c) (3) community-based organization that mobilizes the public, private and corporate will and resources needed in support of initiatives that are not supported by BCPS needed to guarantee a world-class public education for all Baltimore County Students. To do this we:

- **Invest in Teaching and Learning:** We provide supplemental venture capital to educators (principals, teachers, administrators and parents) to accelerate student achievement through well defined initiatives.
- **Mobilize the Community:** We marshal the talent and resources of businesses, philanthropic organizations, government agencies, parents, citizens, and businesses in support of public education to strengthen every public school.

GOALS
- To provide financial resources for programs and initiatives that aligns and supplements students’ education experience.
- To encourage academic excellence.
- To promote community and BCPS system awareness in education and the Foundation.
- To ensure the perpetuity of the Foundation with an endowment fund.

STATEMENT of PURPOSE
The purpose of the Foundation is to solicit, manage, and distribute supplemental funds for educational purposes in program areas that may not be funded by the school system. Funding is supplemental and does not replace or alter use of tax-based revenue. Donations are received from individuals, corporations, and other foundations to fund educational programs and projects.
that are in alignment with the school system’s strategic plan and to create an Endowment Fund. Programs will be funded from donations as well as a percent of the Endowment Fund.

**ORGANIZATION, STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE EDUCATION FOUNDATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, INC.**

The Foundation’s current organizational structure has been analyzed to determine whether it is structured to meet the previously established vision, mission, goals, and statement of purpose. Working collaboratively through this analysis, the Foundation began the 2012-2013 school year with the consulting firm of Krupp, Hooper & Associates. The Foundation’s Executive Committee and Board of Directors, under the leadership of the Director, focused on the organizational effectiveness, and are willing to change and/or modify various components in order to strengthen the operation of the Foundation.

The information below reflects current and proposed organizational structure of The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc.

The Foundation currently consists of: Officers/Executive Committee members (consisting of four officers), a Board of Directors (consisting of eleven directors inclusive of two Board members from the Baltimore County Public Schools Board of Education) and Staff (consisting of four Baltimore County Public Schools employees; one being the newly appointed, first director in the existence of the Foundation).

**2012-2013 FOUNDATION OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE/BOARD OF DIRECTORS STRUCTURE**

**OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**PRESIDENT**

Donald L. Arnold, CFP®

VALIC

**VICE PRESIDENT**

David Uhlfelder, PA

David Uhlfelder, PA

BCPS Board of Education Member

**SECRETARY**

Molly F. Shock

**TREASURER**

Alan N. Kanter, Esq.

Retired

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Douglas Eder

Oak Contracting

Gerald Feldman, M.D.

Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, LLP

John A. Hayden, III Esq.

Grant Thornton (Retired Partner)

Larry Kamanitz, CPA

BCPS Board of Education Member

George Moniodis
Steven Prumo
Lynch

The Sanford Clark Group, Merrill Lynch

Dennis Robinson, Jr. Esq.
Timmy Ruppersberger, Esq.
James A. Sasiadek
Mike Trenery
Stacy Walsh

Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, LLP

Retired Education Administrator
Black Oak Associates
WMAR-TV
The Foundation is discussing and considering the need to implement a newly formed Advisory Board/ Foundation Development Council to assist the Director and President with issues/concerns related to public education and business community partnerships. The newly formed Board/Council would provide support and guidance on current long-range issues and goals of the Foundation, as well as open doors on behalf of the Foundation to secure human and financial support aligned with our mission, vision, and goals.

Community and business partners that are being considered as members to the Board/Council include but is certainly not limited to the following professions: TV/RADIO/media, higher education professionals, medical professionals, athletic professionals and athletes, retired employees of Baltimore County Public Schools, current employees of Baltimore County Public Schools, President of the Baltimore County PTSA and school-based PSTA members, faith-based individuals, hotel and tourism, and various businesses including, but not limited to – legal, finance/accounting, technology, etc.

