

# BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Verletta White ♦ Interim Superintendent ♦ 6901 North Charles Street ♦ Towson, MD ♦ 21204

## ORIGINAL PROPOSED FY2020 OPERATING BUDGET

### Responses to Board Members' Questions February 1, 2019

#### FY 2020 OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST

1. With the projected increases in student enrollment for next year, there will likely be an increase as well in the number of students needing the federal and state legally mandated services of these professionals. Where is the increased staffing proposal for these professionals? Are they again being overlooked only to have so many of them resigning to join the private sector due to severe burn out issues? Are there increased staff positions proposed in these areas being funded by all of the 3rd Party Billing \$\$\$ they are responsible for BCPS receiving yearly?

This year's request in the FY2020 budget is focused on reducing student to teacher ratios for special education inclusion teachers. State and federal funding does not increase with enrollment, only through legislative appropriation.

2. The proposed budget is creating 27 math resource positions. If the information I have received is correct, there is currently a minimum of 6 math positions currently open. Probably a number of the 27 resource teachers will come from the current BCPS math teaching staff. Specifically what is a realistic plan for filling all of these math positions?

The 27 math resource teacher positions being requested are school-based teaching positions and will not be housed in the central office. These positions will be assigned to individual schools and hired by principals. These teaching positions are being requested in order to provide intensive, small-group mathematics instruction to students and additional mathematical support akin to what our current reading specialists provide in English Language Arts.

3. Please direct staff to provide the Board with an updated version of the attached report showing expenditures related to digital curriculum and instruction. In addition, please provide an itemized list of Client Software with annual costs. I further request that any additional related expenditures that do not appear on the last version of this document be added. Lastly, I request that the budget category and funding source for each item be identified on this updated report, as it is not apparent for some items, and as we have split funding for some items. We need to see the expense allocation by budget category and by funding source. This information is critical as we evaluate the proposed operating budget. I ask that this information request be prioritized and provided as soon as possible, and that it be made public, along with other budget questions and responses.

The technology [spreadsheet](#) has been updated. Leasing costs are in Activity 0005. Software licensing fees to be provided with more detail with A-4 forms from Budget and Reporting.

4. I would like clarification on exactly what the Board of Education is voting on when we pass this budget. Are we voting on every precise word in the budget book or just the financial tables etc.? I'm assuming it's the totality of the entire book which means we are asking the Superintendent to fully execute that book if we pass it without changing anything? Is this a correct understanding?

Yes, your understanding is correct. The Board votes to adopt the entire budget as presented, but also has the opportunity to amend the budget. After the Board adopts its budget, the county executive may further amend the budget prior to presenting his budget to the Council. The Council may only reduce the budget recommended by the county executive.

5. We have separate budgets for Operating and Capital requests however there is a great deal of Capital information in the Budget Book. In fact there is more information in the Budget Book than was given to us to process when the County Capital Request was presented to the Board. I have been attempting to ascertain exactly when the start of the capital budget season. As a living set of documents that rolls from one year to the next that is difficult. Is this in the book only for information or are we supposed to be doing something with it? If all the capital materials and the operations materials are in the same book then why are we not given the book as a proposed budget book prior to the making of the first decision to be made? There are things in this book which the Board has already passed in the state capital request so why didn't we have all of this information then. I would like to recommend that we either separate the budget book into two separate books, one which pertains to the Capital Budget and this one so that the capital materials are prepared at the beginning of the capital budget cycle which I'm told is the state request.

Development of the operating and capital budgets takes place over a one-year timetable.

The calendar summarized on page 47 is a good illustration of the capital process.

In August the superintendent and staff begin work on the operating budget. All departments are required to analyze data and review each line item for effectiveness and efficiency to determine the educational value of each item in within their budget.

The FY2019 budget document was presented to the Board at the beginning of the fiscal year and serves as a starting point for the Board from which to develop the following year.

6. Along with the Capital Budget request, and the other work of the Board I don't feel we have been given enough time to review this budget. I would have liked to have had it to start reading at least three weeks prior to when we got it if for no other reason than to be able to read it even if questions can't be answered at that time.

Due to the complexity of developing comprehensive programming proposals, accurate revenue and expenditure projections based upon September 30 enrollment, and compiling the information in cohesive document, it would be challenging to accelerate the process. Staff has been able to provide the Board with detailed information in response to every question that has arisen. BCPS staff has offered 2 by 2 sessions with Board members to address any questions in detail.

- The general fund is asking for 11% over MOE increase. This seems like it's higher than has ever been historically granted. Is it typical for the Board to send a request to the County Executive that asks for this much over MOE? What was the percent over MOE of last year's request prior to the budget being adopted? Is that the correct understanding of the text on page 7?

