

APPROVED
31-1993

Rockville, Maryland
June 15, 1993

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Tuesday, June 15, 1993, at 8 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Dr. Alan Cheung, President
in the Chair

Mrs. Frances Brenneman

Mr. Blair G. Ewing

Mrs. Carol Fanconi

Mrs. Beatrice Gordon

Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez

Absent: Mr. Stephen Abrams
Mr. Jonathan Sims

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
Mrs. Katheryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy
Ms. Carrie Baker, Board Member-elect

#indicates student vote does not count. Four votes are needed for adoption.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Cheung announced that the Board had been meeting in closed session on negotiations and to consult with legal counsel. Mr. Abrams had asked to be excused because of his work responsibilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 460-93 Re: BOARD AGENDA - JUNE 15, 1993

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its agenda for June 15, 1993.

RESOLUTION NO. 461-93 Re: ANNUAL GROWTH POLICY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education take a position that the proposal by the Council staff to modify the annual growth policy to provide for payments by developers based on fiscal year costs by classroom was, so far as the Board could tell, not accompanied by workable procedures; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board support the Planning Staff and the following Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission comments as follows:

1. Core facilities have a significant impact on the school environment, but are excluded from the developer's responsibility under this proposal.
2. Construction of single classrooms here and there may meet short-term needs but circumvent long-term comprehensive planning goals.
3. A unified planning approach by the Board of Education could be eroded by piecemeal actions of other agencies.

and be it further

Resolved, That further study should be undertaken by the interagency staff working group to try to develop better solutions that more appropriately address this issue.

Re: SCHOOL PROGRAMS RELATED TO
ENROLLMENT SIZE

Board members heard from principals and former principals regarding their views on the preferred size of Montgomery County high schools. The staff's recommendation was for a senior high school with 250 to 450 students per grade or a range of 1,000 to 1,800 students. Staff explained that a review of the research revealed no exact number for high schools. The size of the school depended on program and the composition of the student body. Concern was expressed about students being lost in a large school without having a school-within-a-school organizational pattern or interdisciplinary teams. Staff discussed the problems with small schools' being unable to offer multiple sections of honors courses and the difficulty in creating a schedule for students. Mrs. Gemberling pointed out that the staff had been talking about the curricular program, but school size had an impact on the extracurricular program because small schools could not field teams and in large schools students did not have as much of an opportunity to participate.

Mrs. Fanconi said she had heard principals say the MCPS was still staffing schools for the 1970's when they were now dealing with a totally different population. She requested some statistics on ESOL students and honors classes. She was also concerned that if the Board set 1,000 to 1,800 as the standard that the community would try to hold the Board to this range. It seemed to her that in the near future they would have several high schools at the 2,000 student range, and if economics forced the Board into having schools of this size, the policy should reflect this. It was her view that the 1,800 figure was too low.

Ms. Gutierrez felt that it was frustrating to spend only half an hour on this very important issue. She said that the school system should not be making decisions on the consensus of a group of principals. It was incumbent upon the Board to look at this issue from a scientific approach using survey data and research. For example, what effect did the size of a school have on the number of suspensions? What was happening with their magnet school-within a school? What was the impact of ESOL on the program of a school? She commented that they had identified serious issues, and it was incumbent upon the Board to have a major discussion of these concerns. If they were still allocating resources on a faulty basis, it would behoove them to do the analysis and allocate resources to reflect the needs of each student body. She requested information on course offerings and which courses students were taking. She pointed out that students were accepted at colleges because of their high school courses including AP courses, and if they did not have equity in their high schools this would impact the acceptance of students in college. She suggested that the Board have a rigorous study on the impact of school size and school program on student performance.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was not worried about school size per se but the terms in which they were expressed. They were described as "enrollment standards" and should be "enrollment preferences" or "enrollment objectives." In any event, he said the important issue was how they wanted to organize and staff schools to deliver programs for the future. They had been building elegant buildings to do what schools did 60 years ago, and the structure of the high school had not really changed in that time. He was not being critical because MCPS had been successful, but he thought that they had not given consideration to change in secondary education. He believed that current school staffing was out of line with the kind of challenges MCPS was facing and that they needed a larger and different set of adults in charge of managing schools. He was not suggesting that they abandon the school size section of the policy, but that at some point they address these major issues in a systematic way.