COMMITTEES

The Foundation has four newly formed, functioning committees that meet weekly/monthly. The committees are as follows: Governance Task Force, Development, Finance/Planning Implementation, Marketing/Publicity, and Ad Hoc.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Since the inception of The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc., it has successfully collaborated with non-profits, government agencies, business, and the parents and communities of many schools in Baltimore County to bring a number of projects successfully to fruition. They include but are not limited to the following:

The Foundation has provided funds for various “Seed Projects” and targeted projects for:

- Home and Hospital
- High School Robotics
- Purchase of computers and computer software
The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc., since 2000 has disbursed over $2,900,000. These projects include the following bulleted items:

- Approximately eighty projects since 2000 with thirty-five still active.
- Sixteen Scholarship Projects including 158 awarded scholarships $153,000.
- Two high school stadium projects ($205,000).
- Eleven school playground projects ($299,000).
- Fifteen school technology projects ($897,000).
- High School Robotics teams ($49,000).
- Capital improvements at two elementary schools ($480,000).
- Thirty-two school-based instructional projects ($837,000).
  - Thirty restricted projects.
  - Two unrestricted accounts.

Each year The Education Foundation Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc. has provided schools with the opportunity to apply for up to two thousand dollar grants ($2,000) to support projects during the school year that are aligned with the BCPS Blueprint for Progress and the School Improvement Plans. Focus areas of the grants include the following areas: Arts and Culture, Financial Literacy, Green Initiative and Environmental Sustainability and STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.)

Below are the results:

- 2010-2011 - Ten Instructional Initiative Grants awarded supporting seventeen elementary, middle, and high schools ($13,409).
- 2011-2012 - Nine Instructional Initiative Grants awarded supporting seventeen elementary, middle, and high schools ($17,820).
- 2012-2013 - Twenty-one Instructional Initiative Grants awarded supporting thirty elementary, middle, and high schools ($34,457).

**PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES**

Many BCPS departments, offices, and schools have and continue to work with the Foundation to raise funds for specific programs, initiatives, and projects. Some of these projects are:

- Office of Career and Technology Education student internships and scholarships.
- Office of World Languages supports funding for the Chinese Cultural Exchange Program.
- Department of Technology supports funding for hardware, software, and infrastructure needs including those of Assistive Technology and Home and Hospital programs.
Twenty-four Challenge Mathematics Enrichment and Competition for elementary and middle school students.

- Associated Builders and Contractors Fund.
- Woodholme Elementary School in support and funding for the Robotics Program and Technology Integration.
- Patapsco High School and Center for the Arts in support of the marching band appearances globally upon invitation.
- Carroll Manor Elementary School in support of technology and library materials.
- Franklin Elementary School in support of technology.
- Hampton Elementary School in support of instructional program enhancements.
- Jacksonville Elementary School in support of equipment, books and materials.
- Pikesville Middle School in support of instructional enhancements.
- Pikesville Middle School in the funding for an auditorium.
- Rodgers Forge Elementary School in support of technology.
- West Towson Elementary School in support of technology.

GRANTS

During the 2012-2013 school year, the following grants have been issued to the Foundation:

- $10,000 Play 60 Super School grant – Stoneleigh Elementary School.
- $10,000 NFL Network/Verizon (matching grant) – Office of Health Education.
- $10,000 Maryland Physicians Care and My Healthy World grant – Holabird Middle School.
- $10,000 Rosedale Federal Savings and Loan Association grant – Kenwood High School.

SPONSORED EVENTS 2012-2013 THROUGH 2013-2014 TO DATE

- Welcome Reception, October 10, 2012, introducing Superintendent, Dr. S. Dallas Dance and Foundation Director, Deborah S. Phelps at The Suburban Club.
- Foundation Logo Contest – working with the BCPS Office of Art, the Foundation solicited support from high school students to participate in the creation and design of a logo. Participating schools included Hereford High School, Patapsco High School, Perry Hall High School, Randallstown High School, Overlea High School, and Western School of Technology.
- Education is a BLAST Night Family Night held on February 23, 2013, at the Mariner Arena. Approximately seventy-one tickets were sold. Earnings pending. A check for $1,000 will be donated to the school that sells the most tickets – compliments of John A. Hayden III, Esq. of Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, LLP. The check will be issued to Shady Spring Elementary School.
- State of the Schools Luncheon, March 21, 2013, Valley Mansion

The Foundation is hosting this event working collaboratively with the BCPS Office of Community Outreach. Thus far, a total of $33,800 has been received for the event with $56,250 promised by local businesses, colleges, universities and foundations. Sponsorship packets were created and designed to clearly explain the various
sponsorships available for the event. Sponsorships continue to arrive daily in support of the event.

