

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 1

QUESTION:

Provide an update on the status and availability of the report from the Secondary Learning Center Transition Project Management Team.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

An evaluation of the Learning Center Transition is being completed by the Office of Shared Accountability. This report is currently in the revision process, pending receipt of additional data from the Office of Organizational Development. This evaluation should be published in February 2009.

The Secondary Learning Center Transition Project Team, designed to provide input and oversight of the Secondary Learning Center Transition Plan, meets on a regular basis to ensure each task is successfully implemented as proposed by Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Parents, community members, school staff, and central office staff discuss and monitor the progress of each student and the services provided by reviewing supporting documentation and meeting with key MCPS staff. The attached July 2008 memorandum is the most recent report submitted to the Board of Education in compliance with the reporting requirements for the 2007-2008 school year. Status update reports will be sent to the Board of Education at the end of February and at the end of July.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 2

QUESTION:

Referencing the testimony of the Watkins Mill Cluster, how many students are enrolled in the Watkins Mill International Baccalaureate (IB) program and what is the capacity? What would be the cost to split the Richard Montgomery High School (RMHS) program to create two catchment areas? What would be the process to start a Middle Years Program (MYP) in the Watkins Mill Cluster?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

Watkins Mill High School (WMHS) currently has about 30 diploma candidates in each graduating class and a total of 145 students in Grades 9–12. It is designed to handle all interested and capable students with no set capacity. The school is permitted and encouraged to enroll more local students in preparatory classes in Grades 9 and 10 to increase the program size in Grades 11 and 12. Given the staff currently trained at the school, a realistic immediate capacity would be about 50 diploma candidates per year without a needed increase in staff training.

Costs to split the IB program at Richard Montgomery High School (RMHS) include additional staffing, transportation, and efficiencies lost by reducing the program at RMHS to 50 students per year as well as the programmatic costs of splitting an existing program.

IB program costs vary from year-to-year based on the number of staff requiring professional development and the IB fees charged. Average nonposition costs of an IB program over five years of implementation are approximately \$51,000 per year. This average cost does not account for significant increases in professional development if a large number of students are added to a program. Most IB programs have a 1.0 full-time equivalent classroom teacher for coordination of the program. The budgeted cost of a classroom teacher for FY 2010 is \$62,994, bringing the total estimated cost of a single IB program per school to \$113,994.

The magnet IB program incurs additional costs through an additional staffing allocation to offset the impact of unique classes in the school schedule; however, this additional staffing could be split with the program and assigned to the new site. To handle the magnet recruitment, application, selection, and appeals processes the magnet IB program requires an administrative level magnet coordinator instead of the teacher level coordinator and additional clerical support. The budgeted cost of an N level administrator is \$116,681. The additional clerical support would cost approximately \$49,013 per year, bringing the additional staff cost of splitting the magnet IB program to \$165,994 per year. This would represent a \$102,700 increase to serve the same number of students at two sites.

Transportation costs would rise over the first four years of implementation as students matriculate through RMHS and begin at WMHS, but would return to the same cost for operating at RMHS only, as the same number of students would be involved.

It also is important to consider the program consequences of establishing split sites. RMHS has served as a magnet IB by distinguishing itself with the breadth and depth of IB course offerings taught by a large number of IB trained staff. A reduction to 50 students would mean a decrease in the variability and depth of course offerings. In addition a process would need to be put in place to allow teachers to continue at RMHS or relocate to WMHS. One option to consider to offset this effect would be to increase the overall enrollment of the program to 150 students with 75 students at each site. Combined with the local students in each program, the magnet IB programs would be able to maintain the current depth of program offerings.

However, this option comes with the cost of transporting 50 more students, which would mean adding two more bus routes. The cost of operating two magnet bus routes and leasing two more buses is \$69,992 per year. This option also has the disadvantages of pulling more students from their home high schools, further exacerbating the problem indicated by the Watkins Mill cluster.

IB has an application process that typically takes two years to complete. To demonstrate readiness for the program, schools are required to show commitment to the IB philosophy, professional development, curriculum and assessment, and financial support from the school district administration and school board.

To add a Middle Years Program in the Watkins Mill cluster several questions should be considered. Would a paired middle-high school model be developed? Would both feeder middle schools host MYP? What high school IB program would be available for students in the Clarksburg High School portion of the Neelsville Middle School area? Estimated costs for these different configurations are in the table below.

