

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: February 11, 2003

TO: **BOARD OF EDUCATION**

FROM: Dr. J. Hairston, Superintendent

SUBJECT: **Follow-Up to the Proposed FY04 Budget Work Session**

ORIGINATOR: J. Robert Haines, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services
Christine Johns, Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction

RESOURCE PERSON(S): Merle Audette, Chief of Staff
Greg Barlow, Barbara Burnopp, Randy Grimsley, Rita Fromm, and Don Krempel, Executive Directors of Business Services
Phyllis Bailey, Ron Boone, Dr. Gwen Grant, Kathy McMahon, and Robert Kemmery, Executive Directors of Curriculum and Instruction
Michael Goodhues, Director, Budget and Reporting

INFORMATION

As a follow-up to Board member questions at the Work Session on Tuesday, February 4, 2003, the administration's responses are provided in the appendices.

Appendix I is the definition of terms that are used to describe the funding sources for each new item in the Proposed FY04 Proposed Budget. In addition, a code for each funding source is included.

Appendix II provides the Table of Contents from the Work Session binder which now includes the location of each item in the Budget Book, a code for the funding source, and the cost for each item.

Appendix III lists the Board members' questions and the administration's responses.

Appendix I – Definition of Terms

Appendix II – Table of Contents

Appendix III – Questions and Responses

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

New Thornton Funds (NTF)

These are new funds from the State that are categorized as unrestricted funds. They represent the increase in State funding that would not have occurred without the changes that the Thornton Commission made to the funding formulae. These funds provide flexibility to school systems in the planning process.

(Examples are: In the FY04 Proposed Budget, the New Thornton Funds are used for funding the expansion of full-day kindergarten at 10 schools, Professional Development, Special Education, Army JROTC, Performance Series, Evening High School, Technology, Lease of Buses, Drivers, Air Quality, CollegeEd, Career and Technology, and Special Area Time.)

Redirected State Funds (RSF)

These are FY03 funds that are in Special Revenues. Under the new legislation, the State has removed the restrictions from the funding and have re-categorized them as unrestricted funds. As a result, for the FY04 Budget, all of these unrestricted funds are in the General Fund.

(Examples are: In the FY04 Proposed Budget, the following restricted funds have been re-directed: Academic Intervention, State Class Size Reduction, approximately two-thirds of State Compensatory Education, and Mentors. The redirected funds are for the FY04 initiatives of reduced staffing ratios for grades K-2, Mentor/Math Mentors, and Technology Teachers.)

Maintained State Funds (MSF)

These are FY03 funds that are in Special Revenues. Under the new legislation, the State has removed the restrictions from the funding and have re-categorized them as unrestricted funds. In the Proposed FY04 Budget, not all of the Special Revenue funds have been redirected.

(Examples are: Career and Technology, Teacher Development, Gifted and Talented, Library-Elementary, Northwest/Southwest Regional IEP, Targeted Poverty, Targeted Improvement, Summer Programs, and Limited English Proficiency, Adult General Education (AGE), School Community Center Program (SCCP), Disruptive Youth, Therapeutic Services, and approximately one-third of State Compensatory Education)

Redirected General and Special Revenue Funds (RGF) – (RSRF)

These are funds that are in the FY03 Budget for achieving specific results and have been redirected for the FY04 Budget to achieve different results, and in some cases, very similar results.

(Examples are: In the FY04 Proposed Budget Equity and School Improvement Funds that are presently in the General Fund have been redirected for the Accelerated and Enrichment Programs. Title I and Title II – Special Revenue funds have been redirected

in the proposed FY04 Proposed Budget for the Primary Talent Development Program and for the Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Academies.)

Additional Built In Costs (BI)

These are additional costs to the systems that reflect increases in specific programs that are to be funded by the State and County. Built-in costs are the mandated increases required to maintain the “status quo” of our current operation.

(Examples are: Benefits, Salary Increments, Private Placement, New Town Start-Up, Teaching Positions for increased enrollment in 2002 - 2003 and projected increased enrollment in 2003 - 2004.)

Request for Funds (RF)

These are additional funds that are requested to achieve a specific result.