Mrs. Brenneman understood that the anecdotal information from the principals was based on some research, but she agreed with Mr. Ewing that school size should be a goal rather than a standard in the policy. She suggested that the Board receive some background information on the advantages and disadvantages of schools of various sizes.

Mrs. Gordon recalled that the Board had asked for a discussion with a group of principals providing their best judgment on school size, and she appreciated the information. She noted that they were building elementary schools much larger than the standards in the proposed policy, but it was not the Board's choice. The Board should be looking for a range that it believed

it could provide for, and not just what the County Council funded. She pointed out that in the year 2000 they would have high schools beyond the 1,800 student limit, and they needed to listen to principals about providing programs regardless of school size and looking at alternatives when they had large schools. Montgomery County would continue to have a range with some schools outside of both ends. She agreed that they needed to have a discussion about the instructional program, but not as part of the facilities policy.

Dr. Cheung observed that they were talking about a range and through different staffing and organization they would be able to operate within the range. If they went beyond that or under that, they would need to find more creative ways to deal with the size issue. The size should not be the main driver; it should be the staffing and organization in terms of the programs and providing a comprehensive program. He felt that this evening's discussion was very useful.

Mrs. Fanconi suggested that they needed an evaluation of elementary school to see if the size they were building now was the best and what the impact had been on children. They needed this information as soon as possible, but she did not think this future discussion should hold up the facilities policy. She thought that this might be a topic for a meeting this summer so that when the policy came back to the Board in the fall the Board could define those sizes to drive the capital budget.

Re: POLICY ON LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL
FACILITIES PLANNING

Mrs. Fanconi moved and Mrs. Brenneman seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has had a policy to guide Long-range Educational Facilities Planning (LREFP) since the early 1970's and last amended its policy in October, 1987; and

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1992, the Board of Education discussed an analysis of the LREFP policy and an analysis of the policy on Quality Integrated Education (QIE) because of the impact of the QIE policy on the LREFP policy; and

WHEREAS, On July 7, 1992, the Board of Education held a worksession on the issues presented in the two analyses of the two policies; and

WHEREAS, On September 9, 1992, the Board of Education adopted a timeline for discussion/action on the LREFP policy and QIE policy; and

WHEREAS, On May 17, 1993, the Board of Education adopted the amended QIE policy; and

WHEREAS, At worksessions on May 26 and June 3, 1993, the Board of Education discussed substantive and editorial issues of the LREFP analysis; and

WHEREAS, On June 15, 1993, the Board of Education discussed standards related to educational facilities and reviewed a draft policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education tentatively adopt the draft policy on LREFP; and be it further

Resolved, That the tentative adopted draft policy be sent out for public comment and discussed at a public hearing on September 9, 1993, with final adoption scheduled for September 27, 1993.

Related Entries: ACD, JEE, JEE-RA

Responsible Office: Department of Educational Facilities Planning
and Capital Programming

Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning

A. Purpose

1. The Board of Education has a primary responsibility to provide school facilities that address changing enrollment patterns and that sustain high quality educational programs in a way that meets its policies. The Board of Education fulfills this responsibility through the facilities planning process.
2. The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning (LREFP) policy provides direction on how the planning process should be conducted and prescribes criteria and standards to guide planning. This process is designed to promote public understanding of planning for Montgomery County Public Schools and to encourage community members, local government agencies and municipalities to identify and communicate their priorities and concerns to the superintendent and Board.
3. **The Board recognizes the interrelationship of its facilities planning policy with other policies such as those on educational programs, quality integrated education, and capital modernization/renovation projects.**
4. **The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning policy also describes the ways in which facilities planning for school sites and school service areas considers the Quality Integrated Education policy.**

B. Issue

Enrollment in MCPS is never static. The fundamental goal of facilities planning is to provide a sound educational environment for a changing enrollment. The number of students, their geographic distribution, and the demographic characteristics of this population all concern facilities planning. Enrollment changes are driven by factors including birth rates, movement within the school system and into the school system from other parts of the United States and from other parts of the world.

Enrollment changes in MCPS do not occur at a uniform rate throughout the county. The MCPS system is among the twenty largest in the country in terms of enrollment and serves a large county of approximately 500 square miles. The full range of population density, from rural to urban, is present in the county. Where new communities are forming, enrollment has been growing faster than in established areas of the county. In areas with affordable housing, there is often greater diversity in enrollment caused by immigration from outside the country.