Program Configuration	Estimated Annual Cost
MYP at only Montgomery Village Middle School or Neelsville Middle School	\$113,994
MYP at Montgomery Village Middle School and Watkins Mill High School	\$202,790
MYP at Montgomery Village Middle School and Neelsville Middle School	\$227,998
MYP at Montgomery Village Middle School, Neelsville Middle School, and Watkins Mill High School	\$316,794

The Neelsville Middle School feeder pattern is split between Clarksburg and Watkins Mill high schools. Opening a program at Neelsville Middle School will create requests for students in the Clarksburg High School feeder pattern to continue in the IB program at Watkins Mill High School. If the magnet option is not available, it is important to note that approving transfers based on program is not permitted by the MCPS transfer policy. In addition, this would set a

precedent for expansion through student the transfers to the three other local IB programs at Rockville and Bethesda-Chevy Chase high schools and the developing program at Seneca Valley High School. The IB programs at Springbrook and Albert Einstein high schools and the developing program at John F. Kennedy High School are currently part of regional consortia.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 3

QUESTION:

Provide a list of elementary school enrollment starting with the schools with the lowest enrollment.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: 1-3

ANSWER:

The table below provides the projected enrollment for all elementary schools. As requested the enrollments are sorted from lowest to highest. The projected enrollment numbers include Pre-K, Head Start, general education (K-6) and special education students.

School Name	Projected Enrollment FY2010
Monocacy	192
Seven Locks	256
Westover	267
Damascus	271
Cashell	275
Clarksburg	275
Carderock Springs	284
Germantown	292
Oak View	293
East Silver Spring	298
Candlewood	334
Meadow Hall	347
Bannockburn	353
Cresthaven	353
Cedar Grove	357
Highland View	357
Poolesville	363
Belmont	364
Pine Crest	364
Luxmanor	371
Cold Spring	371
Washington Grove	371
North Chevy Chase	374
Burnt Mills	376
Woodfield	379
Lake Seneca	386
Darnestown	386
Glenallan	386
William T. Page	390

Strathmore	394
Rock Creek Valley	399
Lois P. Rockwell	403
Sequoyah	403
New Hampshire Estates	407
Roscoe R. Nix	408
Takoma Park	411
Brooke Grove	413
Brown Station	414
Westbrook	415
DuFief	418
Dr. Charles R. Drew	420
Wheaton Woods	420
Brookhaven	420
Travilah	423
Cannon Road	428
Stonegate	431
Mill Creek Towne	434
Chevy Chase	438
Kemp Mill	443
Somerset	444
Flower Valley	444
Fields Road	444
Woodlin	452
Clopper Mill	455
Rosemont	460
Garrett Park	461
Highland	462
Bradley Hills	463
Summit Hall	463
Burning Tree	465
Montgomery Knolls	467
Sherwood	475
Flower Hill	476
Piney Branch	476
Bells Mill	482
Fallsmead	482
Arcola	488
Bel Pre	489
Laytonsville	490
Jones Lane	491
Ritchie Park	495
Gaithersburg	503
Diamond	505
Bethesda	509
Cloverly	510
Broad Acres	511

Thurgood Marshall	515
Rock Creek Forest	521
Georgian Forest	525
Watkins Mill	526
Strawberry Knoll	534
Judith A. Resnik	539
Harmony Hills	541
Weller Road	542
Clarksburg #8	543
Fairland	550
Olney	550
Twinbrook	551
Glen Haven	556
Potomac	558
Fox Chapel	562
Rock View	563
Viers Mill	566
Greenwood	568
Forest Knolls	570
Dr. Sally K. Ride	571
Wayside	582
Captain James Daly	583
South Lake	586
Kensington-Parkwood	587
Stone Mill	589
Lucy V. Barnsley	593
Beverly Farms	594
Stedwick	594
Jackson Road	595
S. Christa McAuliffe	605
Goshen	605
Whetstone	614
Ashburton	618
Wyngate	619
Lakewood	621
Maryvale	622
Sligo Creek	624
Waters Landing	629
Rosemary Hills	630
Burtonsville	633
Clearspring	633
Greencastle	640
Sargent Shriver	644
Rolling Terrace	645
Farmland	650
Beall	656
Wood Acres	657

College Gardens	700
Ronald McNair	709
Little Bennett	722
Great Seneca Creek	741
Galway	772
Oakland Terrace	778
Rachel Carson	853
Spark M. Matsunaga	950
Total	64624

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 4

QUESTION:

Provide clarification on the rationale for the change in the Home School Model. What are the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and paraeducators in the Home School Model and how will those services be provided in the future?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: 5-33

ANSWER:

The departments of Special Education Services and Special Education Operations have identified the Home School Model (HSM) as a service delivery model that provides more inclusive opportunities for elementary students in general education as mandated by state and federal regulations. While some schools may experience a smaller teacher allocation in FY 2010, in most cases, the paraeducator allocation will increase to support students in a variety of settings.