Example is: CASE Restructuring

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item #	Description of Item and Resources	Page # Work Session	Page # Budget Book	Source Fund Code	Cost \$
	Definitions of Terms	1-2			
	Elementary Programs				
1	Full-Day Kindergarten and Relocatables	3-6	35, 103,177	NTF	1,026,606 406,500
2	Kindergarten Reading Materials	7-8	103	NTF	114,000
3	Social Studies Texts Grades 4, and 5	9-11	103	RGF	572,326
4	Science Kits Grade 4	12-13	103	RGF	60,000
	Secondary Programs				
5	Social Studies Text, Grade 11	14-15	103	RGF	497,450
6	CollegeEd	16-18	115	NTF	94,600
7	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	19-20	35,131	MSF	2,539,800
8	Performance Assessments	21-22	129	NTF	59,400
	Professional Development				
9	Professional Development Reading/Language Arts and Math Academies	23-25	255	RSRF	160,000
10	Professional Development Math, Special Education and Technology	26-27	163	NTF	336,000
11	Teacher Development	28-29	35,163	MSF	664,000
	Federal and State Programs				
12	Northwest and Southwest Regional IEP Team	30-31	35	MSF	500,000
13	Special Education Growth Factor	32-35	35	NTF	1,502,516
14	Private Placements	36-37	111	BI	8,528,555
15	Targeted Improvement Program	38-39	35,113	MSF	1,758,179
16	Targeted Poverty	40-41	35,113	MSF	3,362,004

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Pre-K-12 Special Programs					
17	Library Fund K-12	42-43	143	RGF MSF	1,147,284 752,000
18	Maintained Career and Technology	44-45	137	MSF	556,914
19	Army JROTC/Patapsco High	46-47	35,137,177	NTF	58,626 146,912
20	Career and Technology	48-50	35	NTF	186,648
21	Primary Talent Development	51-53	253	RSRF	1,407,460
22	Maintained Gifted and Talented	54-56	139	MSF	269,200
Student Support Services					
23	Disruptive Youth/General Adult Ed/Therapeutic Services	57-58	147	MSF	159,737
24	Evening High School	59-62	147	NTF	113,364
25	Pupil Personnel Services—Residency	63-64	157	RGF	15,000
26	Summer School	65-66	147	MSF	260,000
27	School Community Center Program	67-68	147	MSF	65,707
Elementary, Federal and State, Human Resources and Professional Development Services					
28	• Redirected State Funds--\$12,973,630	69			
28-A	A. Academic Intervention	70-71	223	RSF	(1,967,323)
28-B	B. Class Size Reduction Program	72	228	RSF	(2,597,972)
28-C	C. State Compensatory Education	73	230	RSF	(2,008,335)
28-D	D. Mentors	74	163	RSF	(6,400,000)
29	• Redirected State Funds for New Initiatives--\$12,973,630	75			
29-E	E. Student-Teacher Ratio, K-2	76-77	35	RSF	5,716,243
29-F	F. Mentors and Math Mentors	78-80	35	RSF	4,623,432
29-G	G. Technology Teachers	81	35	RSF	2,633,955

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Human Resources					
30	Maintain State Compensatory Education	84-85	35,113	MSF	1,023,589
31	Enrichment and Accelerated Programs	86-88	41	RGF	2,500,000
32	CASE Restructuring	89	Multiple Pages	NR	400,000
33	Special Area Time, K-2	90-91	35	NTF	863,247
Information Technology					
34	Technology—Student Information System Phase 1 of 2	92-93	205	NTF	1,500,000
35	Technology—Disk Storage	94	205	NTF	392,000
36	Technology—Data Warehouse	95-96	205	NTF	250,000
Fiscal Services					
37	New Town High School	97-98	35,46,47, 181, 183,217	BI	1,084,078 1,608,164
38	Increments	99	Multiple Pages	BI	8,742,057
39	Benefits	100	292	BI	18,700,000
40	Enrollment 2002-2003 and 2003-2004	101	35,53	BI	3,600,000
41	Mid-Year Adds	102	Multiple Pages	BI	890,659
42	Miscellaneous Increases and Technical Adjustments	103	Multiple Pages	BI	4,100,000
Planning and Support Operations					
43	Leases of Buses and Drivers for New Town High School	104	217	NTF	103,795
Physical Facilities					
44	Air Quality	105-106	179	NTF	100,000

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

1. Question:

How much is the Environmental budget and is the \$100,000 requested from the New Thornton Funding supplemental or included in the existing budget? Where can this be found in the budget book?

