

# BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## PROPOSED FY 2018 OPERATING BUDGET

### RESPONSES TO BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS JANUARY 31, 2017

#### MANAGING GROWTH

- 1. Where will the 12 additional contracted bus routes be located (i.e., NE, SE, Central, etc.), and how are these intended to be divided between special education students and nonspecial education students?**

Please see the grid below showing the distribution of the additional 12 contracted routes:

Area	No. of Additional Contracted Routes
SW	2
NW	4
C	0
NE	2
SE	4

All contracted bus routes are allocated to transport nonspecial education students. This allows BCPS staff to transport students needing access to special transportation services.

- 2. What is the basis for the \$150,000 proposed for additional transportation for athletics?**

The projection for transportation is based off a 4% increase from what was spent in FY 2016. The requested increase is needed due to the expansion of our middle school athletic programs, the increase in our gasoline prices, and the lack of transportation vendors in eastern Baltimore County.

- 3. Inadequate student transportation capacity remains a concern for the safety of students. In response to a Public Information Act request in the fall of 2016, the Office of Transportation provided the number of student transportation subscribers for Perry Hall middle and high schools. The subscribed (projected) numbers exceeded bus capacity for a majority of the routes. While the proposed FY 2018 budget increases student transportation contracted services over FY 2017 by \$2.2 million, the budgeted amount is a decrease of \$1.2 million from FY 2016 actuals. Why the decrease, given the increase in enrollment? What specific actions are being taken to ensure adequate seats for all bus riders? When determining capacity needs, what student-to-seat ratios are used at elementary, middle, and high schools?**

Student transportation safety remains the highest priority. When route planning, the Office of Transportation takes into consideration the number of eligible riders vs. actual riders. Eligible student riders excludes walkers and students attending on special permission transfer. All other students are planned as riders. Factors that affect actual ridership projections include students who transport themselves, carpool with other students, students that remain to attend after school programs, athletic

programs, are transported by parents, or attend out of area day care centers. It has been and remains practice to closely monitor actual ridership numbers through a variety of processes, to include:

- Driver reports of actual student ridership.
- School assistance in monitoring actual student ridership, and reports information to the Office of Transportation.

If capacity concerns are noted:

- Transportation partners with the school's administration to ensure each student is riding the bus to which he/she is assigned.
- The driver will obtain student counts.
- If determined to be appropriate, the Office of Transportation will rebalance ridership loads (adjust bus stops) between available buses.

The Office of Transportation is continually balancing the use of BCPS buses and contractor buses to manage routes. The budget request will bring the contract bus budget more in line with actual use of contract buses, while continuing to work on filling vacant bus driver positions. A year-end budget appropriation transfer has been approved in recent years by the Board of Education and county council to move budgeted funds from vacant positions to contracted services.

Each full-size school bus is rated to transport 64 or 72 passengers. At the elementary level, actual ridership may reach, but not exceed, this capacity. This requires 3 students seated per bench seat. At the middle and high school levels, the Office of Transportation targets actual ridership to be 44-50 students per bus, as it is less practical for students to sit 3 per bench seat.

## RAISING THE BAR AND CLOSING GAPS

- 1. It appears that our Office of Magnet is funded at \$1 million and has 3 FTE (2 professional/1 support staff) (pg. 284); CTE is funded at \$2 million and has 10 FTE (6 professional/4 support staff) (pg. 227); and the Office of College and Career Readiness is funded at \$1.7 million and has 3 FTE (2 professional/1 support staff) (pg. 260). This means that our efforts to prepare our kids for the workforce totals about \$4.7 million and includes 10 professionals and 6 support staff.**

**Is this an accurate depiction of our efforts toward college and career readiness? Are there other offices or programs that should be taken into account? Maybe our finisher programs?**

The goal of Division of Curriculum and Instruction is to produce students who are college and career ready. Efforts involve collaboration among several offices within the Division of Curriculum and Instruction. In addition, the Office of Educational Options, the Office of School Counseling, the transition program for students receiving special education services through the Office of Special Education, and the Office of Advanced Academics work in conjunction with the offices mentioned above to align efforts. Completer programs are part of Career and Technology Education (CTE).

- 2. Who is the primary point of contact for our school counselors, who are trying to introduce students to these programs and opportunities? What other responsibilities does this point of contact have?**

A coordinator of School Counseling and two specialists are the points of contact. The coordinator and specialists ensure that the comprehensive school counseling programs support and align with the systemwide goals, standards, and priorities identified in *Blueprint 2.0*. The coordinator works with the academic offices, including CTE, to provide guidance and professional learning to counselors that enable them to work with students around the programs and opportunities. This includes the development of a 6-year graduation plan, assistance with the college application process, and post-secondary options. In addition, this position provides leadership in the development, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive school counseling program to ensure alignment with school, district, and state missions, and promote academic achievement and success for all students. This includes addressing the academic, career, personal, and social-emotional development of students.

- 3. Is there anyone whose job is to coordinate across our different offices and programs, and also coordinate with the state and county government's own efforts in skills training and workforce development?**

Currently, there is not a specific position that coordinates efforts between BCPS and Baltimore County government; however, the coordinator of CTE, the executive director of Innovative Learning, and the BCPS executive officer for Community Outreach serve on the Baltimore County Workforce Development Board.

- 4. Provide an update on what efforts are being made regarding community schools as it relates to the operating budget?**

A 1.0 FTE has been allocated to act as the community schools coordinator. No additional resources from the operating budget will be required. Existing student support services' structures will be accessed to develop the services and community partnerships associated with this program.

ESOL-Related Community Schools:

The Community Schools Program exists at Owings Mills High School, in addition to pursuing programs at Lansdowne High School, and Baltimore Highlands Elementary School. A community school is both a place and a set of partnerships between the school and other community resources. Its integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement leads to improved student learning, stronger families, and healthier communities.

In relation to the operating budget, supports for the Community Schools Program at Owings Mills High School is included in the ESOL budget in contracted services under “Other Instructional Costs.” These funds will specifically support the Newcomer Academy at Owings Mills High School.

5. **Crossroads-type schools operate on the premise of two: students may take two math classes in a single day, and may take two English classes in a single day. This doubling of instruction, coupled with a doubling of adults in classrooms, is intended to make up for the lost time in previous, unsuccessful educational settings for students, and generate productive outcomes for these students. Yet, Crossroads-type schools have seen the number of Double A's or Triple A's on site reduced by half over the years. To the extent the number of Double A's or Triple A's are not being increased for Crossroads-type schools, what educational outcome data justifies the continued reduction of this adult staffing?**

There is a difference between additional adult assistants (Double A's and Triple A's) and both special education paraeducators and general education paraeducators. Additional adult assistants are driven by students' Individualized Education Programs (IEP). Students may require additional adult assistance for complex academic, behavioral, medical, or physical needs. These are temporary positions that are allocated to schools based upon individual student needs as identified through the IEP team process. These are no positions allocated for total school support. Any fluctuation of allocation of these temporary positions is based upon the specific students' IEP needs at that time.