The change to this model establishes an equitable way to allocate staff to all HSM schools. All students with Individualized Education Programs receiving HSM or resource services within an HSM school will be included in the count, rather than only considering those students receiving greater than 15 hours of special education service as is the current practice. This proposed staffing model considers the expectation that students with disabilities are included with their general education peers throughout the school day, as appropriate. Unlike the current staffing model, this staffing model allows for the addition of paraeducator support for the resource teacher.

Special Education teachers will continue to serve the critical role of ensuring the provision of special education services by providing instruction in a variety of settings to meet the needs of each school's targeted population of students with disabilities. This will include access to services in the general education classroom and/or during small group instruction in the core content areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. These teachers will plan with their general education counterparts to deliver quality instructional services. Special and general education teachers will plan and provide direct oversight and supervision of the paraeducators assigned to assist with the implementation of the Individualized Education Program. Paraeducators will support students with disabilities in the general education classroom, and during small group instruction in addition to art, music, and physical education as needed to address each student's individualized needs.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 5

QUESTION:

Provide a detailed explanation of the reorganization in the Department of Student Services.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: 5-63

ANSWER:

The reorganization of the Department of Student Services (DSS) for FY 2010 will reduce administrative expenses while allowing for all functions to continue with no impact on the services provided to students, their families, and schools. The changes will streamline administrative oversight of service delivery, will improve customer service, and will allow for some department processes to be completed with reduced staff involvement.

The three student services field offices will close. This will eliminate 12 staff positions—3.0 director I (P) positions, 3.0 (B-D) instructional specialist positions, 3.0 administrative secretary (Grade 14) positions, and 3.0 secretary (Grade 12) positions. The duties and responsibilities of the field office unit will be reassigned to other student services units. The school psychologists and pupil personnel workers currently housed in those three offices will transition to school-based offices. Sixteen schools have been identified as having available long-term space to house these staff. Housing school psychologists and PPWs in schools will result in increased visibility and greater opportunities for interactions with school staff as well as with students. Additionally, scheduling staff assignments without the constraint of three separate field office service areas will create greater flexibility and efficiency in assigning school psychologists and PPWs to schools.

In the current DSS organizational structure, there is a supervisor for the psychological services unit and a supervisor for the pupil personnel services unit who provide professional development to school psychologists and pupil personnel workers. Each of these supervisors is supported by a secretary (Grade 12) position. In the reorganization, these four positions will be eliminated, and 2.0 new director I (P) positions and 2.0 administrative secretary (Grade 14) positions will be created. The new director of psychological services and the new director of pupil personnel services will be responsible for specific student services programs including professional development and the scheduling, supervision, and evaluation of staff.

A new Student Services Appeals Unit is being created. This unit will be staffed by a 1.0 supervisor (O) position, 2.0 coordinator (N) positions, and 2.0 secretary (Grade 12) positions. This unit will be responsible for hearing suspension cases with a request for expulsion and suspension appeals. Any staff assigned to this unit can hear any case that is brought forward. This will speed up the scheduling of hearings. This unit also will handle change of school assignment (COSA) requests. There will be greater efficiency due to the fact that only this unit, rather than multiple units, will be involved in processing the requests.

In the school counseling unit, 2.0 counseling specialist positions are being eliminated and a new 1.0 K-12 (B-D) counseling specialist position is being created. This will result in the school counseling unit consisting of one supervisor (O) position, one specialist (B-D) position, and one secretary (Grade 12) position. The counseling unit is responsible for providing the professional development and support needed to school counselors to ensure the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) approved school counseling program is implemented in every school.