Response:

The current Environmental budget is \$569,000 and the requested \$100,000 is additional money.

The FY04 Proposed Budget is on page _____.

2. Question:

What would the cost be to pay the Evening High School teachers \$30.00 or \$34.92 an hour?

Response:

The following costs would apply for each of the rates:

Proposed FY04 Budget \$25 an hour	Response \$30 an hour	Response \$34.92 an hour
\$ 113,364	\$222,410	\$ 319,495

3. Question:

What Baltimore County Public Schools do not have GT programs and identified students?

Response:

152 schools have GT programs and identified students. Sollers Pt Southeastern Technical was left off the count but does have a GT program with identified students. Schools that do not have GT programs are alternative and special education schools as well as the Early Childhood Center. These schools are the following:

Special Schools

Battle Monument

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Campfield Early Childhood Center
 Maiden Choice School
 RICA – Catonsville Education Center
 Ridge Ruxton School
 White Oak School

Alternative Schools

Inverness Middle/High
 Catonsville Center for Alternative Studies
 Rosedale Middle/ High
 Meadowood Education Center

Other

Featherbed Lane Primary

Pending funding of the FY 04 Special Revenue Title I budget proposal, White Oak and Featherbed Lane Primary will get .5 GT (CATALYST) teachers. When New Town High School opens in the fall of 2003 it will have a GT program and identified students.

4. Question:

What has been the retention of the new teachers who attended the summer reading academies during the **summer of 2002?**

Response:

The academies for the **2002-2003 school year** were open to all new elementary hires. The academies were not mandatory; therefore all new hires did not attend due to previous work commitments or vacation plans. Additionally, although the academies were intentionally held late in the summer, some of the teachers were not hired at the time of the academies.

The specifics related to the question are being compiled and will be provided.

5. Question:

How will the CollegeEd program be implemented and what results has the system had with the pilot this year?

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Response:

In the fall of 2000, The College Board and Baltimore County Public Schools announced that they had entered into an agreement to increase college awareness and preparation for the more than 107,000 students in the school system. Now in the third year of a partnership, the program implements components of The College Board System and an integrated set of College Board products, services, and teaching and learning materials that focus on college readiness and preparation from middle school through high school graduation. These expanded resources provide BCPS students with extra support in an increasingly competitive college admissions process. In addition to The College Board Partnership, locally developed materials, such as SAT manuals and national programs including AVID and TestU, provide support for students' educational development and future success in college.

This year (2002-2003) The College Board activities include a pilot program of The CollegeEd curriculum in eight middle schools. CollegeEd is a 12-week course (45 minute sessions) for seventh-grade students developed by The College Board to inspire every single student to attend and succeed in college. CollegeEd is the only program in the country aimed at all students. Rich or poor, black or white, all students will receive the very best college planning and preparation. Next year, Baltimore County Public Schools are proposing to offer and implement CollegeEd in all middle schools for approximately 8,800 7th graders. The research on the value of CollegeEd for all students is very positive.

The assessment of the CollegeEd curriculum by school administrators, teachers, parents/guardians, and students in pilot schools, as well as the curriculum experts at Teachers College, Columbia University and members of the SBPG was overwhelmingly positive. There was a strong consensus among all constituencies that the ideas that the curriculum espouses are critical to inspire middle school students of all economic, educational, and racial/ethnic backgrounds to have high educational aspirations, and that the knowledge base it offers empowers them to achieve those aspirations.

Teachers in the pilot schools judged the curriculum to be comprehensive and well-developed, offering them a well-planned, interactive guide that equipped them with key strategies that increased their ability to inspire and prepare their students for higher education. They conveyed that the curriculum was easy to teach and the assignments and activities were engaging and, for the most part, age appropriate, if somewhat challenging.