6. **“Since additional adult support positions are staffed based on individual needs per their IEP, no additional positions are proposed at this time.” Notwithstanding the unlinked nature of the two clauses in the quoted response, how can this be considered a coherent or even minimally competent answer given that it presumes current levels of Double A's and Triple A's are the maximum warranted, ever, under any scenarios, including multiple, large chorale groups with special needs students in overcrowded middle schools like Perry Hall Middle School?**

Additional adult assistants are driven by students' Individualized Education Programs (IEP). Students may require additional adult assistance for complex academic, behavioral, medical, or physical needs. These are temporary positions that are allocated to schools based upon individual student needs as identified through the IEP team process. These are not positions allocated for total school or class support. If students with needed identified support are participating in the chorale class, as noted at Perry Hall Middle School, then that support would be provided to that student in that specific classroom setting. IEP teams determine the location and manner of needed additional adult support for students to service the needs as outlined on an Individual Education Program.

7. **“Since additional adult support positions are staffed based on individual needs per their IEP, no additional positions are proposed at this time.” Notwithstanding the unlinked nature of the two clauses in the quoted response, how can this be considered a coherent or even minimally competent answer given that it presumes current levels of Double A's and Triple A's are the maximum warranted, ever, under any scenarios, for our growing autistic student population?**

Additional adult assistants are allocated as determined by IEP teams in addressing individual students. If a student in elementary school is identified with the disability coding of autism, or any other disability coding, then the IEP team can consider if the supplementary aide and service of additional adult support is warranted. If warranted, then the additional adult assistants are provided to schools.

8. **Overall, which contractors are receiving the bulk of payments under the \$7.3 million for instructional textbooks and/or supplies? Do we have a breakdown?**

The \$6.9 million for instructional materials and resources in the Chief Academic Officer’s budget includes the \$6.17 million in one-time expenditures, plus \$760,000 in digital instructional tools.

The largest orders for textbooks and associated instructional materials in FY 2017 are anticipated for Houghton Mifflin (\$2.5 million), Heinemann (\$944,000, part of Houghton Mifflin), Fisher Scientific (\$822,000), Curriculum Associates (iReady \$720,000), McGraw Hill (\$501,000), and Discovery Education (\$196,000). We expect vendors to be similar in FY 2018; however, there may be new vendors pending approval of the FY 2018 budget and subject to bringing any additional or modified contracts before the board.

9. **If contracts have already been Board-approved and/or are pending Board approval for these instructional textbooks and/or supplies, what companies and contracts are or will be paid with this \$7.3 million, and does this exact or approximate number appear elsewhere in the budget?**

For some of the instructional supplies, there are existing Board-approved contracts. Others are proposals for FY 2018, and consequently, a contract may not exist. Contracts will be brought before the Board for approval after being reviewed by the Curriculum and Building and Contracts committees as they are developed and only if funding is appropriated. BCPS partners with many vendors to support the various content areas. Specifically, we are requesting funds to purchase from the following vendors: McGraw Hill, Houghton-Mifflin-Harcourt, Discovery Education, Curriculum Associates, Permabound, Bookrack, Heinemann, Fisher, Vernier, Flynn, CDW, National Geographic, Washington Sound, and Ballard Tighe.

10. **What is still not quite clear: Is this separate from the one-time \$6.1 million, the same as, or separate from the \$7 million (listed under #3 on pg. 4? of the admin response)?**

The \$6.9 million for instructional materials and resources in the Chief Academic Officer’s budget includes the \$6.17 million in one-time expenditures, plus \$760,000 in digital instructional tools.

**11. What percentage of the texts in the \$7.3 million are digital? The administration has said that under S.T.A.T., “all curricula will be available online.” The companies cited above in bold are primarily digital/computer-based/software or include digital-related offerings, or like the textbook company McGraw-Hill moving to online offerings. Additional links (Most of the rest of these companies do not come up online under the names listed above related to curriculum. A few seem to be book providers like The Book Rack in Timonium.)**

Curriculum in BCPS refers to the standards, lesson seeds, scope and sequence, and pacing guides that, when combined, serve as a guide for teachers. It is the goal of BCPS to provide teachers with online access to curriculum. Instructional materials are items that support the curriculum. For FY 2018, instructional texts only account for a portion, approximately 74% of the overall \$6.9 million. This includes the following: texts that are solely print materials (approximately 39%); texts that have a combination of both print and digital text (approximately 44%); and solely digital (approximately 17%). Other items included in the \$6.9 million are non-textbook materials, including programs and hands-on materials. These other items make up approximately the remaining 26% of the overall \$6.9 million.

**12. How much in dollar amounts has been spent on the following contracts so far, or are slated to be spent in FY 2018, and for what products?**

**a. Math curriculum, Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt, \$2.3 million, including print, digital, video and animated math tutorials**

[http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/bcps/Board.nsf/files/AAHPE3621B81/\\$file/061416%20JNI-720-15%20%20Mathematics%20for%20Grades%206-8%20Algebra%201%2C%20and%20Professional%20Development%20Services.pdf](http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/bcps/Board.nsf/files/AAHPE3621B81/$file/061416%20JNI-720-15%20%20Mathematics%20for%20Grades%206-8%20Algebra%201%2C%20and%20Professional%20Development%20Services.pdf)

\$2.0 million spent to date.

**b. McGraw-Hill Education, \$15.6 million, which includes print and digital/multi-media resources**

<https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/MWE-820-14%20BOARD>

\$8.4 million spent to date.

**c. Vernier: software & technology, e-catalog?**

<https://www.vernier.com> \$1.2 million to JACK (!)  
[https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/120214\\_JNI-798-14%205%20mod%20eCat%20Math%20Science%20Supplies....pdf](https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/120214_JNI-798-14%205%20mod%20eCat%20Math%20Science%20Supplies....pdf)

The contract is with multiple vendors for science materials. Vernier is one of those vendors. \$1 million has been spent to date (\$181,000 to Vernier).

**d. CDW: computers, hardware, software (projectors?) the big consortium The National Powers Alliance. Cost, unknown. What purchased?**

<https://www.cdw.com>  
<https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/120616%20RGA-107-07%20Modification%20-%20The%20National%20Joint%20Powers%20Alliance%20Purchasing%20Consortium.pdf>

\$3.5 million has been spent to date on this contract (\$2.8 million is with CDW).

**e. Ballard-Tighe: online assessments (future?)**

<http://www.ballard-tighe.com/home/>

There is no existing contract.

**f. Summer School Text books / National Geographic / The Book Rack / others...**

[https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/JNI-784-12\\_Board%20Exhibit\\_1-10-12.pdf](https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/contractFiles/JNI-784-12_Board%20Exhibit_1-10-12.pdf)

Contract for Summer School Textbooks is expiring at the end of January and is not being renewed at this time.

**g. A \$750,000 contract... Coming up end of January... To expand / print and digital?**

<https://www.bcps.org/apps/bcpscontracts/viewContract.aspx?i=849>

The \$750,000 contract will not be renewed. Consequently, it is not part of the \$7.3 million.