A student services specialist (B-D) position is being created to bring enhanced support to the increasing number of schools working with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Forty-eight schools and four alternative program sites are working with PBIS this school year. Of these schools, approximately 15 schools that are in at least their third year of implementation, will move to the self-sustaining level of implementation and will require no financial support. This will allow for up to an additional 15 schools to begin implementation of PBIS in FY 2010 with no additional funding required.

The changes listed above account for a net reduction of 6.0 positions and a savings of \$633,676, including employee benefit costs.

There are several additional changes to DSS included in the Superintendent's Recommended FY 2010 Operating Budget that also will provide savings. Two vacant positions, an assessor in the bilingual assessment unit and an office assistant IV in the alternative programs unit, have been vacant since last school year and will be eliminated in FY 2010. The elimination of these two positions yields a savings of \$127,330, including employee benefit costs.

The collocation of the alternative programs high school programs to the Mark Twain facility will result in a net reduction of 1.5 positions and a savings of \$132,507.

In summary, the reorganization of DSS results in a net reduction of 9.5 positions in DSS and other non-position savings for a total of \$898,439.

The amount of the reduction in the budget resulting from the reorganization of DSS and the elimination of the three field offices does not include additional savings that may result by making the three field office spaces available for other MCPS offices that currently occupy leased space.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 6

QUESTION:

Respond to the testimony of the ESOL Advisory Committee and provide information on the budget changes in the ESOL program for FY 2010.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: 4-63

ANSWER:

For FY 2010 the ESOL reduction in the budget will not impact how positions are allocated. The change to the budgeted ESOL positions is a technical change and does not impact the staffing formula used for schools.

In FY 2009 there was a change to the budget that impacted ESOL positions based on an examination of how positions were allocated in past years. Through an analysis of the staffing formulas it was revealed that METS students were triple counted as part of the staffing process. Study of the METS program revealed that this triple counting was not necessary. For example, if there were 30 METS students in a middle school, the following teacher positions would be allocated:

- General education classroom teachers: Using the teacher formula of allocation (enrollment x 7 divided by 5 divided by 27) – 1.5 teachers would be allocated
- ESOL teachers: Using the middle school ESOL ratio (35:1) – a .9 FTE ESOL teacher would be allocated
- METs teachers: Using the METS ratio (15:1) – a 1.0 teacher position would be allocated.

In other words, for 30 students a total of 4.4 teachers would be allocated to the school. Staff recognized that this triple counting resulted in overstaffing the school and was not an efficient use of resources or necessary to run an effective program. As a result, it was determined that METS students would be counted twice, once in the general education number to account for times when students were included and then again using the METS 15 to 1 ratio to account for METS and/or ESOL services the students required. This new process would result in the same 30 students being allocated a total of 3.5 teachers. In addition, a school with 30 students would receive two 6-hour instructional assistants, or six staff for these 30 students.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 7

QUESTION:

How many students are coming into the Middle School Magnet Consortium from out of the area? What is the process for student selection? Is there a preference given to FARMS students? How many out-of-area applications were there last year for this year's enrollment in 6th Grade?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

During the 2008–2009 school year, 578 students in Grades 6, 7, and 8 are attending Middle School Magnet Consortium (MSMC) schools from outside the consortium boundaries. There are 1,869 students attending the schools who reside within the Consortium boundaries for a total of 2,447 students across Grades 6, 7, and 8 in all three schools.

The MSMC was established with a federal grant that ended with the 2007–2008 school year. Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) adapted the goals established by the grant to meet current system needs. The MSMC goals are to:

- increase student performance in the three target schools,
- broaden local student program choices and expand student program choices in MCPS, and
- decrease socioeconomic isolation in Consortium schools without increasing socioeconomic isolation in sending middle schools.

To help meet the last program goal students are recruited from outside the Consortium and a lottery process selects applicants. In the fall counselors share magnet options with all Grade 5 students, the Options book is sent to families of all Grade 5 students in MCPS, and parent information meetings and open houses are held to share information about the program. Families in the Consortium must submit a student choice form ranking their first, second, and third school preferences and interested families outside the Consortium may submit a choice form as well. In fall of 2008, 698 out-of-consortium choice forms were received, up from 688 in 2007.