With the growing student population, the complexities of our student needs (increased poverty, homelessness, ESOL, special education, etc.) have grown as well, which makes this point in time unprecedented in the history of BCPS. The process includes multiple conversations over time between BCPS and Baltimore County leadership. The chart below shows that historically there is typically a difference between the funds initially requested from the county in the proposed budget and what is adopted. Although we have unprecedented needs, this is not an unprecedented request.

FISCAL YEAR	MOE	MOE
	PERCENTAGE PROPOSED	PERCENTAGE ADOPTED
2006	4.30%	3.30%
2007	3.10%	2.60%
2008	6.50%	2.40%
2009	7.80%	5.60%
2010	11.50%	4.90%
2011	7.60%	0.00%
2012	0.30%	0.00%
2013	0.00%	0.00%
2014	0.00%	0.00%
2015	5.70%	1.60%
2016	6.50%	0.30%
2017	2.20%	0.10%
2018	6.60%	2.60%
2019	7.50%	3.30%
2020*	11.20%	TBD

\*Revised proposed budget 0.7% above MOE

8. How much of this \$91 million would be the county's responsibility and how much would be the state's responsibility and of the County's responsibility does that increase the County's future obligations under MOE.

Based on current projections, state revenue for aid to education will increase by approximately \$24.3 million. Under MOE, the county is required to increase its share of education by \$3.8 million. After including all state revenue, any amount over above the county's required contribution, is considered above MOE. All of the MOE responsibility belongs to the county.

9. There seems to be an entire section of the Budget Book which existed in the FY19 book which is not in the FY20 book. These are pages titled "Summary of Budget History" and are pages 115-125 of the FY19 book. Please provide this section as it pertains to FY20.

That section has historically only been included in the adopted budget.

10. I have many questions as it pertains to Watershed Charter which I will ask in a different email because I don't really even understand all the details of how that even came about. It happened just before this Board was sworn in and I wasn't in that closed session. I would like more information on that.

The Watershed Public Chart School (Watershed) budget is based on the charter school's enrollment projection, per pupil funding according to state law, and the assumption that Watershed will be able to obtain required external funding and meet all educational specifications for their building and academic plan.

11. What would be the instructional and fiscal impact of keeping K at 5:1 devices, grades 1-5 to 2:1 devices (since they don't take them home anyway), keeping grades 6-12 on 1:1 devices and putting the entire school system on google chrome books?

Learning is our core purpose in BCPS. Our mission states our commitment to provide for every student the "highest quality, 21st century education in a safe, secure and positive environment conducive to high levels of teaching, learning and student engagement, resulting in globally competitive students prepared for their chosen college and/or career path."

The 21st century demands successful citizens who possess a wide range of literacies and competencies, which cut across all content areas and disciplines. Students are expected to build intentional cross-cultural connections and relationships with others so as to pose and solve problems collaboratively and strengthen independent thought by developing proficiency and fluency with the tools of technology, the design and sharing of information, synthesizing multiple streams of information, having proficiency with multimedia texts, and understanding the ethical responsibilities to navigate these complex environments.

In BCPS, we have aligned the tools we use to our instructional expectations in early childhood, intermediate elementary grades, and secondary schools. Limiting access to technology limits student choice to learning methods that work best for them and widens the equity gap for many students living in poverty.

Teachers' workload will increase with limited access to current curriculum, increased planning time, and requiring technology sharing between classes. Limiting access to technology would hamstring teachers; instead of making instructional decisions for students – by name and by need – any reduction in access would force teachers to make decisions based on technology availability, not student need. Moreover, teachers have been engaged in professional learning for over five years to develop their ability to deliver high-quality, differentiated blended instruction. Curriculum would largely have to be rewritten, printed materials purchased, and teachers retrained and all within a short window to meet the requirements of our master agreement and prepare for school in August.

The shift to elementary Chromebooks dramatically reduces the cost of technology (in excess of \$15 million over the next three years), preserves our blended learning environment, and holds the prospect for additional efficiencies on the horizon.

*"It is imperative that our students be provided with 21st century technology to learn 21st century skills! One- to-One Laptop Initiatives across the country are changing the lives of our students and leveling the playing field so that ALL students will be able to sit at the table of 21st century economic success." ~ Dr. Karen B. Salmon, Superintendent of Schools*

*"We need technology in every classroom and in every student and teacher's hand, because it is the pen and paper of our time, and it is the lens through which we experience much of our world." ~ David Warlick, author*

*"Technology will never replace great teachers, but technology in the hands of a great teacher can be transformational." ~ George Couros, author*

12. On page 16 the Special Revenue Fund which is used for Title 1 and IDEA grant money for 60% is decreasing by \$1 million even as we are adding a school that is a title 1 school and even as our special education population is expanding. The grants themselves are increasing slightly even as the fund decreases. Does this mean we are cutting funding for Title 1 schools and special education by \$1 million? Where is this \$1 million being cut from?