MCPS is challenged continually to anticipate and provide facilities in an efficient and fiscally responsible way to meet the varied educational needs of students. The Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning policy describes how the school system responds to educational and enrollment change, the rate of change, its geographic distribution and the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic diversification of enrollment.

School facilities also change. Simple aging of the physical plant requires a program of maintenance, renovation, and modernization. Acquiring new sites, designing new facilities, and modifying existing ones so that they keep current with program needs is essential. This policy coordinates planning for these capital improvements.

C. Position

The following procedures, criteria, and standards apply to the facilities planning process.

1. Capital Improvements Program (CIP) - The Capital Improvements Program schedules needed changes to the MCPS physical inventory for the coming six fiscal years.
 - a) After review of the superintendent's recommendations for a capital budget and six-year CIP, the Board will adopt a capital budget and a

six-year CIP and submit them to the county executive for review and recommendations to the County Council for inclusion in the county CIP and for funding of upcoming fiscal year projects. **The superintendent will notify PTA/PTSAs, municipalities, civic groups, student government associations, and other interested groups of its publication and will send copies of the proposed CIP for review and comment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee on Public School Construction, county government, municipalities, MCCPTA, Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils (MCR), and Montgomery County Junior Council (MCJC).** The six-year CIP will include:

- (1) Background information on the enrollment forecasting methodology
- (2) Current enrollment figures and **demographic profiles of all schools including racial/ethnic composition, Free and Reduced Meals program participation, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) enrollment, and school mobility rate**
- (3) Enrollment forecasts for the next six years by year, and longer term cluster forecasts for a period approximately ten and fifteen years into the future
- (4) A profile of all school facilities showing physical and program characteristics, such as Head Start, kindergarten and pre-kindergarten, ESOL, and special education centers
- (5) A summary of any capital requests by the Board of Education that would change the facility, as well as Board actions affecting programs at the facility or the service area of the facility (When necessary, supplements to the CIP may be published to provide more information on issues.)
- (6) Montgomery County Project Description Forms for all requested capital projects (A project description form describes the needs for a particular facility or for several

facilities with similar requirements and contains the project budget.)

- b) The county executive and County Council are required to adopt a six-year capital improvements program (CIP) which includes MCPS projects, reporting construction schedules, and anticipated costs. This document includes:
- (1) A statement of the objectives of MCPS capital programs and the relationship of these programs to the long-range development plans adopted by the county
 - (2) Recommended capital projects and a proposed construction schedule for schools and other educational facilities
 - (3) An estimate of cost and a statement of all funding sources
 - (4) All anticipated capital projects and programs of the Board including substantial improvements and extensions of projects previously authorized

2. Master Plan

- a) About June 15 of each year the superintendent will publish a summary of all Board-adopted capital and non-capital facilities plans. This document, called the Master Plan for Educational Facilities, is required under the rules and regulations of the State Public School Construction Program.
- (1) This comprehensive plan will incorporate the impact of all capital projects approved for funding by the County Council and any non-capital facilities plans approved by the Board of Education.
 - (2) The Master Plan for Educational Facilities will show projected enrollment and utilization for facilities for the next six years and for a period approximately 10 and 15 years in the future. This information will reflect projections made the previous fall as updated in spring, and any changes in enrollment or capacity projected to result from capital projects, boundary adjustments or other changes authorized by the Board prior to the date of the plan's publication.

(3) The plan will include demographic profiles of school enrollments and physical and program profiles of school facilities.

b) Schools that fail to meet one or more of the facility standards for enrollment and utilization based on projections will be identified in the Master Plan. The Master Plan for Educational Facilities serves as the review and reporting mechanism required by this policy.

3. Enrollment Forecasts

a) Each fall enrollment forecasts for all schools will be developed for a six-year period. In addition, longer term forecasts for a period of approximately ten and fifteen years in the future also will be developed. These forecasts will be the basis for evaluating facility space and initiating planning activities. The forecasts should be developed in coordination with the Montgomery County Planning Department's county population forecast and any other relevant planning sources.

b) Each spring a revision to the enrollment forecast for the next school year will be developed to refine the forecast for all schools and to reflect any change in service areas or programs.