In-consortium and out-of-consortium forms are entered into a computerized lottery. The factors considered in the lottery process are described in the MSMC Program booklet distributed to parents and available online. The booklet states:

“A variety of factors are considered when selecting students for MSMC schools. Factors in the lottery process may include the total number of available seats, total number of applicants for those seats, choice ranking, sibling link, socioeconomic status of the applicant, gender of the applicant, and, for out-of-consortium students, the percentage of

students on the Free and Reduced-price Meals System (FARMS) at the applicant's home school. No one factor determines whether a student is invited to attend one of the three schools. Some students may receive a school assignment other than their first choice.”

To meet the goal of decreasing socioeconomic isolation at the three schools the lottery may consider the FARMS status of applicants. In addition the FARMS status of the applicant's home school also may be considered to avoid increasing socioeconomic isolation at the sending school.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 8

QUESTION:

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

Respond to the Churchill Cluster's concern regarding the risk of losing AP certification if adequate funds are not available for science materials to perform the labs that the College Board requires for AP status.

ANSWER:

Funds for the necessary materials to teach Advanced Placement (AP) courses will be available to all schools. While course-related fees may not be charged for items such as science laboratory supplies, beginning in school year 2009–2010, the recommended FY 2010 Operating Budget realigns \$1.5 million to support implementation of the new course fee guidelines. The College Board does not certify AP programs, but audits AP courses based on course syllabi provided by individual teachers. The College Board expects laboratory experiences to be a key component of AP science courses. Montgomery County Public Schools is committed to providing a wide variety of classes and programs that engage students in rigorous learning experiences, including AP science courses that prepare them for the challenges of higher education and employment.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 9

QUESTION:

Respond to the Richard Montgomery Cluster testimony regarding the change in average kindergarten class size at focus schools from 15 to 17. If a class size exceeds 17 students will the school receive an additional teacher?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

In the past, teachers were allocated to schools using formulas based on projected enrollment. MCPS maintained an average class size of 15 in the kindergarten class in focus schools and a maximum class size guideline of 25 for non-focus schools. In order to maintain the average class size of 15 for focus schools, classes were allowed to increase to 17. Once all kindergarten classes in a school were at 17, an additional position was allocated. Similarly, in first and second grades the target average class size is 17 for focus schools. Once all classes at the grade level are at 19 students, an additional position is allocated.

For FY 2010, kindergarten will be treated the same as we have treated grades 1 and 2; once all classes are at 19, another position will be allocated. We hold off on the process until all classes reach the identified point, because enrollment fluctuates throughout the year. If we were to allocate as soon as a class goes over the targeted average, and enrollment drops, we would then have to pull back the position from the school soon after. Waiting until all classes are over the target allows for decreases in enrollment without having to pull positions from schools.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 10

QUESTION:

Will the reduction of 8.7 elementary special program teacher positions impact the French Immersion classes at Sligo Creek Elementary School?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

The special program position reduction will result in consistency of allocations at our immersion programs. Immersion programs are staffed first for classroom teachers and then the program is allocated additional staffing above and beyond the classroom teachers. Classroom teachers are allocated for the school so that class size can be maintained. Due to the size of the Sligo Creek immersion program, class sizes for immersion classes are within guidelines and are below the school system average.

In addition to classroom teachers for the program and a .6 reading initiative teacher to support the immersion program in grades 1 and 2, the larger full immersion programs will each be allocated an additional 1.0 teacher to coordinate the program. Sligo Creek currently is allocated 1.5 extra teachers and .5 will be reduced for FY 2010. This reduction will not significantly impact what is provided to students. Class sizes will be maintained at the same level and a 1.0 coordinator will continue to provide support to the program. Currently the .5 additional teacher is used to provide instruction to 4th and 5th grade immersion classes. These classes will already have class sizes well within Board of Education guidelines.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 11

QUESTION:

What are the changes proposed for copier maintenance and what are the anticipated cost savings?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: Various

ANSWER:


A memo from the superintendent regarding the plan for copiers will be distributed to the Board prior to the worksessions on the FY 2010 Operating Budget.

Office of the Superintendent of Schools
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Rockville, Maryland

January 26, 2009

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Board of Education

From: Jerry D. Weast, Superintendent of Schools 

Subject: FY 2010 Cost Savings Plan—School Copiers

This memorandum provides information about reducing operating budget expenditures by implementing a new school copier plan for Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Implementation of this plan will reduce the cost of purchasing and maintaining high-volume school copiers while continuing to provide high-quality copies for teachers and other staff in our schools.