Parents/guardians of all socio-economic, educational and cultural backgrounds expressed strong support for the CollegeEd course. All of the interviewed parents/guardians perceived the course as a valuable educational experience for their children and an important resource for themselves. Non-college educated parents/guardians praised the

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

curriculum for legitimizing their dreams for their children's future, opening their children's eyes regarding possibilities, and for providing the children and the parents/guardians with the knowledge necessary to map and navigate the path toward higher education. Better educated parents/guardians commended the curriculum for reinforcing the importance of planning early for higher education, for assisting them to up-date their own knowledge about the academic and social aspects of preparing for college, and the college application and financial aid processes, thereby enhancing their ability to assist their children. The curriculum's potential to inspire, motivate, and educate parents/guardians is critical in light of Horn, Nunez, & Bobbitt (2000) research which found that family involvement in the college preparation process in middle school was strongly related to students' subsequent enrollment in postsecondary education. This finding was true regardless of the families' socio-economic, educational or cultural background.¹

At the end of this school year, implementation models used in the pilot schools will be examined and discussed. Insights gained from the pilot schools will be instrumental in selecting a method of exposing students to the concepts of CollegeEd at the seventh grade level.

¹ Horn, L., Nunez, A.M. & Bobbitt, L. *Mapping the Road to College* (NCES 2000-152). Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000.

6. Question:

The PowerPoint presentation given to the Board in a previous meeting, mentioned that the first year cost of the Student Information System is \$1.5 million. What was the \$642,000 for? Is that for on-going costs to maintain the system? Is it another \$1.5 million for the second year?

Response:

The \$642,000 figure was actually the combination of items #35 and #36, which are both one-time costs related to data storage and the data warehouse. The \$1.5 million slide was a representation of first year funds required for the total additional technology budget request, and was not intended as a representation of the ongoing cost for the Student Information System. An additional \$1.5M is needed to complete the system development and it will be request in the FY05 Budget.

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

7. Question:

Will the new system be able to be accessed by teachers, principals, administrators, and others who will need to make decisions based on the data this system contains?

Response:

While the Superintendent's technology vision has not been fully funded, (part of which provides a high capacity PC dedicated for every teacher's use on their desk, and a better than 5 to 1 ratio of students per high capacity PC), the fact remains that there is a tremendous amount of access available for teachers, administrators, and principals. Currently, 95% of the classrooms in BCPS have Internet and network access. There are also over 35,000 networked computers in BCPS, with over 24,000 being high capability. The system is designed to be browser-based, therefore enabling not only high capability computers to have access, but also mid capacity, and even low capacity to have access. As long as a computer has the ability to run a browser, it will be able to access this system, given that person has the appropriate security rights.

8. Question:

What is the amount of the increase in and total spending for non-public placements?

Response:

There was an increase of 80 students in non-public placements from December 1, 2001 to December 1, 2002. This is the largest increase the system has experienced and it represents 55 more students than the increase from the previous year.

1. The cost of non-public programs continues to increase annually.
2. More non-public facilities are requesting personal assistants for students with considerable challenges and/or therapeutic needs.
3. More students with intense needs require movement from less expensive day-only programs to residential placements.
4. There has been an increase in the number of new residents to the county who are already in non-public placements. These individuals legally must remain in these programs under the "Stay Put" language of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
5. The income level to qualify for mental health supports under social services was lowered from \$30,000.00 to \$10,000.00. As a result, far less families, both the children and their family members, are receiving the therapeutic interventions that may have prevented escalations in behaviors/symptoms.

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Enrollment Increases for the Past Four Years:

<u>12/98 to 12/99</u>	<u>12/99 to 12/00</u>	<u>12/00 to 12/01</u>	<u>12/01 to 12/02</u>
+ 20	+ 52	+ 25	+ 80

Deficits for the Last Three Fiscal Years:

	FY 2002		
	Local	State	Total
Appropriated	9,800,000	9,001,000	18,801,000
Spent	11,163,730	11,415,609	22,579,339
Deficit	-1,363,730	-2,414,609	-3,778,339

	FY 2001		
	Local	State	Total
Appropriated	9,364,586	8,528,049	17,892,635
Spent	9,949,035	9,144,571	19,093,606
Deficit	- 584,449	- 616,522	-1,200,971

	FY 2000		
	Local	State	Total
Appropriated	8,785,000	8,000,000	16,785,000
Spent	9,220,587	7,952,461	17,173,048
Deficit	- 435,587	47,539	-388,048

9. Question:

What services do the Northwest-Southwest IEP Team provide to the schools? Is there a need for more support at schools with large numbers of agency-placed students?