- **Teen for Jeans 2013**, February 2013, eleven schools partnered via the Baltimore County Education Foundation, Inc. with Aeropostale in support of the implementation of a community service project for homeless teens. Participating schools collected 3,574 pair of jeans to tabulate, box, and donate to two local stores in Baltimore County. In return, each student participant received a 25% coupon for a new pair of jeans. Schools had the opportunity to compete for a $10,000 grant and a $5,000 scholarship.

- **Golf and Tennis Classic**, September 30, 2013, at Woodholme Country Club, the Foundation is partnering with Maryland Association of Nonpublic Education Facilities (MANSEF) to host this event.

- **A Celebration of MOM ~ An Investment in our Children**, May 11, 2013, at Port Discovery. The Foundation partners with Port Discovery.

- **WE Give Books** – Meeting scheduled with the Office of Language Arts to discuss We Give Book (WGB) and the Pearson Foundation aimed to assist the Foundation in securing low-cost books for use in schools. Books will be acquired through the We Give Book Million Reasons to Read Challenge matching program. (Event pending)

- **Parent Involvement Day** – a meeting was held with the BCPS Title I Office to discuss the possible plans for gaining sponsorships to host a day involving parent/guardians in Title I schools, to provide resources and gain knowledge pertaining to child development and school involvement. (Event pending.)

In addition to all of the above information pertaining to the transformation of The Education Foundation Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc., we ask that you make it a point to visit our URL site, [EducationFoundationBCPS.org](http://EducationFoundationBCPS.org), allowing us to showcase the work of the Foundation and how it impacts our school system. It will be launched at the State of the Schools Luncheon along with our FACEBOOK page and Twitter account. We are currently going through a name change from being identified as The Baltimore County Public Schools Education Foundation, Inc. to The Education Foundation of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc.

Join us in making a contribution to The Education of Baltimore County Public Schools, Inc.

By contacting

Deborah S. Phelps, Director
dphelps@bcps.org

or

Donald A. Arnold
arnold@verizon.net

**Contributing to a Brighter Future!**

To invest in teaching and learning by mobilizing the community to fund activities and programs that aligns with Baltimore County Public Schools vision of a successful and bright future for every student.
Attached is the general fund *Comparison of FY2012 and FY2013 Revenues, Expenditures, and Encumbrances – Budget and Actual* for the periods ended January 31, 2012 and 2013.

*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 January 31, 2012 and 2013. Figure 4 is a comparative statement of budget-to-actual revenues, expenditures, and encumbrances.
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 $319.7 million, 46.4% of the budget, as compared to $322.6 million, 48.3% 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 January 2013, four 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 $2.1 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 January 2013 are $719.1 million, 56.5% obligated, compared to $704.9 million, 57.5% obligated, for the same period in FY2012. The increase of $14 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 53.6% 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 49.3% 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.

![% of Budget Obligated as of January 31, 2012 and 2013](image)

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. Year to date FY2013 expenditures are $2.1 million less than FY2012 because FY2012 had higher computer replacements costs through January 2012. The remaining budget will be spent during the school year to purchase additional consumable classroom supplies, textbooks, computers, 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, $4.7 million, 61.8% of the FY2013 budgeted funds, have been committed. In the prior year, $5.6 million, 69.7%, 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 January 2013, 95.3% of the nonsalary budget has been committed, compared to 94.1% committed at January 2012.

• **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 January 2013, 87% of the nonsalary budget has been committed, compared to 91.7% committed at January 2012.