The special education Pass-through grant increases by \$270 thousand and Title I by \$605.5 thousand. The majority of special education funding comes from the general fund. The remainder of the Special Revenue fund includes 38 other grants, which tend to decrease over time. Additionally, an allowance is budgeted for new grants that may be awarded during the fiscal year. Consequently, the overall fund fluctuates from year to year.

13. On page 17, 6 schools are being converted to “whole school magnets” please explain what this means about how enrollments will happen and how many seats will be available to out of catchment zone students for those magnet programs. It is my understanding that in a “whole school magnet” as opposed to a “magnet within a school” all students are part of the magnet program. Some come from the neighborhood catchment zone while others apply through the Office of Magnet Programs and are given seats only if the neighborhood catchment zone doesn't fill the capacity of the school. What is keeping the zoned population from displacing the available magnet seats offered to students around the county via the Office of Magnet programs in such a way that the magnet programs are eventually taken away from the schools completely for lack of availability of county wide placements as happened with Lutherville Elementary, and Halstead Academy when they lost their magnet status completely and all applicable funding for exactly the same reason. It's my understanding that magnet status can be removed if the school can no longer accommodate significant numbers of county wide placements from around the county.

In BCPS, we have comprehensive magnet schools, whole-school magnets, and magnet programs within schools. Carver is an example of a comprehensive magnet; these schools do not have attendance boundaries and seats are open to all interested students through an application process. A whole-school magnet is a magnet program in which every student enrolled in the school participates in the magnet program (these are the kinds of magnet programs being funded by the Magnet Schools Assistance Program). This differs from a magnet within in a school in which only students enrolled in the magnets participate in the magnet programming (Deer Park Middle Magnet is an example). In the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) Grant Schools, students access magnet school enrollment by virtue of their home address as they live within the attendance boundary of the school. These students are referred to as in-boundary students. They do not need to apply to the magnet school. In addition, every year magnet program seats are accessed by students living outside the attendance zone of the magnet school who apply through the BCPS magnet application process. Once accepted and enrolled, these students access the magnet school as out of boundary students. The ability to draw students across attendance boundaries is part of how BCPS defines magnet programs. The six MSAP schools were specifically identified due to the current and projected enrollments as compared to the school's state-rated capacity; that is, these schools have available seats and capacity. All six schools have projected enrollments that will continue to ensure seats and access for out of boundary students.

14. Please provide information about those 6 schools and how many seats will be dedicated to the Office of Magnet programs for County wide placement.

The six MSAP schools include:

- Golden Ring Middle School – 40 out of boundary seats per application year
- Middle River Middle School – 50 out of boundary seats per application year
- New Town High School – 60 out of boundary seats per application year
- Overlea High School – 60 out of boundary seats per application year

- Windsor Mill Middle School – 60 out of boundary seats per application year
- Woodmoor Elementary School – 24 out of boundary seats per application year

15. On page 19 please elaborate as to why the County stopped paying for worker's compensation and transferred that responsibility to the school system. If there are county documents from the county auditor available that explains this please provide them.

The county is still funding worker's compensation through their funding of the BCPS budget. The worker's compensation responsibility change was made to provide BCPS with more direct management of the program, given our familiarity with working conditions, employee training, and risk management.

16. On page 25 a onetime expenditure of \$750 thousand for a long term capital planning study is mentioned. What will be the full scope of this study? Will it be similar to the facilities assessment or is it intended to make recommendations about which projects should take priority in terms of funding? Will it update and confirm information in the 2014 facilities assessment which is now outdated as buildings in bad conditions are likely now in worse conditions. Will it give us a full plan the county can follow for what it would take to address all facilities needs in the whole county? Will there be public feedback etc.? Have any other jurisdictions performed such a study and what was the result? I like the idea of doing this and fully support it I just want to know that we are doing it in a broad enough way as to be utilized unlike the plan that still exists in charts only in the back of the 2014 facility assessment which was never implemented for elementary school and Lansdowne High School. That was a very hard to grasp plan. The High School Capacity Study recommendations on the other hand were very easy to understand by comparison. Are we going to see something more like that?

The scope of the long term planning study has not yet been determined by the Board of Education. The overall intention of the study is to provide a transparent long-term prioritized capital plan that can be agreed on by state and county officials.

- a. What will be the full scope of this study? The scope of work has not yet been developed. The intent is to have the condition of all schools considered and a priority list of needs established, which will become the basis for a ten year capital plan. The Board of Education will develop the scope of the study.
- b. Will it be similar to the facilities assessment or is it intended to make recommendations about which projects should take priority in terms of funding? The Board of Education will develop the scope of the study.
- c. Will it update and confirm information in the 2014 facilities assessment which is now outdated as buildings in bad conditions are likely now in worse conditions. The scope of work has not been determined yet.
- d. Will it give us a full plan the county can follow for what it would take to address all facilities needs in the whole county? It is anticipated that the results of this analysis will provide recommendations to prepare a ten-year capital plan for the Board's consideration.