Response:

NW/SW Regional Team
School Service Data for Semester 1, 2002-3

Schools served by name:	# of times served
Chadwick Elementary	18
Catonsville Elementary	4
Dogwood Elementary	5
Edmondson Heights Elementary	16

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	N'TF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Hebbville Elementary	13
Featherbed Lane	1
Powhatan Elementary	4
Woodlawn Middle	17
Woodlawn High	18
Catonsville Middle	1
Johnnycake Elementary	8
Southwest Academy	8
Woodmoor Elementary	1
Pikesville Middle	2
Pikesville High	3
Deer Park Middle	4
Milbrook Elementary	1
Church Lane Elementary	2
Scotts Branch Elementary	2
Old Court Middle	3
Randallstown High	10
Randallstown Elementary	1
Chatsworth	1

Twenty – three total schools to date

- Number of IEP Teams: 36
- Number of assessments by type
 - Educational assessments - 47
 - Psychological assessments - 11
- Parent Surrogates arranged by home school – 1
- Parent Surrogates arranged by NW/SW Team – 7
- Other services:
 - Staff development
 - Instructional Support
 - Secure records
 - Placement Problems
 - Consult
 - Assist with local teams
 - Function as liaison between agencies and schools

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Northwest-Southwest Regional IEP Team
Schools of Ten or More Agency Placed Students

(Data as of 10/15/2002)

Area	School	Students
Southwest Area:	Arbutus Middle	16
	Catonsville High	20
	Edmondson Heights	20
	Featherbed Elementary (Primary and Intermediate)	17
	Hebbville Elementary	17
	Johnnycake Elementary	18
	Maiden Choice Elementary	27
	Powhatan Elementary	12
	Southwest Academy	36
	Woodlawn High	74
	Woodlawn Middle	48

- Total Southwest Area schools with ten or more agency-placed students 12 of 33 schools (36%)
- Total Southwest Area schools with one or more agency-placed students 32 of 33 schools (97%)
- Total agency-placed students in all Southwest Area schools 388 students

Area	School	Students
Northwest Area:	Church Lane Elementary	10
	Deer Park Middle	32
	Franklin High	12
	Hernwood Elementary	22
	Milford Mill Academy	53
	New Town Elementary	18
	Old Court Middle	53
	Pikesville High	14
	Pikesville Middle	22
	Randallstown Elementary	15
	Randallstown High	75
	Scotts Branch Elementary	16
Winand Elementary	13	

- Total Northwest Area schools with ten or more agency-placed students 13 of 30 schools (43%)

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

- Total Northwest Area schools with one or more agency-placed students 26 of 30 schools (87%)
- Total agency-placed students in all Northwest Area schools 409 students

Area	School	Students
Central Area:	White Oak Elementary	17

- Total Central Area schools with ten or more agency-placed students 1 of 33 schools (3%)
- Total Central Area schools with one or more agency-placed students 23 of 33 schools (70%)
- Total agency-placed students in all Central Area schools 81 students

Area	School	Students
Northeast Area:	Overlea High	16
	Parkville High	11

- Total Northeast Area schools with ten or more agency-placed students 2 of 33 schools (6%)
- Total Northeast Area schools with one or more agency-placed students 27 of 33 schools (82%)
- Total agency-placed students in all Northeast Area schools 108 students

Area	School	Students
Southeast Area:	Chesapeake High	14
	Deep Creek Middle	11

- Total Southeast Area schools with ten or more agency-placed students 2 of 35 schools (6%)
- Total Southeast Area schools with one or more agency-placed students 21 of 35 schools (60%)
- Total agency-placed students in all Southeast Area schools 65 students

BCPS Totals:

- Total BCPS schools with ten or more agency-placed students 30 of 164 schools (18.3%)
- Total BCPS schools with one or more agency-placed students 109 of 164 schools (66.5%)
- Total agency-placed students in all BCPS schools 1051 students

10. Question:

Is there a loss of services to schools when staff is designated for this team?