• **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 additional funding for the state Aging Schools Program. Year-to-date nonsalary expenditures and encumbrances for Maintenance of Plant are $13.6 million, 64.7% of the budgeted amount, as compared with $13.6 million, or 86%, in the prior fiscal year. Capital outlay nonsalary expenditures are 67.2% expended at January 2013, as compared to being over the budget in January 2012. 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 January, 2012 and 2013

### General Fund

#### FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget as of 01/31/12</th>
<th>Remaining as of 01/31/12</th>
<th>Percentage Earned or Obligated</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget as of 01/31/13</th>
<th>Remaining as of 01/31/13</th>
<th>Percentage Earned or Obligated</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>$668,495,342</td>
<td>$322,568,383</td>
<td>$345,926,959</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>$1,226,742,597</td>
<td>$691,076,239</td>
<td>$535,666,358</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Maryland</td>
<td>$536,555,216</td>
<td>$352,039,621</td>
<td>$184,515,595</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>$1,135,432,815</td>
<td>$735,179,992</td>
<td>$400,252,823</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$4,540,000</td>
<td>$4,402,581</td>
<td>$137,419</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>$7,572,440</td>
<td>$611,000</td>
<td>$6,961,440</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$17,152,019</td>
<td>$12,065,854</td>
<td>$5,086,385</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>$26,180,284</td>
<td>$20,480,059</td>
<td>$5,700,225</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$43,056,852</td>
<td>$4,806,749</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>$1,272,253,709</td>
<td>$702,523,731</td>
<td>$569,729,978</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures and Encumbrances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Salaries</td>
<td>$25,079,503</td>
<td>$14,388,915</td>
<td>$10,690,589</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>$25,051,560</td>
<td>$13,530,736</td>
<td>$11,520,824</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$12,002,215</td>
<td>$6,388,819</td>
<td>$5,641,394</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>$11,743,335</td>
<td>$5,946,402</td>
<td>$5,796,933</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$37,091,716</td>
<td>$20,777,734</td>
<td>$16,331,982</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>$36,793,896</td>
<td>$19,477,138</td>
<td>$17,316,848</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level Administration</td>
<td>$7,927,079</td>
<td>$5,713,987</td>
<td>$2,213,686</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>$7,832,972</td>
<td>$5,836,804</td>
<td>$1,996,168</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$86,726,857</td>
<td>$50,497,969</td>
<td>$36,246,892</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>$87,497,025</td>
<td>$49,198,460</td>
<td>$38,298,565</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$114,753,955</td>
<td>$102,937,755</td>
<td>$11,816,200</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>$112,326,867</td>
<td>$98,636,622</td>
<td>$13,690,245</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel</td>
<td>$33,200,193</td>
<td>$16,583,970</td>
<td>$16,760,223</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>$34,867,212</td>
<td>$17,073,244</td>
<td>$17,794,968</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$24,799,624</td>
<td>$23,494,529</td>
<td>$1,485,095</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>$26,072,673</td>
<td>$24,852,424</td>
<td>$1,220,249</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$58,000,015</td>
<td>$40,078,499</td>
<td>$18,191,318</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>$60,940,875</td>
<td>$41,925,668</td>
<td>$18,315,207</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Plant</td>
<td>$41,374,772</td>
<td>$22,693,906</td>
<td>$18,680,866</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$43,056,852</td>
<td>$23,209,215</td>
<td>$19,847,637</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$46,215,315</td>
<td>$42,397,401</td>
<td>$3,817,914</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>$47,977,200</td>
<td>$41,214,389</td>
<td>$6,162,811</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$87,590,087</td>
<td>$65,091,307</td>
<td>$22,498,780</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>$90,034,052</td>
<td>$64,423,594</td>
<td>$5,610,458</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>$11,942,283</td>
<td>$7,079,918</td>
<td>$4,862,365</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>$13,583,978</td>
<td>$6,519,382</td>
<td>$7,064,596</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$15,719,183</td>
<td>$13,560,548</td>
<td>$2,158,635</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>$21,079,834</td>
<td>$13,620,619</td>
<td>$7,459,215</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$27,701,466</td>
<td>$20,630,467</td>
<td>$7,071,000</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>$34,643,812</td>
<td>$20,149,002</td>
<td>$14,494,810</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$267,632,772</td>
<td>$143,010,217</td>
<td>$124,622,555</td>
<td>$53.4%</td>
<td>$290,727,510</td>
<td>$172,264,446</td>
<td>$118,463,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$2,820,491</td>
<td>$1,614,613</td>
<td>$1,205,878</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>$2,972,058</td>
<td>$1,482,467</td>
<td>$1,489,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary</td>
<td>$397,312</td>
<td>$617,313</td>
<td>$220,081</td>
<td>155.4%</td>
<td>$392,732</td>
<td>$263,982</td>
<td>$128,750</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$3,217,723</td>
<td>$2,231,925</td>
<td>$985,798</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>$3,364,790</td>
<td>$1,746,456</td>
<td>$1,618,334</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td>$780,704,663</td>
<td>$410,274,903</td>
<td>$370,429,760</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>$796,516,751</td>
<td>$399,723,755</td>
<td>$396,792,996</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Salary</strong></td>
<td>$446,017,834</td>
<td>$294,659,886</td>
<td>$151,378,048</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>$475,736,958</td>
<td>$319,359,160</td>
<td>$156,377,798</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures and Encumbrances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,227,253,709</td>
<td>$702,523,731</td>
<td>$569,729,978</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached is the proprietary fund *Comparison of FY2012 and FY2013 Revenue and Expenses – Budget and Actual* for the periods ending January 31, 2012 and January 31, 2013. Amounts included reflect actual revenues and expenses to date and do not reflect forecasts of revenues and expenses. Figure 1 is a comparative statement of budget-to-actual revenues and expenses. Figure 2 demonstrates the revenue breakdown by category.