4. Capacity Calculations

a) The capacity of a facility is determined by matching educational programs to space. Program capacity is calculated as the product of the number of teaching stations at a school according to the following ratios:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Capacity Ratings Per Room</u>
Head Start & Pre-K	36:1 (2 sessions per day)
Grade K 1/2 day	44:1 (2 sessions per day)
Grade K all day	22:1
Grades 1-6	25:1
Grades 6-12	25:1*
Special Ed. Intensity 4	13:1
Special Ed. Intensity 5	10:1
ESOL/SPARC/BASIC	15:1

* Program capacity differs at the secondary level in that the regular calculated capacity

of 25:1 is adjusted by .9 to reflect the optimal utilization of a secondary facility.

Some special programs require classroom ratios different from those listed.

Maximum class size for preschool and special education programs is mandated by state and federal regulations.

- b) Elementary, middle, and high schools should operate in an efficient utilization range of **80 to 100 percent of program capacity**. If a school is projected to be underutilized (less than 80%) or overutilized (over 100%), facilities planning to address these utilization levels may be undertaken. In the case of overutilization, an effort to judge the long-term needs for permanent space should be made prior to planning for new construction. Temporary measures such as the use of relocatable classrooms may be appropriate. Underutilization of facilities also should be evaluated in the context of short-term and long-term enrollment forecasts.

5. Enrollment Standards

- a) **Enrollment includes all students, except those receiving individualized instruction in self-contained classroom settings.**
- b) **Standard range of enrollment for schools, provided they have program capacity, is:**
 - (1) **Two to four classes per grade of students in an elementary school**
 - (2) **Two to three teams per grade in middle schools with team size averaging between 100 to 125 students**
 - (3) **250 to 450 students per grade in high schools**
 - (4) **Enrollment as set forth in applicable education policies for the K-12 program**
- c) **The standard range of enrollment will be considered when planning new schools or changes to existing facilities.**

6. School Site Size

Standard size requirements for school sites are:

- a) 12 useable acres for elementary schools
- b) 20 useable acres for middle schools
- c) 30 useable acres for high schools

Sites of these approximate sizes accommodate the instructional program including related outdoor activities. In some circumstances it may be necessary to use smaller or larger sites. In these circumstances special efforts to accommodate outdoor activities are necessary such as use of adjacent or nearby park properties or shared use of school fields. It may be necessary to acquire more than the standard acreage in order to accommodate environmental concerns, unusual topography, or surrounding street patterns.

7. Community Representation

Members of the community have several opportunities for direct input into the facilities decision-making process including: actual participation as **voting or non-voting members** of advisory committees, submission of letters, alternatives, or other written material for consideration by the superintendent and staff; and testimony in written or oral form before the Board of Education. **In addition, the views of the members of the community are solicited through the Montgomery County Council of PTAs which is the largest group representing school communities affected by facility planning activities, cluster coordinators, local PTAs, student advocacy groups, and other organizations.**

- a) PTA or other parent and **student representatives** along with appropriate MCPS facility and program staff should be involved in the facility planning process for **site selection, school boundary studies, school closings and consolidations, and aspects of facility design (including modernization planning, new school planning, and architect selection).**
- b) In addition to parent and **student representation**, MCPS employees, municipalities, local government agencies, civic and homeowner associations, and countywide organizations contribute to the facilities planning process. A civic or homeowner association must be registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Countywide organizations are those with members

throughout the county, including organizations such as the League of Women Voters, Allied Civic Group, Montgomery County Civic Federation, etc.

- c) The Board will conduct public hearings for **potentially affected** school communities prior to any action affecting attendance areas and the closure or consolidation of schools.
- (1) Public hearings will be conducted following publication of the superintendent's recommended budget and six-year capital improvements program in November.
 - (2) Public hearings also will be held in March for any capital budget recommendations deferred from the fall.
 - (3) Written comments from interested parties will be accepted until 24 hours before action by the Board.

D. Desired Outcomes

This policy is intended to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Provide the facilities and future school sites necessary to sustain high quality educational programs at reasonable cost, including non-traditional facilities where these meet the needs of students
2. Utilize schools in ways that are consistent with sound educational practice. Consider the impact of facility changes on educational program and related operating budget requirements and on the community
3. Provide opportunities for all students in accordance with the Board policy on Quality Integrated Education
4. Provide space to accommodate students, including those with special needs, such as special education and ESOL students, with regard to where they live
5. Provide a schedule to maintain and modernize older school buildings in order to continue their use on a cost-effective basis, and to keep facilities current with educational program needs
6. Provide a capital program and master plan that consider long-term enrollment trends, educational program needs, and capacity available over a broad region in determining:

- a) where and when new schools and additions will be constructed
 - b) where and when school closures and consolidations are appropriate
7. **Provide a meaningful role for the community in facilities planning**
8. **Provide as much stability in school assignments as possible**
- a) Provide high schools for Grades 9-12 and, where possible, create clusters composed of one high school, and a sufficient number of elementary and middle schools each of which send all students including special education and ESOL students, to the next higher level school in the cluster.
 - b) **Efficient utilization of resources and facilities may require shared use of facilities by more than one cluster**

E. Implementation Strategies

1. Evaluating Utilization of Facilities
- a) In the fall of every year after new enrollment forecasts are developed, utilization of all school facilities will be evaluated. The effect of any proposed educational program changes or grade level reorganizations also will be evaluated. For schools that are projected to have insufficient capacity, excess capacity or other facility issues in the future, the superintendent will recommend:
 - (1) A capital project in the six-year CIP
 - (2) A solution such as boundary change, school pairing, **facility sharing**, closing/consolidation, or other similar solution which does not necessarily involve a capital project
 - (3) No action or deferral pending further study of enrollment or other factors
 - b) Facility recommendations made by the superintendent will incorporate consideration of educational program impacts. **As part of the process of developing facility plans, facilities planning staff will work closely with appropriate program staff to identify program requirements for facility plans.**

- c) Recommendations that relate to school boundary changes will be made after the superintendent requests advice from a school boundary advisory committee.
- d) The superintendent also may request advice for other types of facility recommendations, such as school closures and consolidations, grade level reorganizations, pairings and program moves.

2. Guidelines For Development of Facilities Recommendations

In cases where enrollment change requires the opening of additional facilities, or any other change in student assignments, a number of factors are to be taken into consideration by the Board of Education, the superintendent, and any advisory committee.

- a) Area of Focus: Facility
 - (1) Facilities proposals should result in school utilizations in the 80% to 100% efficient range whenever possible.
 - (2) Proposals should be fiscally responsible and consider ways to minimize capital and operating costs whenever feasible. **The geographic scope of facility studies should be broad enough to realize economies in costs and comprehensive long-range solutions to facility issues while preserving as much stability in school assignments as possible.**
 - (3) **Shared use of a facility by more than one cluster may be the most feasible facility solution in some cases. In these cases, not less than 25% of the shared school's enrollment should come from each cluster.**
- b) Area of Focus: Population
 - (1) **Although schools are housed in permanent or temporary facilities, a school consists of students assigned from a geographic attendance area. New school openings and boundary adjustments demand that consideration be given to the impact of various proposals on the affected school populations.**
 - (2) **Where reasonable, school service area boundaries should be established to promote creation of a diverse student body in each of the affected schools considering the county's**

different racial/ethnic groups in accordance with the Quality Integrated Education Policy, the socioeconomic background of students as measured by Free and Reduced Meals Programs (FARMS), census information, and other reliable indicators, the inclusion of special education programs and students, and the mix of single family and multiple family dwellings within each service area. Data showing the impact of proposals on each of these factors shall be developed.

- (3) Where reasonable, school service area boundaries should be established or modified to bring school mobility rates among the affected schools towards the countywide average.

c) Area of Focus: Geography

- (1) In most cases, the geographic scope of elementary school boundary studies should be limited to the high school cluster area. For secondary schools, one or more clusters of schools may be studied. **Recognizing that at times changes must occur to facilities and boundaries, plans that are developed for change should result in as long a period as possible of stable assignment patterns.**
- (2) Consistent with the school system policy on Site-Based Participatory Management, with its emphasis on community involvement in schools, boundary proposals should result in service areas that are, as much as practical, made up of contiguous communities surrounding the school. Walking access to the school should be maximized and transportation distances minimized when other priorities do not require otherwise.
- (3) Recommendations for student reassignments should consider prior boundary changes and/or school closings and consolidations which may have affected the same communities.

3. Calendar

The long-range facilities planning process will be conducted according to the following calendar.