MCPS used a competitive bid process to purchase 294 high-volume school-based copiers in 2004. We are now in the fifth and final year of the maintenance contract for these machines. Staff recently issued a bid for the ongoing maintenance of these copiers. The lowest bid was 0.0034 cents per copy, about twice as much as the current contract. If we awarded this bid, the cost of maintaining these copiers would increase from \$768,000 to \$1,360,000.

Staff has developed a plan to save money on maintenance. An MCPS in-house copier repair team will be created and will take responsibility for servicing all high-volume school copiers. This team will work with staff members at each school through a collaborative approach to repair and maintain copiers. School-based staff will be trained in minor repair and preventative maintenance. Replacement parts will be kept in inventory to improve service response.

Staff also has developed a plan to prolong the life of existing machines and reduce the cost of replacement. If all 294 copiers were replaced this summer with new copiers (similar to the strategy used five years ago), the cost would be \$1,441,012 for each year of the five-year lease agreement (\$7,205,060). The copiers will be replaced over three years with refurbished rather than with new copiers. We anticipate the annual cost savings of this plan will be more than \$1.1 million (more than \$1.5 million FY 2010).

A transition to the new service model will begin in February 2009, and the complete transition to in-house maintenance will be in place by July 1, 2009. A team comprised of representative stakeholders will monitor the program. Key performance metrics will be used to maintain

operational efficiency. There will be continued focus on cost reduction and providing high-quality copies to school-based staff.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Larry A. Bowers, chief operating officer, at 301-279-3626.

JDW:vnb

Copy to:
Executive Staff

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 12

QUESTION:

Provide a chart showing the impact of FY 2010 budget reductions for Title I schools, focus schools, school with high FARMs rates, and schools that have not met AYP.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

Attached is a chart showing the impact of FY 2010 budget reductions for Title I schools, focus schools, and schools with high FARMs rates, and information about schools that have not met AYP.

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
Kindergarten Teachers	17 FTEs	✓									Not all focus schools will be impacted. Impact depends on enrollment.
Elementary SDTs and RSs	5.5 FTEs each = 11 FTEs			✓							The smallest schools will have a reduction of a .5 Staff Development Teacher and a .5 Reading Specialist.
Academic Intervention Teachers	33.8 FTEs			✓			✓			✓	These allocations change each year so schools don't expect the same allocation from year to year. To minimize the adverse effect of the reduction of these positions the remaining 110.9 academic intervention teachers positions will provide direct support to students at assigned schools.
MSMC Coordinators	3.0 FTE						✓				Argyle, Loiederman, and Parkland Note: As with other consortium schools each school will be allowed a resource teacher program coordinator. This is a teaching position.
MSMC Teacher	6.0						✓				Argyle, Loiederman, and Parkland

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
Composition Assistants	6.5								✓		Enrollment increases and decreases also change the allocation. As a result increases in enrollment may offset the reduction so that a school has no net loss. Schools will lose an average of 2 hours (.25) each.
Teacher Assistant	9.0					✓			✓		Enrollment increases and decreases also change the allocation. As a result increases in enrollment may offset the reduction so that a school has no net loss. Schools will lose an average of 1.1 hours (.14) each
Media Services Technician	1.0									✓	Blake As part of the creation of the Northeast Consortium Blake was allocated a second MST.
IT Systems Specialists	1.0									✓	Paint Branch As part of the creation of the Northeast Consortium Paint Branch was allocated a second ITSS.

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
Signature Coordinators	2.6									✓	13 schools with signature programs will each receive a .4 rather than a .6 for signature coordination.
Middle Schools Counselors	3.0						✓				From year to year allocations change depending on projected enrollment. Reductions in FY 2010 may be a result of enrollment changes and may not be a result of the changes in the budget. Similarly, there may be increases in counselor allocation due to enrollment increases that offset the reduction from the budget.
High School Media Specialist	4.0									✓	Gaithersburg, Magruder and Northwest will not be allocated a 2 nd media specialist Note: Although the cut is 4.0 only 3 schools will lose a position. This is a result of changes in enrollment.

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
Elementary Media Assistant	6.0			✓							Schools with projected enrollment between 450 and 480. These are the schools that either had or were expecting a 1.0 allocation and will no longer receive the 1.0
High School Media Assistant	3.0									✓	6 schools – 4 largest and 2 others where ratios do not fit the formula
School Improvement and PLCI Funds			✓			✓			✓		All schools.
Graduation	\$124,000								✓		All schools other than Damascus.
Elementary Special Program Teachers	8.7 FTEs			✓							Schools with special programs including immersion, PYIB, and mini magnets. The reduction is a continuation of the effort to provide consistency in allocations to similar programs.