**h. What adds up to the \$7.3 million?**

One-time instructional materials of \$6,174,018 are required to continue implementation of new curriculum for English language arts (\$2,160,500), music (\$1,450,000 million), science (\$1,194,000), digital learning (\$493,000), social studies (\$275,685), ESOL (\$222,000), and advanced academics (\$117,333), and other resources (\$261,500).

English language arts instructional tools and supplemental resources for Grades 1–3 and Grades 6–9 (\$121,500), and pilot for Grades 4–5 (\$102,000).

Techbook digital resource to support the state mandated Next Generation Science curricula in Grades 6–8 and 9–12, engaging students in science and engineering concepts (\$536,000).

**13. Who are the vendors for SPARC (School Programs for Acceleration and Recovery Credit), the program that is replacing AdvancePath? <https://www.bcps.org/programs/edoptions/sparc.html> AdvancePath is a vendor and it was stated that SPARC was replacing AdvancePath. But, SPARC is not a vendor. It is the name they have given the program. Who are the vendors for this new program called SPARC?**

**a. Why are we switching?**

BCPS contracted with AdvancePath Academies starting in 2007. BCPS has developed the internal capacity to implement and support blended learning without the support of an outside vendor. School Programs for the Acceleration and Recovery of Credits (SPARC) is the BCPS blended learning model that allows students to earn credits in the manner that was in place with the AdvancePath Academies. Six SPARC Academies are now in place where the six AdvancePath Academies existed.

It should be noted that BCPS now provides the SPARC program offerings at all high schools and alternative centers. These SPARC programs allow students to earn credits towards high school graduation.

**b. What is the predicted annual cost? One-time purchase or ongoing software license?**

The Office of Educational Options supports the SPARC Academies with access to digital content (\$25,200), classrooms supplies, and instructional supplies. In addition, the Office of Educational Options has an FTE who supports SPARC teachers.

**c. What is the cost difference from AdvancePath to SPARC? Per pupil or per class or per school?**

The school year 2015-2016 contract with AdvancePath was \$1,630,038. On average, AdvancePath supported approximately 1,000 BCPS students per year with a per pupil average cost of \$1,630. The estimated annual cost for the SPARC Academies is \$134,976. On average, the SPARC Academies anticipate supporting 1,000 students this year with a per pupil average cost of \$135.

**14. How long has the Coordinator of Teaching and Learning/Autism in Office of Special Education been vacant? When is it expected to be filled?**

The employee that was in the position stepped down in November 2016. The position is currently in the approval process and should be posted soon.

**15. The May 18, 2016, memo, SUBJECT: Measures of Academic Progress Growth Comparisons, states how growth was above national average in some instances. Please provide comparisons to Maryland state averages and our regional counties. Also, please provide the year-end measurements and comparisons.**

The board had been provided with the memo summarizing the growth and achievement changes that occurred in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. It was also included in the Weekly Update of January 27, 2017. As stated, BCPS exceeded the average national growth in reading and mathematics in Grades 1 through 8. NWEA is a nationally norm referenced assessment.

**16. The mission statement of the Office of eLearning states that the office is “dedicated to providing a \*quality\*, comprehensive educational program to address the needs of a diverse student population through the development and implementation of personalized digital learning environments.” How is the quality of distance and blended learning measured? What standards exist for determining the quality of eLearning programs? courses? Are these BCPS standards? Third party standards? What quality assurance measures are required of contracted service providers? Is content certified? By whom? What is included in “Other Charges” for “Other Instructional Costs”? Does that line item include third party quality assurance services? Does BCPS use any third party quality assurance services? Which ones?**

Whether virtual, blended, or face-to-face, “quality” is always measured by student learning and attainment of student outcomes. BCPS eLearning courses are taught by BCPS teachers. Therefore, they are evaluated in the same standard evaluation protocol used with all BCPS teachers. All eLearning courses use the BCPS curriculum. eLearning students follow the same BCPS curriculum as their peers accessing learning in a traditional school, but eLearning students access the curriculum virtually. The Office of eLearning does not utilize contracted services to deliver instruction to students. BCPS academic offices vet digital content to ensure curricular alignment. Other charges can include BCPS teacher review of digital resources, as well as the development of digital resources to meet the needs of BCPS students. We do not enlist third party services for quality assurance, but rely on BCPS teachers and curriculum experts most familiar with the needs of BCPS students.

**17. How many students have transitioned from nonpublic placement to BCPS, or were served by BCPS when they otherwise would have required nonpublic placement, as a result of increased investments in special education staffing and regional programs? What is the net cost savings as a result?**

Approximately 20 students transitioned from the nonpublic schools to the public schools during the 2015-2016 school year. Currently, 5 students have transitioned thus far from the nonpublic schools to public schools for the 2016-2017 school year. The increased staffing received for the 2016-2017 school year was allocated to enhance secondary regional programs for students with high functioning autism and complex social-emotional learning needs. The approximate net cost savings can be calculated at the end of the school year. The average cost is \$78,000 for services in a nonpublic setting.

**18. Explain the Supplies and Materials charges on pg. 176 from FY 2017 of over \$1M.**

The \$720,000 for English language arts instructional tools was approved in FY 2017 and budgeted with the Chief Accountability and Performance Management Office. It has been determined that responsibility for the management of the instructional tools should be transferred to the office of English Language Arts (page 229).

## INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

### 1. Please explain/define the various funds on pg. 12.

- The **General Fund** includes the most diverse revenue stream that pays for most of the operating expenses (instruction and support functions) and is mainly funded by state aid to education, local county funds, and fees, while **Special Funds** refer to restricted state, federal, and private grants.
- The **Capital Projects Fund** covers capital infrastructure needs, funded from state bond issuances for public school construction administered by the state Board of Public Works, and local county funds from county bond issuances and PAYGO general revenue.
- The **Debt Service Fund** is required for state reporting purposes to account for the payment of interest and principal on long-term general obligation debt. Debt results from the sale of bonds used for construction and renovation through the capital budget. The Board has no contingent liability for the repayment of long-term debts incurred by the state and county to finance the construction of public schools in the county.
- The **Enterprise Fund** covers all financial activities of the food service program.
- The **Internal Service Fund** covers the self-insured worker's compensation claims.

### 2. Where are the 14 expense categories as defined in state law shown in the budget? Only 13 are shown on pg. 18.

The chart on page 18 represents only the general portion of the budget, which has no expenses related to the final category of Food Services. The Food Service category is used only in the Enterprise Fund.

### 3. Of the 34 schools currently without AC, how many of them will have outlived their life expectancy at the time of installation of central AC? Which ones?

None.

### 4. Is the S.T.A.T. program financially sustainable in the long-run, or are we setting our school system up for a fiscal disaster down the road that different leadership will have to deal with?

Yes, the program is sustainable.

### 5. Last year, the question was raised on the issue of our system being top-heavy in the central office and administration. On pg. 18, it appears as if we are going dramatically in the wrong direction: Admin Costs increased in FY 2017 by 13.9%, and this year by a proposed 18.1%. Why is this category continuing to increase so dramatically?