Superintendent publishes a summary of all actions to date affecting schools (Comprehensive Master Plan) and identifies future needs	June 15
Cluster PTA representatives submit comments and proposals about issues affecting their schools to superintendent	July 15
Staff presentation of enrollment trends and September 30 planning issues for Board of Education information	September 30
Superintendent publishes and sends to the county executive Capital Budget and Six-Year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) with recommendations for capital projects, and any boundary changes, reorganizations or other facility plans as appropriate for changing enrollments, programs, and policies.	November 1
Board of Education worksession on CIP recommendations. Alternatives to recommendations may be requested by Board of Education at this time.	early November
Public hearings on recommendations and any Board adopted alternatives.	mid-November
Board of Education action on CIP and any related facility planning recommendations.	end of November
County Executive and Montgomery County Planning Board receive Board of Education requested CIP for review.	December 1
County Executive-recommended CIP transmitted to County Council	January 15
Planning Board review of County Executive's recommended CIP	February 1
County Council public hearings on CIP	Feb - Mar
County Council review of Board of Education requested and County Executive recommended CIPs	Mar - Apr
Deferred facility planning issues published with superintendent's recommended amendment(s) to CIP for Board of Education review	February 15
Board holds worksession, requests any alternatives	March 1 Board holds public hearings March 15

Board action on deferred recommendations	March 30
County Council approves CIP	June 1
School principals, cluster coordinators, and PTA representatives meet with facilities planning and other appropriate staff and exchange information about facilities issues requiring consideration in upcoming CIP's.	Late May

In the event the Board of Education determines that an unusual circumstance exists, the superintendent will establish a different and/or condensed time schedule for making recommendations to the Board, for scheduling public hearings on recommendations for alternatives not previously subject to public hearing and for Board action.

4. Community Involvement Process

School and community involvement in MCPS facilities plans is important to the success of the plans. Parents, staff, and students are primary constituents of facilities planning. The county network of Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs), organized in each high school area by cluster coordinators, is the focus for involvement of the school communities. Coordination with municipalities and local government agencies also is appropriate. Information from other community organizations and individuals also is important.

The following sections describe the community involvement process in **site selection, boundary changes, and in planning and design of new and modernized facilities**. These sections refer to formation and operation of advisory groups. In addition to these activities all community members have opportunities to advise the superintendent and Board annually through cluster reports, written correspondence, and public testimony.

a) Site Selection

- (1) MCPS staff will work with the Montgomery County Planning Board during the development of master plans to identify future school site requirements based on proposed residential development. General or floating locations of sites are identified on master plan maps. As subdivision occurs, site dedications may be requested.
- (2) Specific site selection begins when MCPS projections indicate a new facility is

required. The facility in most cases will be programmed in the six year CIP before a site selection committee is formed.

- (3) Site selection committees will be composed of MCPS staff, PTA representatives, and appropriate municipal and county government agency officials. In cases of secondary school sites, representatives of more than one cluster may be involved in the committee.
 - (a) The MCPS site administrator and planning staff work with the committee reviewing alternative site options from the MCPS inventory, and in some cases study potential purchase of properties.
 - (b) The committee considers the geographic location, its relation to future student populations, the appropriateness of potential sites and makes a recommendation to the superintendent.
- (3) The superintendent evaluates this recommendation and then makes his/her recommendation to the Board.
- (4) The Board considers the committee and staff recommendation before officially adopting a site.

b) Facility Design

- (1) Parent and student representatives will serve with MCPS staff on planning advisory committees to modify, modernize, or construct new facilities.
 - (a) Parent representatives will be identified by cluster coordinators in coordination with school principals.
 - (b) Student representatives at the secondary level will be identified by the principal or chair of the committee.
 - (c) A representative of homeowner, civic association, or other neighborhood groups also may serve on the advisory committee.
- (2) Activities incorporating community viewpoints include development of educational

specifications for schools, architect selection and review of architectural plans.

- (a) Architectural plans should be available for review by homeowner and civic associations adjacent to the school site.
- (b) Whenever possible, concerns of these groups should be addressed at the design stage before architectural plans are finalized.

c) School Boundary Changes

- (1) In most cases where enrollment and program indicate possible changes in school service areas, an advisory committee will be formed. MCPS facilities planning staff and program staff will organize and work with this group in a support role.
 - (a) **The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) will identify parent representation from areas potentially affected by boundary changes.**
 - (b) **At the secondary level, the school principal will identify interested students to serve on the committee.**
 - (c) **The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) also will identify any additional representatives from organized parent or student organizations who have knowledge of the schools involved.**
- (2) **At the outset of meetings, the committee will provide guidelines, criteria, or priorities based on the factors outlined in the section of this policy titled "Guidelines For Development of Facilities Recommendations" (Section E.2) to planning staff for consideration in developing options. Staff will then develop and present viable options for the advisory committee to consider. An iterative process of modification to options may follow, directed by the members of the advisory committee. MCPS planning staff also may provide data needed to develop entirely new options if the committee determines it wishes to develop its own options. The superintendent and Board of Education also**

will consider Section E.2 in their review of boundary proposals.