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
Alternative Teachers	16.0 FTE						✓			✓	Allocations will be based on enrollment and other factors that impact support needed at the school. Schools with greater needs will not have reductions in staffing.
Secondary Special Program Teachers	2.2 FTE									✓	The middle schools reduction will impact Takoma Park (.2), Eastern (.2), Clemente (.2), SSI (.4), and Westland (.2). A 1.0 FTE reduction will take place in high schools.
High School Literacy Coach	15.0								✓		All schools will have a reduction of their literacy coach allocation. The allocations are different at each school. All schools will continue to be allocated 1.0 FTE to provide professional development support.

Position/ Item	Reduction	Elementary			Middle			High			Notes
		T1/ Focus	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	Red Zone	All	Various	
ESOL Teachers											This reduction will not impact any schools. It is a technical correction.
Middle School Teacher Support	11.0						✓				11 Middle School Reform Schools.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 13

QUESTION:

Provide a list of elementary schools that do not have assistant principals.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: 1-3

ANSWER:

The following 20 elementary schools do not have an assistant principal:

Bannockburn
Belmont
Bradley Hills
Candlewood
Carderock Springs
Cashell
Damascus
Darnestown
Germantown
Luxmanor
Monocacy
North Chevy Chase
William T. Page
Poolesville
Ritchie Park
Seven Locks
Somerset
Westbrook
Westover
Woodfield

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 14

QUESTION:

What is the policy and cost related to transportation of out-of-area students to Middle School Magnet Consortium schools?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

Due to budget constraints, transportation for MSMC students who reside in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Walter Johnson, and Rockville high school clusters is being phased out and will cease to exist at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. Currently, three buses are providing limited service from these three eligible clusters. The phase out is as follows:

- During the 2008-2009 school year, Grade 7 and 8 students living in these clusters are eligible for transportation. Transportation for Grade 6 students, including siblings of Grade 7 and 8 students, will no longer officially be provided. Grade 6 students will have an opportunity to ride existing bus routes on a space-available basis. If space is not available on those buses, parents/guardians will be responsible for transportation.
- During the 2009-2010 school year, Grade 8 students living in these clusters will be eligible for transportation. Transportation for Grade 6 and 7 students, including siblings of Grade 8 students, will no longer officially be provided. Grade 6 and 7 students will have an opportunity to ride existing bus routes on a space-available basis. If space is not available on those buses, parents/guardians will be responsible for transportation.
- Beyond the 2009-2010 school year, bus service will no longer be available. Parents/guardians will be responsible for transportation.

Parents of accepted students who reside in all other areas of Montgomery County must provide their own transportation to MSMC schools.

Providing transportation for a county-wide middle school magnet program would require approximately 22 bus routes. The estimated cost per bus route would be \$17,163 and would cover salaries, substitutes, benefits, fuel, parts and repairs. For 22 bus routes this would total \$377,586. Additional buses would need to be purchased at a cost of \$17,833 per bus. The annual lease amount for 22 buses this would total \$392,326. The total annual cost of providing transportation is \$769,912.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 15

QUESTION:

Is there a proposal to eliminate the CAPP program? What will replace the program and will the same quality services be provided at the same student to staff ratio? Where will it be located?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

There is no proposal to eliminate the Collaborative Autism Preschool Program (CAPP). In FY 2010, MCPS is expanding the number of Pre-K Autism classes by six, creating 36 new spaces to serve students who require these services. By doing so, it will create viable public options and reduce the need for Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams to recommend placements into nonpublic programs. MCPS, through the IEP team process, only considers placing students into Montgomery Primary Achievement Center (MPAC), a nonpublic special education preschool, if all public options have first been considered and ruled out.

The MCPS Pre-K Autism classes provide a quality instructional program, using highly structured research-based instructional methods. Most students who have gone through this program not only successfully articulate to school-based special education programs for kindergarten but also require less 1:1 assistance. The six new classes will be located in the Emory Grove facility, Roscoe Nix Elementary School, and Rosemont Elementary School, and will maintain the current student to staff ratio.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 16

QUESTION:

What is the total special education enrollment projection for FY 2010? Why is there a projected increase 600 special education students and how was this projection determined?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

The special education enrollment forecast for FY 2010 is 9,107. This is a decrease of 199 students from the FY 2009 forecast of 9,306. These forecasts represent students with more than 15 hours of service per week.