The FY 2017 proposed budget in the Administration category included \$1.1M, mainly for COLA and step increases. One-time items in the proposed operating budget that were included in the Administration category were the Advantage Financial system upgrade (\$3.2M), internal fiber optic cabling (\$524K), replacement of district primary enterprise backup system (\$390K), and large capacity server additions and replacements (\$349K). A comparison of the FY 2017 and FY 2018 proposed budgets would reflect an increase of 9.8%.

The FY 2018 proposed budget in the Administration category currently contains \$3.0M in salary changes, including the FTE-neutral community superintendent reorganization (\$1.6M total, \$652K incremental), which transferred positions from other activities, steps, and COLAs (\$905K), and other redirects and changes (\$407K).

After further analysis, it was determined that \$2.4M in Administration salaries related to the community superintendent organization, can be appropriately moved to mid-level administration, according to MSDE regulations. This change will be reflected in the Board proposed budget document to be submitted for Board approval on February 7, 2017.

Additionally, one-time costs of \$3.4M cover the Advantage Financial System upgrade, which was pulled last year prior to adoption, and an upgrade for the Kronos payroll system. \$1.3M covers software license fees, and \$1.1M is for one-time expenses for IT servers, wiring closets UPS, and relocatable cabling and wireless access. Contractors (\$300K) are included to work on the BCPS One upgrade required by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights.

- 6. On pg. 18, line item “Instructional Salaries and Wages,” does this figure include the noninstructional salaries of S.T.A.T. teachers, consulting teachers, and others? If so, please break out the figures for instructional salaries and wages and noninstructional salaries and wages and itemize the noninstructional by type of teacher (S.T.A.T., consulting, etc.).**

S.T.A.T. teachers and consulting teachers are included in Instructional Salaries and Wages. According to the MSDE definition, “Instructional salaries are those for staff whose responsibilities include interaction with students in the delivery of instructional programs and related student instructional support services.” MSDE further clarifies by providing the following list of position types to include:

- Teachers and instructors (e.g., classroom, resource, instructional television, home and hospital, outdoor education)
- Teaching assistants
- Teacher aides
- Teacher trainers
- Teaching interns
- Tutors
- Reading specialists
- Librarians/media specialists and library aides
- Department chairs
- Guidance counselors
- School psychologists
- Coaches
- Classroom technical support staff
- Substitute teachers

- 7. Last year, an analysis on the actual contingency money spent on contracts showed an average of 6%. We currently set aside a standard 10% contingency, but if only 6% are actually being used, how much in dollars would we save by lowering the contingency to 8%? Where in the budget does unused contingency money go?**

No funds would be saved by lowering the contingency to 8%. Contingency is only used if needed. Unused contingency funds remain in the capital budget.

**8. On pg. 18, break out the Administration figure between central office and tech-related expenses, and itemize the tech-related portion.**

The \$54,118,435 in administration expenses on page 18 includes the following:

- \$17,801,688 for the BCPS Information Technology Department (Budget by Category on pages 205-215 for further detail)
- \$547,064 in one-time requests for file server replacements (page 208 Budget Highlights)
- \$331,800 in one-time requests for remote wire closet UPS systems (page 208 Budget Highlights)
- \$3,150,000 in one-time requests for the Advantage Financial System upgrade (page 185 Budget Highlights)
- \$200,000 in one-time requests for the Kronos payroll system upgrade (page 185 Budget Highlights)

**9. Provide annual figures on COLA increases and the number of BCPS teachers (FTEs) from FY 2015 – FY 2018.**

SCHOOL BASED STAFFING HISTORICAL DATA - Teachers					
	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	Comments
Teachers - School Ratio	6,152.1	6,179.6	6,253.7	6,314.9	Classroom, Art/Music/PE
Other School Assigned*	1,177.6	1,247.4	1,289.5	1,298.9	Guidance, Reading, Digital Learning (Librarian), STAT, ESOL
Teachers - Other Programs	571.8	575.0	590.5	601.5	PreK, Alternative Schools, Consulting, Instrumental Music
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,901.5</b>	<b>8,002.0</b>	<b>8,133.7</b>	<b>8,215.3</b>	
<b>TABCO</b>					
Bonus (one-time)	3.0%				
COLA		5.0%	2.0%	2.0%	
*School Ratio and Other Programs adjusted to reflect actual STAT allocation					

**10. What accounts for the large increase in Student Personnel Services, pg. 18?**

The increase is driven by:

- \$513K for COLA/steps
- \$80K for a proposed ESOL pupil personnel worker (PPW)
- \$1.8M is due to the transfer of 24 social workers from the Third Party Billing grant to the general fund special education budget. In turn, 33 behavioral interventionists are being transferred to a grant under the Third Party Billing Program. This transfer provides increased stability for the social workers, who are all regular FTEs. These behavior interventionists are on a one-year contract.

**11. Last year’s Admin increase of 13.9% was described as containing a number of “one-time costs.” What were those one-time costs and how much of the 13.9% were one-time costs?**

Refer to Question 5 (Investing in the Future).

**12. Where in the budget can the figures be found that represents FY 2018 costs for S.T.A.T.? A few show up in the FY 2018 budget, such as Code to the Future, yet overall how much will be spent during FY 2018, and from what coffers?**

Code to the Future is a program that resulted from the work of the magnet task force. It is funded through the Office of Magnet Programs, and is offered in two magnet schools for students interested in coding. It is not directly tied to S.T.A.T.

The FY 2018 budget for S.T.A.T. is \$48,786,227. The components are contained within the following accounts:

- Annual leasing cost \$41,221,953 (page 205 Other Instructional Costs/Contracted Services)
- Curriculum Resources \$5,224,704
  - Web-hosted services \$1,594,107 (page 277 Instructional Textbooks and Supplies/Supplies and Materials)
  - Microsoft student software license \$200,000 (page 209 Other Instructional Costs/Contract Services)
  - BCPS One and Client Software \$3,430,597 (page 209 Administration/Contract Services)
- Professional Development \$2,076,968
  - Curriculum and Instruction professional development \$500,000 (page 145 Instructional Salaries and Wages/Salaries and Wages)
  - Instructional Technology Integration \$1,576,968 (page 274 Other Instructional Costs, page 277 Instructional Salaries and Wages, Instructional Textbooks and Supplies, Other Instructional Costs)
- Carry Cases \$262,602 (page 205 Other Instructional Costs/Contracted Services – correction will be made to Board proposed budget book to move to Instructional Textbooks and Supplies/Supplies and Materials)

**13. The budget book on pg. 21 states that the midyear evaluation of S.T.A.T. will be given to the Curriculum Committee in February 2017. Is that still the schedule? Why will the report not also be given to the full committee where all board members can ask questions of the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) staff?**

The midyear JHU S.T.A.T. evaluation is on schedule to be presented to the Board of Education Curriculum Committee in February 2017. In keeping with past practice, the report will be distributed to the full board after the presentation to the Curriculum Committee.