- (3) Official membership on school boundary advisory committees will consist of individuals who are familiar with the affected school communities identified by cluster coordinators at the outset of the process.
- (4) Advisory committees may call on other community resources such as civic and homeowner associations.
- (5) Membership on advisory committees should reflect the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the area as much as possible.
- (6) MCPS staff will notify civic and homeowner associations in the affected communities of proposed boundary changes being undertaken in an area. Cluster coordinators and PTAs may also assist in notification of planning activities through their membership communication mechanism.
- (7) An advisory committee report including recommendations or other forms of information from advisory committees will be forwarded to the superintendent.
- (8) The superintendent will develop recommendations after considering staff advice, the advisory committee report, if any, and input from other organizations and individuals who have provided comments and submit them about November 1 with the CIP.
- (9) Copies of the recommendations are distributed to the affected communities.
- (10) The Board of Education will hold a worksession and may request by majority vote that alternatives to the superintendent's recommendations be developed for official review.
- (11) Recommendations from the superintendent and Board-adopted alternatives will be the subject of public hearings prior to final Board action.

d) Cluster Reports

- (1) By July 15, cluster representatives should state in writing to the superintendent any proposals, priorities, or concerns that the cluster has identified for its schools.
- (2) The cluster may amend its views by September 15 in cases where fall enrollments or other events may change cluster comments.
- (3) Cluster reports are to be considered in facilities recommendations made by the superintendent in the subsequent capital improvements program (published November 1).

e) Public Hearing Process

- (1) Public hearings usually scheduled for mid-November are open to the **potentially affected** public and are held annually following publication of the superintendent's recommended CIP. This document incorporates any boundary changes and school closure/consolidations that may also be recommended.
 - (a) The PTA cluster coordinator will coordinate testimony at the hearing on behalf of cluster schools.
 - (b) Civic groups, municipalities and countywide organizations should contact the Board of Education office to schedule testimony.
 - (c) **Limited public comments from individuals not represented by school or civic groups will be heard by the Board of Education at the end of public hearings. Individuals should contact the Board Office to schedule testimony.**
- (2) Written comments from any individuals or organizations will be accepted until 5 p.m. on the work day preceding final Board action.
- (3) **Written statements, submitted in lieu of testimony, by indirectly affected residents or groups will be considered.**
- (4) Public hearings may also be held on any CIP or facilities planning issues deferred from the fall. These usually would occur in late February or early March. In unusual

circumstances public hearings may be called at other times to consider facility issues that do not fit into the fall or spring timetables.

5. School Closures and Consolidations

The Maryland State Board of Education requires all school systems to consider certain factors and follow set procedures in cases where a school closure is contemplated. The procedures described below are in accordance with those requirements and the guidelines as outlined in this Board of Education policy.

a) The following information on each school that may be affected by a proposed closing shall be prepared and analyzed:

- (1) Student enrollment trends
- (2) Number of transfers into school from outside attendance area
- (3) Race/ethnic composition of student body
- (4) Educational programs at schools
- (5) Age or condition of building
- (6) Review of school's location and site characteristics
- (7) Building characteristics, including any modifications for special programs
- (8) Physical condition
- (9) Financial considerations including operating costs
- (10) Feeder pattern
- (11) Percentage of students transported
- (12) Potential of the facility for alternative use
- (13) Student relocation
- (14) Impact on community in geographic attendance area for school proposed to be closed and school, or schools, to which students will be relocating.

Copies of the data are also to be sent to affected schools' principals and community representatives.

- b) In conjunction with requirements, the superintendent shall provide an analysis of each school's current and projected enrollment given the enrollment and facility standards described in this policy and analysis of the impact of closure/consolidation options on racial/ethnic balance and objectives of the QIE policy.
- c) Recommendations for closure or consolidation should move schools toward standards for enrollment and facility utilization and should represent fiscally responsible and educationally

sound responses to changing enrollment. Recommendations should be consistent with the Board's policy on Quality Integrated Education. They should enable as many students to walk to school as possible, and minimize transportation distances except when transportation or longer distances are required to address racial and ethnic isolation.