The official FY 2009 enrollment for special education students was 8,534 on September 30, 2008. Based on prior year trends in special education enrollment, which showed enrollment close to 8,900 in 2006 and 2007, it is believed that this official count was understated and that some students who should have been included in this count were included in the general education enrollment.

The low number of special education students reported on September 30, 2008, is related to a changeover in the process for enrolling special education students in a new database, called ENCORE. Efforts have been underway since September to correct enrollment reporting and ensure accuracy. In the future it is anticipated that there will be more unified enrollment reporting. This will improve the process of enrolling all students and accurately reporting the numbers.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 17

QUESTION:

There is a possibility of a cut in state aid for nonpublic placements. What is the number of students receiving nonpublic placements? What is the amount budgeted for FY 2010? What would be the impact of a reduction in funding from the present 80 percent to 50 percent?

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: iii – 1

ANSWER:

As of December 31, 2008, MCPS is responsible for the costs of 636 students receiving special education services in nonpublic schools. The amount budgeted for FY 2010 is \$39.1 million. The state of Maryland reimburses local education agencies for nonpublic placement for 80 percent of expenditures that exceed 300 percent of the per student cost of all students in the school system. If the state reimbursement funding formula remains at 80 percent for FY 2010, state reimbursement is estimated to be \$12,919,705. If the state reimbursement funding formula is reduced to 50 percent, estimated reimbursement would be \$8,074,816, a decrease of \$4,844,889.

FY 2010 QUESTION NUMBER: 18

QUESTION:

What middle schools have an 8 period day where teachers teach 6 periods? Provide MSA data for these schools and all other middle schools.

BUDGET PAGE REFERENCE: N/A

ANSWER:

Below is a chart that provides AYP data for middle schools with 8 periods and for all other middle schools.

FY 2009 AYP Status of Middle Schools with 8 Period Schedules

FY 2009 Periods			
Middle Schools	Periods	Periods Taught	AYP Status
Argyle	8	5	Not in School Improvement
John T. Baker	8	6	Not in School Improvement
Eastern	8	6	Not in School Improvement
Forest Oak	8	6	Year 2
Francis Scott Key	8	6	Local Attention
A. Mario Loiederman	8	5	Not in School Improvement
Newport Mill	8	6	Year 1
Parkland	8	5	Corrective Action
Silver Spring International	8	5	Corrective Action
Takoma Park	8	6	Not in School Improvement

FY 2009 AYP Status of All Middle Schools

Middle Schools	FY 2009 AYP Status
Argyle	Not in School Improvement
John T. Baker	Not in School Improvement
Benjamin Banneker	Year 1- Met AYP 2008
Briggs Chaney	Year 1- Met AYP 2008
Cabin John	Not in School Improvement
Roberto Clemente	Not in School Improvement
Eastern	Not in School Improvement
William H. Farquhar	Not in School Improvement
Forest Oak	Year 2
Gaithersburg	Year 1- Met AYP 2008
Robert Frost	Not in School Improvement
Herbert Hoover	Not in School Improvement
Francis Scott Key	Local Attention
Martin Luther King	Not in School Improvement
Kingsview	Not in School Improvement
Lakelands Park	Year 1- Met AYP 2008
Col E. Brooke Lee	Not in School Improvement
Loiederman	Not in School Improvement
Montgomery Village	Not in School Improvement
Neelsville	Year 2
Newport Mill	Year 1- Met AYP 2008
North Bethesda	Not in School Improvement
Parkland	Corrective Action
Rosa M. Parks	Not in School Improvement
John Poole	Not in School Improvement
Pyle	Not in School Improvement
Redland	Not in School Improvement
Ridgeview	Not in School Improvement

Middle Schools	FY 2009 AYP Status
Rocky Hill	Local Attention
Shady Grove	Not in School Improvement
Silver Spring International	Corrective Action
Sligo	Not in School Improvement
Takoma Park	Not in School Improvement
Tilden	Not in School Improvement
Julius West	Not in School Improvement
Westland	Not in School Improvement
White Oak	Not in School Improvement
Earle B. Wood	Not in School Improvement