- e. Will there be public feedback, etc.? **Yes.**
- f. Have any other jurisdictions performed such a study and what was the result? **Yes. Anne Arundel County commissioned a similar study in 2006 and updated it in 2016.**
- g. I like the idea of doing this and fully support it I just want to know that we are doing it in a broad enough way as to be utilized unlike the plan that still exists in charts only in the back of the 2014 facility assessment which was never implemented for elementary school and Lansdowne High School. That was a very hard to grasp plan. The High School Capacity Study recommendations on the other hand were very easy to understand by comparison. Are we going to see something more like that? **Every effort will be made to have the recommendations submitted in an easy to understand format.**

17. Please explain the need for the technology support vehicle on page 26. Do we not already have vehicles? Who is this vehicle assigned to and for what purposes.

The Department of Information Technology has recommended that BCPS acquire vehicles in which to secure valuable diagnostic equipment and inventory. A number of technicians are reimbursed for the use of their own vehicles to perform network and technology maintenance, which poses a liability risk for BCPS. The additional vehicle is needed to start to address this issue and keep up with maintenance requirements.

18. I have concerns that enrollment projections on which MOE funding eligibility cuts off on Sept 30 even though we know certain schools have substantial enrollments in October and these students are not going to appear in any official count which makes all of our projections wrong and means the school won't have adequate staff for their true numbers. What is being done to make sure we have accurate numbers for demographics who chronically enroll their children late in the school year such that we are losing funding as a school system for each one of those students and schools are losing staff by having numbers reported that are not real for most of the school year? So much of what we do depends on accurate numbers. Can they be double checked in November?

Baltimore County has accurately projected student enrollment for the system. Enrollment projections have consistently been within 0.5% of the actual September 30th enrollment. State law has established September 30 as the census date and this cannot be altered. Through the Department of Communications and Community Outreach, BCPS will continue to reinforce the importance of enrolling prior to the start of the school year or as soon as possible thereafter.

19. Throughout this entire book there are tens of millions of dollars simply marked "other costs". I find that unacceptable that such a large cumulative quantity of money would be left unallocated to specific purposes and line items. Please itemize other costs for each area they appear according to how it was done last year as additional documents to the Board. I do recall seeing these at some point last year for the FY19 budget even though they were not part of the FY19 Book. We need this data for FY20 as well.

“Other Charges” is an MSDE object class, which consists primarily of employee benefits for all teachers and staff, listed on page 328. Please see the complete breakdown below.

Object Type Name	Object Name	FY2020 Proposed
OTHER CHARGES	HEALTH INSURANCE	\$ 164,639,976
	SOCIAL SECURITY	77,518,578
	PRIVATE PLACEMENT TUI CTY	45,322,391
	RETIREMENT STATE	29,389,633
	GAS and ELECTRIC	23,414,420
	INSURANCE WORKERS COMP	9,574,013
	RETIREMENT COUNTY	9,523,031
	INSURANCE DENTAL	5,052,280
	TELECOM SERVICES	4,058,760
	VACATION PAYOUT	3,259,699
	PROPERTY and CASUALTY INSUR	2,277,464
	CREDIT REIMB PROFESSIONAL	2,169,000
	CREDIT REIMB COHORTS	2,150,000
	RETIREMENT ADMIN FEE	1,919,169
	LIABILITY/ FIDELITY INSURANCE	1,750,000
	SEWAGE	1,743,117
	MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT	1,617,342
	WATER	1,391,625
	OUT OF COUNTY LIVING ARRANGEME	1,387,044
	PRIVATE PLACEMENT TUI ST	1,158,850
	FUEL OIL	1,130,000
	BUSES INSURANCE	1,094,787
	OVERNIGHT TRAVEL-PER DIEM/LODG	1,011,244
	PARENT REIMBURSEMENT	900,000
	COMMUNICATIONS TELEPHONE	787,781
	TUITION OTHER THAN PRIVATE PLCMT	779,289
	INSURANCE UNEMPLOYMENT	775,000
	CONFERENCE REG FEES	552,779
	INSURANCE LIFE	499,942
	VEHICLE INSURANCE	460,000
	TELEPHONE MAINTENANCE	380,590
	INSURANCE VISION	367,487
	ACQUISITION COST TELEPHONE	281,356
	CREDIT REIMB CLASSIFIED	217,679
DRUG TESTING and PHYSICALS	214,000	
CELLULAR TELEPHONE	197,393	
PROFESSIONAL DUES	193,767	
STIPEND BOARD MEMBERS	83,500	
All OTHER	537,780	
		<b>\$ 399,780,766</b>

20. Page 31 appears the text "The Baltimore County executive has developed a ten-year plan, Schools for Our Future, which is incorporated into BCPS' capital budget for FY2020 and beyond. The program addresses enrollment growth by adding or replacing approximately 6,500 student seats, installing central air conditioning in nearly all school buildings, and modernizing existing buildings." Does this statement mean the current County Executive has developed a new ten-year plan which none of us have seen year or is this a reference to the previous administration that we are just finishing certain projects for?