**Background**

Proprietary Fund Financial Statements are used to reflect activities that operate like commercial enterprises. The Office of Food and Nutrition Services operates as an enterprise fund. An enterprise fund charges fees for services which are provided to customers.

The Office of Food and Nutrition Services directs the Child Nutrition Programs including the National School Lunch, School Breakfast, After-School Snack, Supper, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable, and the Summer Food Service programs for the students of Baltimore County Public Schools. These are federally subsidized programs. The program regulations are administered at the national level by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) is responsible for the program operation within the state. The Office of Food and Nutrition Services operates within federal and state requirements. Federal revenue is received on a per meal basis. MSDE provides the majority of state funds in six equal installments.

**Budget**

The Office of Food and Nutrition Services’ adopted budget is based on past performance and future expectations. At the beginning of the fiscal year, an adjusted budget is prepared to reflect the updated projections. The attached report includes the adjusted budget.

**Revenue**

Based on a 180 days operating year, as of January, 2013, 95 days or 52.8% of the school year has lapsed. Year-to-date operating revenues (food sales) total $6,988,498 (52.6%) compared to $7,492,042 (51.4%) for the same period in FY2012, a $503,544 decrease. This change is due to a reduction in paid lunches. Federal reimbursement is $13,508,146 (54.3%) year-to-date through January, 2013 compared to $12,481,245 (56.6%) at January, 2012, a $1,026,901 increase. This change is due to an increase in the free meal participation. The state revenues are $463,689 (55.7%) year-to-date through January, 2013 compared to $422,740 for the same period in FY2012, a $40,949 increase. For FY 2013, interest income and other revenue includes onetime grants of $289,833.

**Expenses**
Year-to-date expenses through January, 2013 are $20,879,901 (50.89%) compared to $19,916,637 (50.91%) for same period in FY2012. This increase of $963,264 is the result of the increase in the total of paid and free meals served and increased food prices.