**14. If BCPS were to modify its implementation of S.T.A.T. to be in line with the Maryland Educational Technology Plan's recommendation of a 3:1 student-to-device ratio in elementary schools, what would the cost savings be (overall and annually)?**

The Maryland Educational Technology Plan that is being referenced was adopted in 2007, with an implementation timeline of 2007-2012. The 3:1 elementary target referenced, in addition to the 1:1 secondary target in the plan, was to be met by 2012. Since the development of this plan, a new plan has neither been proposed nor approved by MSDE. Adjusting the elementary device ratio to 3:1 would result in an annual savings of approximately \$13.6 million, but would cause elementary schools to no longer be aligned with BCPS' instructional plan.

**15. Overall, which contractors are receiving the bulk of payments under the \$7.3 million for instructional textbooks and/or supplies? Do we have a breakdown?**

The \$6.9 million for instructional materials and resources in the Chief Academic Officer's budget includes the \$6.17 million in one-time expenditures, plus \$760,000 in digital instructional tools.

The largest orders for textbooks and associated instructional materials in FY 2017 are anticipated for Houghton Mifflin (\$2.5 million), Heinemann (\$944,000, part of Houghton Mifflin), Fisher Scientific (\$822,000), Curriculum Associates (iReady \$720,000), McGraw Hill (\$501,000), and Discovery Education (\$196,000). We expect vendors to be similar in FY 2018; however, there may be new vendors pending approval of the FY 2018 budget and subject to bringing any additional or modified contracts before the board.

**16. If contracts have already been Board-approved and/or are pending Board approval for these instructional textbooks and/or supplies, what companies and contracts are or will be paid with this \$7.3 million, and does this exact or approximate number appear elsewhere in the budget?**

For some of the instructional supplies, there are existing Board-approved contracts. Others are proposals for FY 2018, and consequently, a contract may not exist. Contracts will be brought before the Board for approval after being reviewed by the Curriculum and Building and Contracts committees as they are developed and only if funding is appropriated. BCPS partners with many vendors to support the various content areas. Specifically, we are requesting funds to purchase from the following vendors: McGraw Hill, Houghton-Mifflin-Harcourt, Permabound, Discovery Education, Curriculum Associates, Bookrack, Heinemann, Fisher, Vernier, Flynn, CDW, National Geographic, Washington Sound, and Ballard Tighe.

**17. What constitutes "other instructional costs/contracted services," which have jumped from \$10.6 million in FY 2014 to \$53.6 million in the proposed budget? (pg. 80) That's a 500 percent increase.**

As articulated in the 6-year Instructional Digital Conversion Plan, this increase is consistent with the roll-out of devices in alignment to the S.T.A.T. strategic plan and instructional software license fees.

**18. Who are the vendors paid under "other instructional costs/contracted services?" What exactly are these services? What is the list of vendors/providers? Is Marzano Research, ASCD, Discovery Education, and others paid via these funds?**

Daly is the primary vendor for 1:1 devices and related services and support. In addition, the largest vendors related to software license fees are Northwest Evaluations, Engrade Inc., Discovery Education, Curriculum Associates, Dreambox, Learnings, and Creative Enterprise Solutions, which provide services for curriculum, instruction, and assessments.

**19. The \$6 million or so in one-time curriculum costs (Question #4, pg. 4) is for actual books and materials, including novels, field test science kits, and musical texts as part of a blended focus in education. Why are these one-time? Overall, what percentage of the \$6.1 million also includes online or digital resources, or are not listed here?**

New editions of textbooks last for a finite amount of years, and are then usually completely replaced. MSDE has been allowing BCPS to consider these one-time expenditures, which provides additional funding flexibility to the county. Some physical textbooks come with access to digital content, but this budget is not used to directly purchase Web or digital content. Most direct purchases of digital content are made through the Office of Digital Learning.

**20. Do any staff members act as advisors for Speak Up/Project Tomorrow? And, if so, how does that impact the survey and its results that are used to inform the Board of Education and staff on S.T.A.T., moving forward?**

Yes, a staff member acts as an advisor for Speak Up/Project tomorrow. While the Speak Up survey may have value for many systems, BCPS elected not to participate in the survey in the late fall and early winter of this school year, nor will the system participate going forward. The independent evaluation of the S.T.A.T. initiative by Johns Hopkins University has not, and will not, be using the results from Speak Up/Project Tomorrow; therefore, the survey has not, and will not, have an impact on the evaluation of S.T.A.T.

**21. In 2014, 2015, and 2016, Dr. Dance has said that “85% of the budget is ‘all people’.” In 2014, BCPS had \$1.4 billion; in 2015, BCPS had \$1.6 billion, and it went up from there. Is the same percentage of the budget going to the “people” (85%)? Or has the percentage that is going to human capital decreased despite the ever-increasing budget? What is the % of funds for people now?**

	<b>FY14 Adopted</b>	<b>FY15 Adopted</b>	<b>FY16 Adopted</b>	<b>FY17 Adopted</b>	<b>FY18 Proposed</b>
<b>GF Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>	\$1,110,528,398	\$1,138,580,205	\$1,179,705,836	\$1,199,032,840	\$1,246,419,903
<b>Total GF Budget</b>	\$1,311,148,818	\$1,349,057,045	\$1,396,938,133	\$1,435,990,222	\$1,501,743,292
<b>% of Budget</b>	84.7%	84.4%	84.4%	83.5%	83.0%

**22. During and since school year 2012-2013, how many programs have been reduced or eliminated? What was the date of change? What was the fiscal impact \$\$ (all dollars, across any and all budget line-items) and the FTE impact per year since the change in program? Please include instructional programs, extra-curricular, athletic, gifted and talented, special education, school-based procurement, social/emotional programs, teacher certification supports (national certification, etc.), facilities and maintenance, etc.**

Our school system has adopted a performance management framework that is focused on continuous improvement for both the academic and operational sides of our organization. The work requires that departments identify and work toward aligned goals within our strategic plan. This work is summarized in our *Blueprint 2.0* performance report. Within this framework, the Office of Research directs the evaluation of a variety of academic programs. One notable example, previously provided within the answer to **Question 8 (Raising the Bar and Closing Gaps)**, was the evaluation of AdvancePath and SPARC. Both programs were found to lead to successful credit recovery. However, the evaluation concluded that we could reach more students with SPARC at a much lower cost. Therefore, AdvancePath was discontinued.

**23. What is the justification for the \$3.3 million in software upgrades to accounting and payroll systems?**

BCPS and Baltimore County government currently use the same software provider for accounting and payroll functions. The software release level installed at BCPS is no longer being updated by the vendor (Tier 2 level support). Baltimore County government, with BCPS input, has issued a Request for Information (RFI) for software to perform these functions. It is anticipated that the RFI will lead to a Request for Proposals (RFP). Based on the results of this process, an upgrade of the current software or a new system will likely be recommended. BCPS would need the funding in our budget for either a software upgrade or implementation of a new system.