Yes, the latter statement is correct. The county executive is in the process of modifying the long-term capital plan.

21. I see Blueprint 2.0 is contained in this budget book. If we approve this budget book are we approving Blueprint 2.0 at the same time or is this just a reiteration of something that was approved prior? When does Blueprint 2.0 come before the Board?

Blueprint 2.0 was adopted by the Board in FY2012. Budget initiatives are aligned with the four goal areas of the strategic plan: academics, safety, communication, and organizational effectiveness. The Board and superintendent may determine when and how to update or modify the system's strategic plan.

22. On page 46 & 47 the budget calendars are present. It seems like May is the earliest date for both cycles. Wouldn't it make more sense to give us this book in April since it contains information on the capital budget and blueprint 2.0 etc. then we could have all the information ahead of time for the entire budget cycle instead of getting this book smack dab in the middle? So for instance give us FY21 proposed budget in early April prior to the May public hearing on the capital request that way we can see what the proposed FY21 capital information is that is in the budget book at the time we need it and not in January of 2020 when most of the decisions have already been made to the state request.

The FY2020 budget will not have been finalized or adopted in the spring 2019, and it must serve as the basis from which the FY2021 budget will be developed, making it difficult to begin any sooner. The state capital budget is due in early October, the county capital budget must be reviewed by the County Planning Commission in January, the operating budget must be presented to the county executive by March 1, and the county has until June 30 to adopt a final budget. BCPS has built its processes around these key dates.

23. I noticed that the fund balance seems to be increasing every year. The only way I can see that this is possible is if we are budgeting money that we ultimately don't actually spend or if we are bringing in money that we didn't expect to. Please provide and itemized list of accounting activity that contributed to the expansion of the ending fund balance for FY17, FY18, and FY19.

Fund balance is generated when revenues exceed projections, expenditures fall below projections, or a combination of both. Fund balance is relatively consistent over time, but more fund balance has been appropriated by county government in recent years. Most of the positive balance has historically been generated by vacant positions and retirements. Human Resources constantly recruits in order to fill these vacancies as quickly as possible.

24. Please explain page 103. I wasn't aware that capital projects had an impact on the Operating Budget. I just need to understand what this page is.

The table on page 103 shows the operating costs such as utilities, maintenance, and incremental personnel, associated with these projects.

25. On page 107 there is County Debt limit information. Does this say that the county is at almost 2/3 of its debt limit? Am I interpreting this correctly that they can borrow 3.4 Million and they have currently borrowed 2.025 million? Is that what this says?

Baltimore County Government's Spending Affordability Committee issued its most recent report in February 2018, noting that the county's financial management guidelines recommend that debt service payments not exceed 9.5 percent of the general fund revenues. The same report indicates that the county is on pace to exceed that limit by 2022.

26. Pages 101 and 109. This might seem obvious but, do we not purchase food? If not where does the food come from?

All food services purchases are contained on page 109. Food services is a self-supporting enterprise fund, supported by meal sales and state/federal subsidies. Food is purchased under the supplies category.

27. Page 118. Why are their "pending" performance measures for FY18. Why don't we have that data but we have FY19?

Any FY2018 actual results noted as "pending," were not finalized by the time of the proposed budget book's publications. These will be included in the adopted budget book. The measures are provided as a point of reference for organizations that evaluate our budget against financial benchmarks typical of other governmental and education budgets. However, BCPS' official measures of internal performance and student achievement are maintained by the Division of Research Accountability and Assessment and reported to the Board, MSDE, and stakeholders.

28. When I was going through all of the offices I noticed some pretty significant payroll increases yet the number of FTE employees for the office were the same number. I can provide examples if you need them. It seems like we are giving administration some pretty significant pay raises on a regular basis and increased the number of staff by 136 FTE over the last two years. I can't tell how much of this is in the school house or just central office?

I would like someone to further unpack how to read certain of these pages so I can be certain I have the correct understanding of everything from page 129 to the end of the book. It's less than clear to me at the moment. This might be a good use of the 2 by 2 meeting.

This statement is not accurate. All units have received the same increases, tied to collective bargaining agreements over the past three years. Administrative positions have been relatively flat over the past several years. The vast majority of the increase in FTEs are tied to "People for Our People" including psychologists, social workers, and pupil personnel workers. The proposed steps, COLAs, 15-minutes extension of the school day, and proposed new positions all increase salary expense.

29. Pg 15 – Explain 9M 1X expenditure excluded from Maintenance of Efforts calculation.

One-time expenditures are excluded by law from MOE calculation.

30. Pg 16 – What is the additional school to become Title 1 in 2020?

Arbutus Elementary School.

31. Pg 21 – Explain sentence in last paragraph "Staff will increasingly rely upon digital media..."

This references school year 2018-19, the first in which all high school staff are implementing blended instruction.