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Response:

The Northwest -Southwest IEP Team is funded through “Maintained State Funds.” Therefore, there is no new staff taken from schools to provide the services offered by the team.

11. Question:

What professional development opportunities are offered to veteran teachers?

Response:

The Department of Professional Development provides growth and development opportunities for veteran teachers through the following initiatives:

- Continuing Professional Development courses,
- Professional Development Schools in partnership with 13 local universities,
- Mentor training and mentor cadre training, and
- Teachers As Leaders as a component of the leadership program.

The total cost of these initiatives for 2001-2002 was \$522,348.

In 2001-2002, Title II funds provided \$626,976 for teacher development that included ongoing professional development in content and pedagogy as well as coursework in partnerships with higher education.

12. Question:

What professional development is available to paraeducators?

Response:

BCPS participates in a partnership with the College of Notre Dame (Advance Instruction for Paraeducators). Through this partnership, paraeducators may obtain 15 credits towards a Bachelor’s Degree.

BCPS participates in a partnership with the Community College of Baltimore (The Educational Support Program). This program enables paraeducators to complete coursework toward a degree in education.

The Department of Professional Development offers a course specifically designed for paraeducators in techniques for supporting students with disabilities.

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	N'TF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

Paraeducators attended the following workshops sponsored by the Department of Professional Development:

- *Implications of No Child Left Behind*, and
- *The Role of the Paraeducator in the BCPS Service Model*.

During systemwide professional development days, paraeducators are offered tutorials in mathematics and writing in order to prepare for a state assessment leading to certification. Those already qualifying for certification will attend workshops in using technology to enhance instruction.

13. Question:

What groups of employees have not had their class specifications reviewed? What would it cost to have these groups reclassified?

Response:

1. Elementary/Special Education School-Based Clerical Employees
 - This group, represented by **BACE**, was a part of a reclassification study done in the 1993-94 school year and reviewed in the 1998-99 school year. The 1993-94 study resulted in upgrades to most classes of clerical employees, but it was the 1998-99 review that highlighted the need to reclassify elementary/special education school-based administrative secretaries, and a smaller number of other school-based clerical employees. The reclassification would have resulted in one grade improvement for this group of school-based employees.
 - If funded, this item would cost approximately \$550,000.
2. Bus Drivers
 - This group, represented by **AFSCME**, was part of a reclassification study done over ten years ago. The reclassification would have resulted in an amount of money being added to the scale for drivers, thus improving their hourly rate.
 - If funded, this item would cost approximately \$425,000.
3. Grounds Men I and II
 - These groups, represented by **AFSCME**, were part of a reclassification study done in 2000. The reclassification would have resulted in a one grade improvement for these employees.
 - If funded, this item would cost approximately \$175,000.

Funding Source:

Description	Code
Built In	BI
New Request	NR
Redirected State Funds	RSF
Maintained State Funds	MSF
Redirected General Fund	RGF
New Thornton Funding	NTF
Redirected Special Revenue Fund	RSRF

**Superintendent FY04 Proposed Budget
Addendum and Technical Adjustments
2/11/03 Board Meeting**

Addenda Item

Employee Reclassifications

Revenue projections received 2/3/03 from MSDE indicate a \$484,000 increase in the projections previously used for the current FY04 request. These additional revenues will be used to fund previously agreed upon salary reclassifications phased in over FY04-FY05 for the BACE and AFSCME bargaining units. School-based Clericals, Groundsmen and Bus Drivers will be affected by this change.

JROTC – Patapsco High

Add .4 FTE, salary and benefits consistent with Federal agreement, and non-salary funds for relocatable improvements.

Special Education – Enrollment

Adjust per pupil calculation to reflect Level IV and V enrollment only in formula. This will result in a decrease of \$192,000 in four categories.

Technical Changes

Include minor changes to salary, FTE and non-salary accounts between categories and updates to page 36. None of these changes are financially material or reflect a new or revised policy direction.