**24. The student health immunization software (\$375,000) was included in the budget. The Board was told that this software will automate the necessary checks of student immunizations against immunization recommendations. As that is the case, will school nurses still be responsible for data entry or can this responsibility be delegated? Data entry will still require a significant portion of staff time – can this task be performed by other support staff, freeing up nurses to care for students? Is additional funding needed for support staff to assist with this task? Are there any plans for a self-service approach to this data entry where parents would be able to enter this data through BCPS One, saving staff time and cost? In general, what are the plans to enable self-service data entry through BCPS One? This could save considerable staff time and cost.**

The software is for immunizations and all other aspects of student health care. The expectation is that the software will match the child’s records to the state requirements and create an alert if a vaccine is missing or needed. Data entry can be delegated to health assistants. Additional funding is not needed to support the school nurse with this task.

A self-service approach would not comply with COMAR because the school nurse could not confirm the accuracy of the entry. COMAR requires the immunization history to come from a doctor’s office or school.

**25. Provide additional detail on the increase of \$1.1 million for Information Technology, redirected from schools and offices for S.T.A.T. What are the sources of the redirects and in what amounts?**

BCPS has been following a 5-year plan of redirecting funds from schools and offices as follows:

<b>Redirected Funds</b>	
School-based technology (middle and high per pupil rates adjusted, pg.132)	\$682,431
School-based textbooks (middle and high per pupil rates adjusted, pg. 132)	170,323
<b>Subtotal school-based</b>	<b>852,754</b>
Central office textbooks	121,232
Central office library	89,570
Central office supplies	22,901
<b>Subtotal office-based</b>	<b>233,703</b>
<b>Totals redirected to S.T.A.T.</b>	<b>\$1,086,457</b>

**26. For Network Support Services, comment on the one-time increase of \$547,000 for the replacement of the district file servers. Was virtualization considered as an alternative to purchasing this equipment?**

Yes, virtualization was considered and is currently being used on the file servers at the school.

**27. Network Support Services – Provide a breakdown of physical versus virtualized server and equipment costs. Has a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis been conducted on migrating to a fully virtualized infrastructure? Hybrid infrastructure? Is there a plan to increase use of virtualization? Please share the details and anticipated cost savings.**

Yes, a cost-benefit analysis was conducted. DoIT is currently running a hybrid infrastructure. Yes, this funding will increase the use of virtualization, where appropriate.

**28. Network Support Services – What is the justification for the increase of \$1.1 million in district software license fees? What specific software will be licensed?**

The increase maintains our compliance with manufacturer license agreements. The software licenses are dependent on increased student enrollment and regular yearly contract-allowed increases for products that are dependent on the total number of devices connected. Products include, but are not limited to, Microsoft, VMware, Safari, Cisco TAC, LightSpeed, and Adobe.

**29. Network Support Services – What cost savings can be anticipated given the increased \$494,000 in telecommunications equipment (for the new VoIP system, presumably)?**

The anticipated cost saving will be at least \$87,000 per year, to start. In the outlying years, the savings only increases as more sites are converted to VoIP.

**30. Network Support Services – What are the costs associated with the stated objective of implementation of an updated network monitoring system? Were contracted network monitoring services considered?**

The projected cost is \$140,000. Yes, contracted monitoring services were considered.

**31. Network Support Services – For the increase of \$221,000 for cabling and wireless access in relocatable classrooms, how many relocatable classrooms will this support?**

The increase is projected to support 18 relocatable classrooms.

**32. Enterprise Applications – Comment on the \$571,400 increase of Contracted Services; \$300,000 is noted for the expansion of BCPS One. What is the justification for the remainder of this increase?**

The funds requested are for two contractor positions to enhance BCPS One functionality for ADA. A quality assurance tester and Web developer are required to meet the needs of the ongoing development and assurance of Web accessibility and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance in accordance with the signed Office of Civil Rights (OCR) agreement.

**33. Enterprise Applications and Project Management – A shared objective of both departments is to “Support cross-functional districtwide initiatives to improve system and data efficiencies.” Where will these efficiencies be realized? What self-service tools are planned for development? What are plans for consolidating disparate and redundant data collection forms (paper and electronic) and repositories (paper and electronic storage)?**

BCPS One application development for self-service includes functionality for parents to access privacy preferences, emergency contact numbers, report cards online, period attendance, and to update student information items.

**34. Enterprise Applications – One department objective is to “Transition from an existing to a newly created SIS.” Was this SIS developed internally or through contracted services and at what cost? Where is this cost reflected in the budget? What is the justification for a new SIS?**

BCPS’ existing internally developed STARS student information system was rebranded and relaunched as BCPS One student information system (SIS) on July 1, 2016. No new SIS was developed.

**35. Technology Support Services – Comment on the very modest increase (\$2.8 million to \$3 million) for overall Technology Support Services; \$330,000 of the increase is due to the transfer of Administrative Technology Support Services to Technology Support Services. Given systemwide technology initiatives, and actuals to-date for FY 2017, is this funding adequate?**

Administrative Technology Support Services was reorganized and placed under Technology Support Services budget lines. Yes, the funding is adequate.

**36. The answer given at the 1/24/17 board meeting on why the Admin costs skyrocketed up 18% after a 14% increase in FY 2017 was confusing. One-time costs from FY 2017 was given as part of the response. Would not the one-time costs from last year, which would then not carry over to FY 2018, cause the expense to go down, not skyrocket? It was also stated during the meeting that most of the expense in the Admin category was tech related. Please provide detail on the IT-related expenses and how much of that category does it encompass?**

A component of the percentage increase is that \$3.15 million for the Advantage Financial System upgrade in the FY 2017 proposed budget was removed by the county in the adopted budget; thus, lowering the base for FY 2017 for comparison purposes. The Advantage Financial System upgrade is again being proposed for FY 2018.

The \$54,118,435 in administration expenses includes the following technology related items, which total 40.7% of the category:

- \$17,801,688 for the BCPS Information Technology Department (Budget by Category on pages 205-215 for further detail)
- \$547,064 in one-time requests for file server replacements (page 208 Budget Highlights)
- \$331,800 in one-time requests for remote wire closet UPS systems (page 208 Budget Highlights)
- \$3,150,000 in one-time requests for the Advantage Financial System upgrade (page 185 Budget Highlights)
- \$200,000 in one-time requests for the Kronos payroll system upgrade (page 185 Budget Highlights)

**37. Explain the Budget Highlights on pg. 204 for \$5.6M increases for S.T.A.T. Where is the \$1.1M redirect for S.T.A.T. coming from specifically from “schools and offices”?**

\$4.5 million is being requested as additional funding for S.T.A.T. from the county government. BCPS has been following a 5-year plan of redirecting funds from schools and offices as follows:

<b>Redirected Funds</b>	
School-based technology (middle and high per pupil rates adjusted, pg.132)	\$682,431
School-based textbooks (middle and high per pupil rates adjusted, pg. 132)	170,323
<b>Subtotal school-based</b>	<b>852,754</b>
Central office textbooks	121,232
Central office library	89,570
Central office supplies	22,901
<b>Subtotal office-based</b>	<b>233,703</b>
<b>Totals redirected to S.T.A.T.</b>	<b>\$1,086,457</b>

## OTHER QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

1. **“somewhat lower levels of poverty?” What is the documentation behind this statement – because there are a few less homeless? Also, BCPS must know that in Baltimore County the income needed to just be self-sufficient is far above the federal poverty level.**

A ranking system is used in the Office of Title I determined by percentage of Free and Reduced-Price Meal qualifications at each school in Baltimore County Public Schools. The number of children eligible for free and reduced-price meals dropped from 46.8% in FY 2016 to 45.1% in FY 2017.