32. Pg 23 – Where will 4 new half day programs be offered?

The four new programs include New Town Elementary School (two half day programs), Hillcrest Elementary School (one half day program), and Harford Hills Elementary School (adding a second half day program).

33. Pg 24 – What is the contract period for two VoIP project managers?

This contract expires in 2022.

34. Pg 29 – With proposed increase in General Education FTEs, how will actual class sizes align with allocation of 21.9 students in Grades K-2, 24.9 students in Grades 3-5, 27.6 students in Middle School, and 29 students in most high schools?

BCPS allocates teachers to schools based on established staffing ratios. However, the variance between the ratios and observed class sizes are typically due to factors such as student enrollment, course offerings, classroom and student groupings, and specialized

programming, such as magnet. General education staffing ratios listed on page 135 are maintained. An increase to high school staffing was proposed separately.

35. Pg 88 – Explain “out of county living” expense of 1.63M and “informal kinship care” expense of 1.1M.

These are actually revenues (not expenses) collected from other LEAs as required by state law to offset expenditures for students placed in Baltimore County Public Schools from other jurisdictions.

36. Pg 109 – Food and Nutrition Revenue includes Federal and State reimbursement amounts. Why is the actual cost of food not included in expenditures?

“Supplies” represent food or the cost of goods sold.

37. Pg 136 – What is BCPS’ justification for 169 STAT teachers and only 172.5 ESOL teachers given the dramatic increase in ESOL students?

Both S.T.A.T. and ESOL teachers are valuable human resources to support teaching and learning. S.T.A.T. teachers are highly regarded in the school system due to their focus on instructional coaching. The work they do grows and sustains a highly effective workforce of over 9,000 teachers. These teachers are critical. ESOL teachers work directly with students on the acquisition of English. At nearly 8,000 students in this category, these teachers are also critical. Therefore, both positions are critical to the success of our students.

38. Pg 136 – What is BCPS’ justification for 169 STAT teachers and only 49 PPWs (pg 193)?

As noted above, S.T.A.T. teachers focus on improving the instructional practice of our teachers who serve our over 114,000 students; whereas, PPWs work directly with a subset of students in each school who are in need of specified support services.

39. Pg 137 – What is the staffing plan for the 2235 Speech Only Students? There are no FTEs shown.

This year’s request in the F2020 budget is focused on reducing student to teacher ratios for special education inclusion teachers. Speech language pathologists (SLPs) are provided to students receiving “speech only,” in addition to students who receive speech and language as a related service. SLPs are allocated to address all speech and language needs for students as outlined on educational plans. As the need for SLPs and other related services grows, the plan is to reflect that need in future budget requests.

40. Pg 156 – Explain increase of/need for 144 professional staff from FY18 actual to FY20 proposed.

Each year a budget is developed as a result of ongoing stakeholder input and continuous analysis of system needs. As previously noted, our student's academic and socio-emotional needs have increased over time; therefore, the need for additional professional staff to support students has been apparent. This includes the need for additional PPWs, social workers, psychologists, and other student support personnel. The table below provides a breakdown related to the positions in question.

Position	FTEs
<b>FY2018</b>	<b>260.9</b>
Psychologist	18.6
PPW	4.6
Social Workers	25.0
Social Workers transferred from Special Ed (no change in responsibilities)	68.7
Vacancy Reclass	4.0
<b>FY2019 Adj.</b>	<b>381.8</b>
Vacancy Reclass	(1.0)
Resource Teachers transferred to School Climate (8.0) and Staff Relations (2.4) (no change in responsibilities)	10.4
Data Specialist	1.0
Health Facilitator	0.3
Psychologist	5.0
Social Workers	7.5
<b>FY2020 Proposed</b>	<b>405.0</b>

41. Pg 196 – Provide justification for \$413,852 salary for two school safety personnel with one FTE being support staff.

This includes an executive director and administrative assistant (a standard configuration), and contractual staff for security, technical support, and clerical support. Contractual staff is budgeted at \$135,990 of the \$413,852.

42. Pg 197 – How can School Safety 6 FTE FY18 actual salary and wages go from \$392,587 to FY20 proposed salary and wages for 5.6 FTE of 603,482? It doesn't make sense that FTEs decrease by .4 and salary and wages increase by \$210,895.

This is primarily caused by timing of vacancies/turnover in FY2018. FTEs are reported at a point in time (end of fiscal year) while expenses are for the full year.

43. Pg 197 Provide justification for proposed FY20 School Safety total salary and wages of \$1,017,334 for only 5 professional and 2.6 support staff personnel.

This figure above is inaccurate. Salaries and wages total \$413,852 under School Safety.

44. Pg 236 Provide justification for increase in Chief Academic Officer salary and wages from \$428,189 FY18 actual to \$568,649 FY20 proposed (\$140K increase) with no change in FTEs. What are the measures of success that the proposed increase is based on?