Baltimore County Public Schools
Comparison of FY 2012 and FY 2013 Revenues and Expenses
Budget and Actual
For the Periods Ended January, 2012 and 2013
Proprietary Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Rev/Exp</td>
<td>Remaining Earned or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget as of 01/31/12</td>
<td>Budget Spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Rev/Exp</td>
<td>Remaining Earned or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget as of 01/31/13</td>
<td>Budget Spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating revenues:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operating expenses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for sales and services</td>
<td>14,572,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of food sold</td>
<td>14,934,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, wages, and benefits</td>
<td>21,100,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1,066,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair of</td>
<td>780,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and support</td>
<td>742,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>39,122,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>(24,550,233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonoperating revenues (expenses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal reimbursement of food service costs</td>
<td>22,059,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State reimbursement of food service costs</td>
<td>765,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal donated commodities</td>
<td>1,796,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income and other</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total nonoperating revenues (expenses)</strong></td>
<td>24,629,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>39,201,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (loss)</strong></td>
<td>$79,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
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Figure 2
DATE: March 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 2,623 legislative introductions: 1062 Senate Bills, 4 Joint Senate Resolutions, 1,553 House Bills, and 4 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2: BOE INFORMATIONAL BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education – Security – School Resource Officers</td>
<td>This bill would require the superintendent to enter into an agreement with the Baltimore County Police Department to provide a school resource officer (SRO) in each elementary and secondary school. Any additional required funds needed in excess of the school system’s FY 2013 operating budget would be provided from the state’s Education Trust Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HB 165</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 807</strong></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></td>
<td>Effective Date – Date Enacted</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 access system would be required to allow staff the 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 access to the building. The bill would require the Board of Public Works to issue implementing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HB 269</strong></td>
<td>Public Schools – Requirements for Controlled Access</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HB 475</strong></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 that 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</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>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>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</strong></td>
<td>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, 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 661</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques - Students with Special Needs and Limited English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>This bill would require MSDE to provide each PreK-12 teacher (newly certified as of July 1, 2015, and all certified teachers as of July 1, 2017) with instruction regarding techniques for teaching students with special needs, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 995</td>
<td><strong>Baltimore County Public Schools - Enrollment and Transfer - Parental Decision</strong></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill Status:**
- **House – 02/13/13 - Hearing**
- **Bill Status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td><strong>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</strong></td>
<td>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, 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 661</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques - Students with Special Needs and Limited English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>This bill would require MSDE to provide each PreK-12 teacher (newly certified as of July 1, 2015, and all certified teachers as of July 1, 2017) with instruction regarding techniques for teaching students with special needs, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 995</td>
<td><strong>Baltimore County Public Schools - Enrollment and Transfer - Parental Decision</strong></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill Status:**
- **House – 02/13/13 - Hearing**
- **Bill Status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td><strong>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</strong></td>
<td>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, 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 661</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques - Students with Special Needs and Limited English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>This bill would require MSDE to provide each PreK-12 teacher (newly certified as of July 1, 2015, and all certified teachers as of July 1, 2017) with instruction regarding techniques for teaching students with special needs, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 995</td>
<td><strong>Baltimore County Public Schools - Enrollment and Transfer - Parental Decision</strong></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill Status:**
- **House – 02/13/13 - Hearing**
- **Bill Status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 507</td>
<td><strong>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</strong></td>
<td>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, 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 661</td>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques - Students with Special Needs and Limited English Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>This bill would require MSDE to provide each PreK-12 teacher (newly certified as of July 1, 2015, and all certified teachers as of July 1, 2017) with instruction regarding techniques for teaching students with special needs, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 995</td>
<td><strong>Baltimore County Public Schools - Enrollment and Transfer - Parental Decision</strong></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill Status:**
- **House – 02/13/13 - Hearing**
- **Bill Status:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HB 833 SB 740 | 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. | Effective Date – October 1, 2013  
Bill Status:  
House – 02/20/13 – Hearing  
http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0661F.pdf  
Senate – 03/20/13 - Hearing  
http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0995F.pdf  
with limited English proficiency, and in appropriate behavioral 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. MSDE is required to adopt necessary regulations to implement this requirement. |
| College Readiness and Completion Act of 2013 | Introduced by Delegates Kaiser, Bohanon  
Introduced by Senators Pinsky, Madaleno | Effective Date – July 1, 2013  
Bill Status:  
House – 02/26/13 – Hearing  
http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0833F.pdf  
Senate – 03/06/13 – Hearing  
This bill would require MSDE to establish specified mathematics course requirements for certain students and would require students to enroll in a college preparation curriculum (unless a parent or student declines to enroll). MSDE would be required to conduct a specified assessment of all students in the 11th grade and, in collaboration with Maryland public community colleges, to develop and implement specified courses for the 12th grade to facilitate student college readiness. The bill establishes Algebra II as the minimum level of math competency for a high school student enrolled in a college preparation program and would require that additional high school math instruction be in “non-trivial” math classes. The bill also includes provisions for creating a new Early College Access Grant and mandating local school system payment of tuition for all dually enrolled students. |
<p>| HB 843 | State Board of Education - Financial Literacy Curriculum - Graduation Requirement | Introduced by Delegates Walker, Arora, Bobo, Bromwell, Cane, Clagett, Clippinger, DeBoy, George, Haddaway- |
| | | This bill would require the Maryland State Board of Education to develop a semester long financial literacy curriculum that each local board must implement. The course will be a requirement for high school graduation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>TITLE / SYNOPSIS</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **HB 926** | **County Boards of Education - Spending - Reporting Requirement**  
Introduced by Delegate Olszewski  
Requiring each county board of education to provide a report to the State Department of Education by specified dates on the amount of State, local, and federal funds spent per student for specified students at each school; requiring the Department to submit a specified report to the General Assembly by specified dates; etc.  
**Effective Date – October 1, 2013**  
**Bill Status:**  
House – 02/27/13 - Hearing  
http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0843F.pdf | This bill would require that each local board to submit a funding report to MSDE (which would report all 24 board’s information to the General Assembly). The report would include state, local, and federal funding on a per student basis and by individual school for the following funding categories:  
- students receiving compensatory education (FARMS-eligible)  
- limited-English proficiency  
- special education funding  
- magnet students  
- all remaining students  
The reporting would begin no later than 10/01/14, and continue each subsequent 3 years. Implementation of the bill would require a different system of collecting and reporting data because it does not follow existing MSDE reporting. |
| **HB 1174** | **Educator Evaluation System - Pilot Program Extension**  
Introduced by Delegates Stein, Cardin, Cullison, Gutierrez, Lafferty, Lucdtke, Malone, Mizeur, Morhaim, and Weir | This bill would require the MSDE to extend the Education Evaluation System Pilot Program until such time that the state assessments are aligned with the Common Core State Curriculum and the necessary assessments are fully implemented. |
| BILL |
| TITLE / SYNOPSIS |
| ANALYSIS |
| Requiring the State Department of Education to extend the pilot program for the Educator Evaluation System until specified assessments are aligned with the Maryland Common Core State Curriculum and the assessments are fully implemented; and requiring the Department to take the steps necessary to implement the pilot program extension requirement. |