In order to prepare for the FY 2018 budget cycle, the Office of Title I creates preliminary rankings using September 30, 2016, enrollment data from the Office of Enterprise Applications, and October 31, 2016, free and reduced-price meals data from the Office of Food and Nutrition. Official poverty rankings should be released by MSDE in February 2017 using enrollment and free and reduced-price meals data reported by BCPS.

2. **Under the Office of Pupil Personnel Services, department goals: “Increase the number of community partners providing support to homeless students and students living in poverty.” Who will be in charge of that effort? How much time will be devoted to that in a given position? What funding is devoted to that goal?**

The homeless liaison, under the direction of the coordinator of the Office of Pupil Personnel Services, will oversee that effort. The homeless liaison is a full-time position within the Office of Pupil Personnel Services. Title I funding through the McKinney-Vento Act supports services and programs for homeless students.

3. **The word poverty comes up 4 times under the Title I Programs. There are 53 Title 1 schools in Baltimore County, but there are over 90 schools where the poverty rates are over 50%, and 112 schools where the poverty rate is 30% or higher.**

For the 2017-2018 school year, 62 schools will be identified as Title I schools. The FY 2017 systemwide average of low-income children is 46.96%. The FY 2018 systemwide average will be determined using the official MSDE poverty rankings released in February 2017. BCPS has identified 62 Title I schools for the 2017-2018 school year.

4. **These funds (Title 1) will provide access to half-day Prekindergarten for 100 four-year-old children from families with household incomes at or below 300% of federal poverty guidelines for school year 2015-2016. Only 100 children? At or below 300% of the poverty level, there must be many thousands who need this support...**

Students will be able to access Prekindergarten, which will expand for the 2017-2018 school year due to the increase in number of Title I programs, causing the potential for 280 additional seats for the seven schools. The 100 seats in 2015-2016 refers to the classes funded with a state PreK Expansion Grant. These seats have since been absorbed within the operating budget. Historic data for general education Prekindergarten seats are as follows:

- FY13 3,145
- FY14 3,220
- FY15 3,360
- FY16 3,320
- FY17 3,430

These totals include general education classes, which host 20 students per class and Inside General Education (IGE) classes for students with IEPs. These include approximately five nondisabled peers per class. The reduction in 40 seats from FY 2015 to FY 2016 was a result of creating full-day Prekindergarten classes in two schools. As a result, four half-day sections became two full-day sections in each school. The current 3,430 seats include 2,270 in Title I schools. Of the remaining 1,160 seats in non-Title I schools, 847 are filled with students who are financially eligible for automatic enrollment. Students with IEPs consist of 142 of the 3,430 in a general education setting. The number of general education Prekindergarten classes will remain unchanged for FY 2018.

Funds are used for centralized programs, and schools are also allocated funds based on a per pupil allocation. School principals work in collaboration with compliance staff in the Office of Title I to spend those funds in alignment with their School Progress Plan. The rankings for the current school year are determined using data from the previous school year. Therefore, 2015-2016 September 30 enrollment and October 31 free and reduced-price meal data are used to determine FY 2017 poverty rankings.

**5. In the FY 2018 operating budget, what constitutes “other instructional costs/contracted services,” which have increased from \$10.6 million in FY 2014 to \$53.6 million in the proposed budget? (pg. 80)**

As articulated in the 6-year Instructional Digital Conversion Plan, this increase is consistent with the roll-out of devices in alignment to the S.T.A.T. strategic plan and instructional software license fees.

**6. Which vendors are getting paid an “increase of \$6.2 million in one-time expenditures” (pg. 69) for “new BCPS curriculum materials” and when? (About \$7 million is listed under the Chief Academic Officer, who selects curricula, for “instructional textbooks and supplies.” (pg. 223)) Does this relate to the same monies or additional?**

The selection process for curriculum materials is in alignment with Board of Education Policy and Superintendent’s Rule 6002, *Selection of Instructional Materials*.

The \$7 million for instructional textbooks and supplies in the Chief Academic Officer’s budget includes the \$6.2M in one-time expenditures, plus an ongoing textbook budget of \$900,000.

In order for materials to be delivered to schools prior to the beginning of the school year, the vast majority of textbooks and supplies planned for FY 2018 will go out to bid, and vendors will be selected, in the April 2017 through July 2017 time frame.

For some of the instructional supplies, there are existing Board-approved contracts. Others are proposals for FY 2018, and consequently, a contract may not exist. BCPS partners with many vendors to support the various content areas. Specifically, we are requesting funds to purchase from the following vendors: McGraw Hill, Houghton-Mifflin-Harcourt, Discovery Education, Curriculum Associates, Permabound, Bookrack, Heinemann, Fisher, Vernier, Flynn, CDW, National Geographic, Washington Sound, and Ballard Tighe.

7. **The student lanyard ID program, whose vendor, ScholarChip Card LLC, was paid at least \$3.7 million by mid-2016, according to sources. The original spending authority for these ID cards was \$10 million. Explain the current status of ScholarChip? What has happened in terms of usage, software integration, kiosk issues, and later payments? Are payments still being made currently to this vendor, and why?**

BCPS has purchased all equipment and implemented the One-card system (\$2.4M in FY 2014 and \$1.6M in FY 2016). BCPS chose not to pursue the attendance module for students. The annual costs to be paid to ScholarChip for system maintenance and supplies is as follows:

Data Center License	
Card Issuance	171 X \$ 500 = \$ 85,500
Staff PD Attendance	1 X \$75,000 = \$ 75,000
Annual Hardware Maintenance	
Secondary	53 X \$ 300 = \$ 15,900
Elementary	113 X \$ 300 = \$ 33,900
Administrative Sites	5 X \$ 300 = \$ 1,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$211,800</b>

8. **Please describe the exact parameters and usage of policy 3215, re: “Contracts or contract modifications of \$500,000 or less may be executed by the superintendent or his/her designee.” It remains unclear how often this option is used and how. What contracts have been approved solely by the superintendent in the past year or more, and for which vendors and what dollar amounts? Are these contracts signed outside of board purview or approval? And are some contract amounts above the board-approved contract spending authorities? Please explain as much as possible.**

All contracts over \$25,000 may only be approved by the Board. Contracts between \$25,000 and \$500,000 may be signed by the superintendent or his/her designee. The designee is typically the purchasing manager or the executive director of the Department of Fiscal Services. Contracts greater than \$500,000 are signed by the Board Chair.

9. **Why doesn't the 2018 budget simply use a fully-loaded FTE cost, without separate “other costs?”**

In addition to reporting by the 15 categories, MSDE requires all school systems to report expenses in five object types: Salaries and Wages, Contract Services, Supplies and Materials, Other Charges, and Equipment. Other Charges is defined by MSDE as expenditures for employee benefits, travel, insurance, communications (telephone) and nonenergy utilities (water/sewage).

10. **In the May 18, 2016, county executive press release, the county executive discussed \$20,000,000 SURPLUS FUNDS that the superintendent would transfer back to the county to support central AC.**

- a. **Where did those “SURPLUS FUNDS” come from?**

Any unspent general funds remaining after the fiscal year closes reverts to the fund balance. Once in the fund balance, BCPS must request authorization from the Baltimore County Council to use those funds for any purpose. The county historically managed the use of fund balance as a source of current revenue in order to help maintain the lowest possible taxes and fees. These amounts totaled \$15.2 million in FY 2014; \$13.1 million in FY 2015; \$19.2 million in FY 2016, and \$23.2 million in FY 2017. The proposed FY 2018 budget includes \$27.7 million of appropriated fund balance.

**b. If any were unfilled employee positions, please outline which ones by budget area and the attributable dollar amount.**

The majority of revenue returned to the fund balance was driven by vacancies across BCPS. As instructional salaries are the largest source of salaries, that budget also contributed the largest amount of vacancy dollars to fund balance. The current three-year labor agreements with all unions assure that there will be no furloughs or layoffs through 2019. Accordingly, turnover is related to the normal ebb and flow of employees in and out of employment with BCPS.

**11. The positions and office budgets for the Office of School Security have been transferred to Maintenance. Please provide a breakdown of these line items specific to School Security.**

The portion of the Office of School Security containing security patrol officers was moved for one year (FY 2015) from Maintenance to the Office of School Security, reporting to the executive director of School Safety. In FY 2016, that group was returned to Maintenance. The group consists of 21.6 FTEs as follows:

- 11.6 security patrol officers (1 supervisor, 2 leads)
- 2 safety/security monitoring operator
- 1 security repair analyst
- 1 security systems analyst
- 4 security, video/access control
- 1 supervisor, loss control
- 1 supervisor, senior operations/inspection-code enforcement

**12. Under the Office of the Board of Education on pg. 135, please detail what is included in the “Other Charges” category of \$100,948?**

Professional Dues	\$61,000
Conference Fees	\$14,000
Travel	\$10,948
Mileage reimbursement	\$10,000
Other Board member expenses	\$5,000

**13. How much is being proposed for FY 2018 to cover travel expenses for the superintendent? Where is that shown in the budget?**

The superintendent’s office has a budget of \$10,000 for travel. It is included in Other Charges listed on page 141.

**14. Under the Office of the Superintendent, please detail what is included in the “Other Charges” category on pg. 138 of \$255,649,901?**

BCPS employee benefits and retirement	\$250,912,921
Insurances (property, liability, vehicle, etc.)	\$4,455,917
Travel, mileage, conferences, professional dues for all offices pages 141–178	\$281,063

**15. Under the Office of the Superintendent on pg. 138, the FY 2017 budget for the six assistant superintendents totaled \$2,049,180. The FY 2018 budget for the four community superintendents totals \$3,689,848. Is it accurate to say that the new community superintendent structure costs over 80% more than the prior structure in its first year? What accounts for this increase of a reorganization that the board was told would be “net neutral”?**

The Board was told that the reorganization would be FTE neutral, which is what occurred. The budget figures noted above are correct. However, the new organization reclassified existing positions and moved capability into the new community superintendent organization, which will allow for greater principal and classroom support. This reorganization, the Service Support Model, occurred after discussions with principals and what they needed to meet their schools’ needs.

**16. The budget request for BCPS-TV on pg. 151 is over \$1.1M. How is that request justified when we consider the opportunity cost of that amount is about 22 instructional teacher salaries?**

See department Mission Statement and objectives on page 150.

**17. Please explain the redirect on pg. 146 of \$187,000.**

The office of Equity and Cultural Proficiency currently has an office of 4 employees to provide training and support to over 18,000 employees. The office is currently using 2 contractors to assist with equity training in schools and offices. The redirect transfers the existing budgeted dollars from contract services to salaries and wages for two full-time employees.

**18. Why has the contracted services under the Chief Communications Officer on pg. 149 jumped from \$26K in FY 2016 to over \$203K?**

Due to the growth in English language learners, the need for translation services has increased.

**19. Please forward the adjustment to the board that was mentioned at the board meeting regarding Admin vs. Mid-Level Admin increases. Information is needed before voting on the budget.**

The FY 2018 proposed budget in the Administration category currently contains \$3.0 million in salary changes, including the FTE-neutral community superintendent reorganization (\$1.6 million total, \$652,000 incremental), which transferred positions from other activities, steps and COLAs (\$905,000), and other redirects and changes (\$407,000). After further analysis, it was determined that \$2.4 million in Administration salaries related to the community superintendent organization can be appropriately moved to mid-level administration, according to MSDE regulations. This change will be reflected in the Board proposed budget document to be submitted for Board approval on February 7, 2017.

The following adjustment will be made to the structure of the proposed budget book for the Board's vote to adopt on February 7, 2017:

8.0 Executive Director FTEs	( <u>\$1,454,807</u> )
4.0 Director FTEs	( <u>597,004</u> )
4.0 Administrative Assistant II FTEs	( <u>293,623</u> )
Car stipends for Executive Director FTEs	( <u>98,256</u> )
Cell phone stipends for Executive Director and Director FTEs*	( <u>9,942</u> )
<b>Total Reclassification from Administration to Mid-level Management</b>	<b>(<u>\$2,453,632</u>)</b>

**20. Under Community Superintendent Zone 1 and Zone 4 on pgs. 157 and 160, the Budget Highlights lists three support staff FTEs and two professional FTEs that were transferred from schools. Please explain those transfers and what positions they formerly held.**

Scholars K-8 closed following school year 2015-2016, freeing up 4.5 positions for this initiative.

**21. Explain the \$4.5M contracted services on pg. 185 under Administrative Services.**

The existing \$1.1 million is for ongoing software license and maintenance costs for all the accounting, payroll, and human resources computer systems. For FY 2018, one-time funds have been requested for computer system upgrades for the Advantage Financial System (\$3.15 million) and the Kronos payroll system (\$200,000).

**22. Explain the decrease of \$3.6M under Budget Highlights on pg. 193 under Maintenance.**

The responsibility for the management and negotiation of building rent contracts has been transferred from the Office of Maintenance to the Office of Logistics.

**23. Generally, from where is the funding for one-time increases coming?**

One-time funding requests are made by the county executive to the State Superintendent of Schools. If approved by MSDE, the state superintendent permits county government funds to be excluded from the Maintenance of Effort calculation.