This is an inaccurate comparison. The FY2018 budget for this class was \$496,807, so the increase over two years to \$568,649 was actually \$71,842. The budget includes 3.0 FTEs, as well as teacher stipend expenses. Actual FY2018 expenditures were below budget due to unexpended teacher stipends.

45. Pg 286 How many BCPS students use eLEARNING services?

eLearning enrollment over time is noted below:

- SY 15-16 – Approximately 900 students
- SY 16-17 – Approximately 1,000 students
- SY 17-18 – Approximately 1,300 students
- SY 18-19 – Approximately 730 students to date (1/17/19)

46. Pg 286 Provide justification for an increase in eLEARNING salary and wages from FY18 actual \$390,090 to \$559,499 FY20 proposed (169K increase) with no change in FTEs.

This is an inaccurate comparison. The FY2018 budget for this class was \$534,571. Of the total salary and wages budget, only \$169,145 is FTE related. Actual FY2018 expenditures were below budget due to unexpended contractual/stipend employee expenses. The budget difference between FY2018 and FY2020 proposed is \$24,928.

47. Where in budget are FTE increases for Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists, and Speech Language Pathologists? If there are no FTE increases for these positions, please explain why.

This year's request in the FY2020 budget is focused on reducing student to teacher ratios for special education inclusion teachers. Student IEPs drive the magnitude of related services needed. Services are provided by a combination of full-time staff and contracted services. As the need for related services grows, the plan is to reflect that need in future budget requests.

48. I noticed about a 33 million dollar increase in salary and wages for the Superintendent office. I would like to know what dollar amount accounts for increased number of FTE over that time and what dollar amount accounts for wage increase. I would also like to know how many of those FTE work directly in the school house and how many of those were newly added FTE in that time frame vs FTE added to people who are not school staff.

Also why are psychologist and social workers who work in the schoolhouse not in the schools section of the budget instead of the Superintendent section?

The primary increase was due to moving the Division of Safety and Climate under the Office of the Superintendent (\$24.1million). For FY2016-FY2018, no new positions were added, though some were transferred from other departments into offices that fall under the Superintendent. In FY2019, the total amount budgeted for new psychologists, PPWs, and social workers was \$3,159,124. This represents 48.2 FTEs whose work supports the school house. The FY2020 budget includes requests of \$830,554 for 13.8 FTEs, of which, only one is a central office position (data specialist). Salary increases (COLA + increment) equated to approximately \$5.78 million from FY2016-FY2020 (proposed).

Summary of FY2016 – FY2020 changes under the Office of the Superintendent totaling \$33.9 million:

Safety and Climate: \$24.1 million  
FY2019 Additions (psychologists, PPWs, social workers): \$3.2 million  
FY2020 Requests: \$0.8 million  
FY2016-FY2020 COLA + increments: \$5.8 million

Psychologist and social workers are budgeted under their respective departments, because they report directly to those departments and not to the principals.

49. In addition, please provide an itemized list of Client Software with annual costs.

Attached is the itemized list.

## FY2019-2020 Information Technology Software License Fees

License	Activity	Object Category	FY2019 Budget	FY2020 Proposed	Increase/(Decrease)	Notes for FY2020
Active Directory & Security Management	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$85,099	\$85,099	\$0	
Active Inspire - Teaching software for interactive classroom	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$576,854	\$0	-\$576,854	BCPS One STAT reduction
BCPS Serve additional departments	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$539,246	\$466,544	-\$72,702	BCPS One STAT reduction
Destiny Asset Manager - Inventory and library management software application used systemwide	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$134,673	\$134,673	\$0	
Learning Management System-Schoology	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$417,492	\$485,823	\$68,331	Amount per contract agreement
SIS (Scheduling & Information Svcs) - Project planning and scheduling	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$651,012	\$551,012	-\$100,000	BCPS One STAT reduction
School/Parent Messenger Communicate (was Blackboard Connect - Calling System)	Other Instructional Costs	Contracted Services	\$383,804	\$333,804	-\$50,000	BCPS One STAT reduction
Adobe - Suite Site Licenses for Offices	Administration	Contracted Services	\$314,811	\$264,811	-\$50,000	BCPS One STAT reduction
Systemwide Calling System Blackboard Connect	Administration	Contracted Services	\$22,625	\$0	-\$22,625	contract discontinued
Programming Utilities	Administration	Contracted Services	\$47,298	\$0	-\$47,298	
<b>Subtotal 091 Exec. Dir. Information Technology</b>			<b>\$3,172,914</b>	<b>\$2,321,766</b>	<b>-\$851,148</b>	
PmPoint - Project Management Application	Administration	Contracted Services	\$3,760	\$3,760	\$0	
Utilities for User Stories, Prototyping, Testing i.e. Axure/JIRA	Administration	Contracted Services	\$9,270	\$9,270	\$0	
<b>Subtotal 092 Project Management</b>			<b>\$13,030</b>	<b>\$13,030</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
Cisco TAC for core & school switches	Administration	Contracted Services	\$574,560	\$574,560	\$0	
Bell Tech for Microsoft Licensing	Administration	Contracted Services	\$950,617	\$1,045,679	\$95,062	Anticipated growth of secondary student population and employees
Idera for SQL: diagnostics	Administration	Contracted Services	\$30,130	\$30,130	\$0	
VMWare Additional licenses	Administration	Contracted Services	\$208,640	\$208,640	\$0	
Enterprise backup license renewal	Administration	Contracted Services	\$220,760	\$253,874	\$33,114	License increase due to normal data growth of critical systems
Dell for Big IP Licenses	Administration	Contracted Services	\$125,632	\$125,632	\$0	
Barracuda Email ESI Tool	Administration	Contracted Services	\$122,138	\$285,000	\$162,862	Partial increase due to new retention directives
Microsoft Premier Support	Administration	Contracted Services	\$166,110	\$166,110	\$0	
LightSpeed Additional Licenses	Administration	Contracted Services	\$345,600	\$345,600	\$0	
Network monitoring/device maintenance	Administration	Contracted Services	\$112,680	\$112,680	\$0	
Juniper VPN maintenance	Administration	Contracted Services	\$175,601	\$65,850	-\$109,751	Out year of maintenance
Safari montage maintenance	Administration	Contracted Services	\$412,038	\$473,844	\$61,806	Anticipated growth of student population and C & I use in the classrooms
WebEx Enterprise unlimited license	Administration	Contracted Services	\$350,080	\$250,080	-\$100,000	Out year of maintenance
Active Directory Auditing Software	Administration	Contracted Services	\$120,750	\$120,750	\$0	
Misc.	Administration	Contracted Services	\$96,575	\$103,575	\$7,000	
District Adobe Products License	Administration	Contracted Services	\$0	\$0		Per Jodi being paid for out of either 091 or 071
<b>Subtotal 070 Network Support Services</b>			<b>\$4,011,911</b>	<b>\$4,162,004</b>	<b>\$150,093</b>	
BCPS Serve (help desk software for ticket tracking)	Administration	Contracted Services	\$96,640	\$99,539	\$2,899	annual increase in license maintenance cost for existing licenses
Microsoft Premiere Support	Administration	Contracted Services	\$31,900	\$32,857	\$957	annual increase in anticipated support costs for Microsoft products
<b>Subtotal 071 Technology Support Services</b>			<b>\$128,540</b>	<b>\$132,396</b>	<b>\$3,856</b>	
Nintex SharePoint Workflow - Utility	Administration	Contracted Services	\$15,000	\$29,000	\$14,000	
DocConverter Conversion – Utility	Administration	Contracted Services	\$2,200	\$828	-\$1,372	
Premier Software Support	Administration	Contracted Services	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	
Single Sign On Software - Ping Federate	Administration	Contracted Services	\$120,000	\$121,000	\$1,000	
Used for Producing the Highlights	Administration	Contracted Services	\$3,000	\$3,500	\$500	

License	Activity	Object Category	FY2019 Budget	FY2020 Proposed	Increase/(Decrease)	Notes for FY2020
WorldSpace Comply - DeQue	Administration	Contracted Services		\$27,000	\$27,000	Added for compliance.
App Development Tool	Administration	Contracted Services		\$500	\$500	
ActiveReports – Utility	Administration	Contracted Services	\$8,000	\$4,000	-\$4,000	
Infragistics Tools	Administration	Contracted Services	\$15,000	\$6,500	-\$8,500	
Tienet	Administration	Contracted Services	\$10,000	\$12,500	\$2,500	
Microfocus	Administration	Contracted Services	\$7,000	\$7,500	\$500	
Mobile Applications	Administration	Contracted Services	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$0	
Domain Name Renewal	Administration	Contracted Services	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	
OnLine Professional Development	Administration	Contracted Services	\$10,000	\$13,000	\$3,000	
SortSite Developer - ADA Compliance Tool	Administration	Contracted Services	\$4,400	\$4,000	-\$400	
SQL Source Control – Utility	Administration	Contracted Services	\$7,000	\$8,200	\$1,200	
Books OnLine - Professional Development	Administration	Contracted Services	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$0	
DMX Maintenance	Administration	Contracted Services	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$0	
Web Hosting (was SharpSchool -	Administration	Contracted Services	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	
Wireframe Sketcher	Administration	Contracted Services	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$0	
<b>Subtotal 068 Enterprise Applications</b>			<b>\$421,400</b>	<b>\$457,328</b>	<b>\$35,928</b>	
<b>TOTAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SOFTWARE LICENSE FEES</b>			<b>\$7,747,795</b>	<b>\$7,086,524</b>	<b>-\$661,271</b>	