**Effective Date – June 1, 2013**

**Bill Status:**
*House – 03/06/13 - Hearing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 1288</th>
<th>Accountability in Education Act of 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Delegates Stockdale, Aumann, Bates, Boteler, Frank, and Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring a county board of education to pay a public institution of higher education 50% of the tuition and fees charged to a student enrolled in a noncredit remedial education course under specified circumstances; requiring a county board to remit payment within a specified number of days on receipt of a specified notification from a public institution of higher education; etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date – June 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bill Status:
  House – 03/19/13 - Hearing |

| SB 10 |
| Baltimore County – Board of Education – Selection of Members |
| 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 – Unfavorable Report **
  House – Unfavorable Report

** The Baltimore County Senate Delegation approved amendments to the bill, but an unfavorable report was issued on the bill based on the 4 to 4 vote. |

This bill would require a local board to pay a Maryland public institution of higher education 50% of the tuition and fees charged (upon request and receipt of an invoice) to a student for a noncredit remedial course taken if that student has been certified by a high school principal as qualified to pursue a higher education and enrolled in a public institution within 18 months after graduation from a Maryland public high school. The bill would be effective beginning in the 2014-2015 academic year.

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. ** The Baltimore County Senate Delegation approved amendments to the bill, but an unfavorable report was issued on the bill based on the 4 to 4 vote.

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 member) are entitled to $100 annual compensation and allowances for travel and other expenses.
- 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.
- Board members would elect a chair and vice-chair from among members at the board’s first December meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 115</th>
<th>County Boards of Education – School Budget, Audit, and Procurement Information – Web site Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced by Senator Benson</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effective Date – July 1, 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bill Status:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate – 01/24/13 - Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
### State Aid for Public Education – Certification of Net Taxable Income

Introduced by The President (By Request - Administration) and Senators Benson, Currie, Miller, Peters, Pinsky, Ramirez, and Rosapepe

Altering the definition of "net taxable income" 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.

**Effective Date – July 1, 2013**

**Bill Status:**
- Senate – 02/27/13 Hearing
- House – 03/12/13 – Third Reading Passed

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 to provide any increased state education aid.

### Baltimore County – Board of Education – Prohibited Members

Introduced by Senators Zirkin, Brochin

Prohibiting a regulated lobbyist or the spouse of a regulated lobbyist from being appointed as a member of the Baltimore County Board of Education.

**Effective Date – July 1, 2013**

**Bill Status:**
- Senate – Unfavorable Report**

**An unfavorable report was issued by the Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee and the bill was withdrawn by the sponsor.

This bill would change current law to prohibit the appointment of a regulated lobbyist or spouse to the Baltimore County Board of Education.

### Public School Employees - Collective Bargaining -

This bill would mandate that all school boards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HB 667</strong></th>
<th><strong>Representation Fees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Senators Pugh, Benson, Conway, Currie, Ferguson, Forehand, Frosh, Garagiola, Gladden, Kelley, King, Klausmeier, Madaleno, Manno, McFadden, Montgomery, Peters, Pinsky, Ramirez, Robey, Rosapepe, Stone, and Young</td>
<td>Requiring public school employers to negotiate with employee organizations designated as the exclusive representatives for the public school employees a required service or representation fee to be charged to nonmembers; providing a specified exception and requirement for specified noncertificated employees whose religious beliefs are opposed to joining or financially supporting a collective bargaining organization; requiring the exclusive representative to establish and maintain a specified procedure; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective Date – July 1, 2013**

**Bill Status:**
- Senate – 03/21/13 - Hearing
- House – 02/20/13 - Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SB 572</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maryland Early Learning Challenge and School Readiness Act (Race to the Tots)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Senators Ferguson and Madaleno</td>
<td>This bill establishes an early learning challenge and school readiness grant in 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 million 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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective Date – July 1, 2013**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Status:</th>
<th>Education - Due Process Hearings for Children with Disabilities - Burden of Proof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate – 03/06/13 - Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0572F.pdf">http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0572F.pdf</a></td>
<td>This bill would shift the burden of proof in cases involving impartial due process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House – 03/06/13 – Hearing</td>
<td>hearings that are requested by any party challenging the appropriateness of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0925F.pdf">http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/hb/hb0925F.pdf</a></td>
<td>disabled child’s individualized education program from the party initiating the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complaint to the party that is required to defend the challenged action. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bill seeks to negate the decision in a 2005 Supreme Court case involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland that upheld the general rule applicable in court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cases that the burden of proof rests with the party initiating a legal challenge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>absent a specific, applicable statute to the contrary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 691</th>
<th>HB 1286</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Senators</td>
<td>Requiring the State Department of Education, a local school system, or any State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery and Benson</td>
<td>agency responsible for providing education to students with disabilities to bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the burden of proof in a due process hearing relating to a dispute over the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identification, evaluation, educational placement, or provision of a free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date – October 1, 2013</td>
<td>appropriate education to a child with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 958</th>
<th>Education - State Funding - Operating and Capital Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Senator</td>
<td>Establishing the rate by which the target per pupil foundation amount is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleno</td>
<td>increased in specified fiscal years; requiring that the county boards of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education receive a specified grant; and establishing the State goal to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date – July 1, 2013</td>
<td>at least $350,000,000 in each fiscal year to fund public school construction or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Status:</td>
<td>capital improvement costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate – 02/14/13 – First Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0958F.pdf">http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2013RS/bills/sb/sb0958F.pdf</a></td>
<td>This bill would increase the target per pupil foundation amount in specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fiscal years and require that the local boards receive a specified grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would also establish a state goal to provide at least $350 million in each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fiscal year to fund public school construction or improvement projects. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bill’s change in the geographic cost index used in the state funding formula to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balances allocations among jurisdictions would likely result in little, if any,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change for BCPS. The $350 million goal for annual public school construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>financing is notable but it is only a goal and the actual amount would likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vary based upon the state budget climate and overall economic condition.</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.