- d) The community's role in the process shall be as follows:
- (1) The superintendent may request formation of a community advisory committee to provide input prior to making any recommendations. Procedures for operation of advisory committee found in Section E.4c (on boundary changes) shall be followed in instances where school closures/consolidations are being considered.
 - (2) The superintendent shall publish recommendations for school closures and consolidations by November 1. After providing recommendations to the Board of Education, copies are to be sent for review and comment to the M-NCPPC, State Board of Education, State Interagency Committee, County Council, municipalities, county government, MCCPTA and all affected school PTAs and cluster coordinators.
 - (3) Individuals, schools, and/or community organizations may react to the recommendations for their school within two months after they are distributed. All reactions and community-developed proposals will be shared with the Board.
 - (4) If an individual or community group wishes to develop an alternative proposal affecting its school and others in the area, it should involve representatives of all school communities affected by the recommendations or make efforts to secure such representation. Any community plans should be sent to the superintendent within two months after the recommendations are distributed.
 - (5) The superintendent shall develop formal recommendations after considering individual and community reactions and alternatives and submit them to the Board of Education by February 1.

- (6) If the Board chooses to request alternatives to the superintendent's formal recommendations, affected communities will be informed about them promptly.
- (7) Subsequent to these steps, the Board's prescribed process for public hearing shall be followed. (see Section E.4e) In addition, state requirements for adequate notice to parents and guardians of students in attendance at all schools being considered for closure by the local board of education will be followed. In addition to any regular means of notification, written notification of all schools that are under consideration for closing shall be advertised in at least two newspapers having general circulation in the geographic attendance area for the school or schools proposed to be closed, and the school or schools to which students will be relocating.
- (8) The newspaper notification shall include the procedures that will be followed by the local board of education in making its final decision. Time limits on the submission of oral or written testimony and data shall be clearly defined in the notification of the public meeting. The newspaper notification shall appear at least two weeks in advance of any public hearings on a proposed school closing. The Board reserves the right to solicit further input or to conduct further hearings if it considers them desirable.
- (9) In making its decision, the Board shall take into account the superintendent's recommendations and the criteria outlined in this policy.
- (10) The final decision of the Board of Education to close a school shall be announced at a public session and shall be in writing. The final decision shall include the rationale for the school closing and address the impact of the proposed closing on the factors set forth above in this policy. There shall be notification of the final decision of the local board of education to the community in the geographic attendance area of the school proposed to be closed and school or schools to which students will be relocating. The final decision shall include notification of the right to appeal to the State Board of Education.

- a) The description of preferred ranges of enrollment for schools refers to all students, except those receiving instruction in self-contained classrooms, whose numbers are added to these ranges.
- b) A preferred range of enrollment for schools, provided they had program capacity, is:

(continue from policy)
- c) The preferred range of enrollment will be considered when planning new schools or changes to existing facilities. Departures from the preferred range may occur if educational program justifies or requires it. Further fiscal constraints may also require MCPS to build schools of other sizes. If larger schools are built or created through additions, alternative approaches to school construction and school management or school staffing will be considered in order to facilitate effective delivery of educational programs.

Board members asked that "useable" in C. Position 6 be changed to "usable." Mrs. Fanconi suggested adding a few words about land needed for playing fields under C. Position 6, and Mr. Ewing thought this should go in the regulations rather than the policy. At the suggestion of Mr. Ewing, it was agreed that C. Position 7 would be changed to put a colon after "solicited through" and bullet the rest of the paragraph.

On C. Position 7. c (3), it was agreed that this section would read, "Written comments from interested parties will be accepted at any point, but in order to be considered comments must reach the Board 24 hours before the time scheduled for action by the Board."

RESOLUTION NO. 463-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE POLICY ON LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

On motion of Mrs. Fanconi seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present#:

Resolved, That the policy on long-range educational facilities be amended in C. Position &, c (2) to read:

- (2) Public hearings may be held in March for any capital budget recommendations deferred from the fall or in cases where capital decisions must be made in March.

It was agreed the policy would include language under the Capital Improvements Program regarding the date the CIP was released similar to language used under the Master Plan. It was also

agreed that D. Desired Outcomes 1. would be rewritten to state "provide educational programs" rather than "meet the needs of students." The Board agreed to change D. Desired Outcomes 4 to substitute "Provide space to accommodate all students, where feasible, in their home school."

RESOLUTION NO. 464-93 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mrs. Fanconi, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:05 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw