

RESOLUTION NO. 808-93 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
GOVERNOR'S GIFTED AND TALENTED
DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision For Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$58,400 from the Maryland State Department of Education, under the Governor's Gifted and Talented Development Grant Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	\$36,850
3	Other Instructional Costs	18,600
10	Fixed Charges	<u>2,950</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$58,400</u>

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 809-93 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a grant award of \$1,930,220 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), under the state Challenge Schools Program for the second year of a multi-year Challenge Grant program in the Wheaton cluster, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Positions*</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2	Instructional Salaries	3.7	\$ 613,669
3	Other Instructional Costs	—	<u>1,316,551</u>
	TOTAL	<u>3.7</u>	<u>\$1,930,220</u>

* 3.7 Teachers, A-D (10 month)

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 810-93 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1994 FUTURE
SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR THE
EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend within the FY 1994 Provision for Future Supported Projects a grant award of \$81,948 from the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Compensatory Education and Support Services, under the federal Chapter 1 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), for the Even Start Family Literacy Program, in the following categories:

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	Administration	\$ 5,500
2	Instructional Salaries	58,068
3	Other Instructional Costs	10,880
7	Pupil Transportation	2,855
10	Fixed Charges	<u>4,645</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$81,948</u>

and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 811-93 Re: REALIGNMENT OF FEDERAL AND LOCAL
FUNDING, AND UTILIZATION OF FY 1994
FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECT FUNDS FOR
THE HEAD START PROGRAM

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

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive a grant award of \$249,226 of Title IIA Economic Opportunity Act (1964) funds, from the federal government through the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, Community Action Agency, increasing federal funds by \$122,134 for services

RESOLUTION NO. 813-93 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT - JULIUS WEST
MIDDLE SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND
ADDITION

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on November 4, 1993, for the modernization and addition project a Julius West Middle School, with work to be completed by May 15, 1995:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Dustin Construction, Inc.	\$8,686,400
2. Hess Construction Company, Inc.	8,734,000
3. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	8,804,000
4. The Gassman Corporation	8,820,000
5. Henley Construction Company, Inc.	8,865,800
6. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	8,947,300
7. Glen Construction Company, Inc.	9,020,500
8. TGMI/Contractors, Inc.	9,166,830
9. Harkins Builders, Inc.	9,455,225

and

WHEREAS, Dustin Construction, Inc., has completed work successfully for Montgomery County Public Schools, including Thomas W. Pyle Middle School; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the architect's estimate of \$8,725,000; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$8,686,400 contract be awarded to Dustin Construction, Inc., for the modernization of and addition to Julius West Middle School, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Smolen + Associates, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 814-93 Re: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR A MAINTENANCE
PROJECT AT VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, The following sealed bids to replace metal telescopic powered gymnasium seating systems for Parkland Middle School, Poolesville Junior/Senior High School and Wheaton High School, funded from Planned Life-cycle Asset Replacement (PLAR), capital funds, were received on November 2, 1993, in accordance with MCPS procurement practices, with work to begin immediately and be completed by August 15, 1994:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Modern Doors & Equipment Sales, Inc.	\$173,222
Brownson Equipment Company, Inc.	\$179,460

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$220,000, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; and

WHEREAS, The low bidder has completed similar projects successfully at Bethesda Chevy Chase, Damascus, Gaithersburg, Walter Johnson, John F. Kennedy, Col. Zadok Magruder, Richard Montgomery, Northwood, and Seneca Valley high schools, and Cabin John, Eastern, Herbert Hoover and E. Brooke Lee middle schools; now therefore be it

Resolved, That a \$173,222 contract be awarded to Modern Doors and Equipment Sales, Inc. to replace the telescopic powered gymnasium seating systems at Parkland Middle School, Poolesville Junior/Senior and Wheaton high schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 815-93

Re: ACCEPTANCE OF SITE DEDICATION
FOR FUTURE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
IN SHERWOOD CLUSTER

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

WHEREAS, The developer of a parcel of land known as the Barnsley Tract, located on the north side of Bowie Mill Road at its intersection with Cashell Road, has offered to dedicate an elementary school site consisting of 17.1 acres to the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The proposed school site is considered suitable for school construction based on favorable tests of soils and study of environmental considerations; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education authorize acceptance of the Barnsley Tract, a 17.1-acre site, to be conveyed at no cost to the Board of Education for use as a future elementary school; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent be authorized to express the appreciation of the Board of Education to the developer for the conveyance of this parcel of land.

RESOLUTION NO. 816-93 Re: GRANT OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND
TREE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS TO THE
CITY OF ROCKVILLE AT JULIUS WEST
MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The building permit for the modernization of Julius West Middle School requires that the Board of Education grant the City of Rockville easements for stormwater management inspection and maintenance and tree conservation; and

WHEREAS, The proposed easement for stormwater management will provide rights to the city for inspection and maintenance of an underground stormwater quality control structure to be located adjacent to the parking area of the school; and

WHEREAS, The tree conservation easement will provide rights to the City of Rockville for inspection and maintenance of trees which are planted to meet state preservation requirements; and

WHEREAS, The proposed easements will not affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, All construction will be undertaken by the Board of Education in connection with the modernization of the school, with the city being granted the right to inspect and maintain; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute Stormwater Management and Tree Conservation Easements at Julius West Middle School.

RESOLUTION NO. 817-93 Re: GRANT OF STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
EASEMENT TO THE CITY OF ROCKVILLE
AT MEADOW HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

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

WHEREAS, The building permit for the modernization of Meadow Hall Elementary School requires that the Board of Education grant the City of Rockville an easement for stormwater management inspection and maintenance; and

WHEREAS, The proposed easement will provide rights to the city of inspection and maintenance of an underground stormwater quality

control structure to be located within the parking area of the school; and

WHEREAS, The proposed storm drain improvement will not affect any land anticipated to be utilized for school programming and recreational activities; and

WHEREAS, All construction will be undertaken by the Board of Education in connection with the modernization of the school. with the city being granted the right to inspect and maintain; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the president and secretary be authorized to execute a Stormwater Management Easement at Meadow Hall Elementary School.

Re: INSPECTION OF WHITE OAK MIDDLE SCHOOL

The inspection of White Oak Middle School was set for Tuesday, November 23, at 10 a.m. Mrs. Gordon will attend.

RESOLUTION NO. 818-93 Re: RESTRUCTURING THE DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION

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

WHEREAS, The Division of Transportation has conducted many meetings with its employees, including bus operators and attendants and other affected staff members, and its management/supervisor team in determining the most effective method to restructure its operations; and

WHEREAS, The findings of the meetings and discussions between staff and corporate partners are that a number of changes, both in realignment of positions and process, need to be made to achieve a more effective operation; now therefore be it

Resolved, The following position changes affecting positions in the Division of Transportation be approved:

CURRENT
(includes pay grade)

3.0 Transportation Supervisor (23)

3.0 Transportation Assistant
Supervisor (16)

PROPOSED
(includes pay grade)

4.0 Transportation Depot
Manager (23)

5.0 Transportation Dispatcher (13)	8.0 Transportation Dispatcher (13)
5.0 Transportation Assistant Dispatcher (11)	
6.0 Transportation Safety Trainer (11)	4.0 Transportation Safety Trainer (11)
3.0 Office Assistant III (10)	2.0 Office Assistant III (10)
1.0 Transportation Assistant Supervisor-Special Ed (17)	---
12.0 Bus Route Supervisor (15)	18.0 Bus Route Supervisor (15)
	1.0 Transportation Information Specialist (23)
	1.0 Transportation Employee Services Coordinator (18)
1.0 Bus Operations Supervisor (25)	1.0 Bus Operations Manager (25)
<hr/> 39.0	<hr/> 39.0

RESOLUTION NO. 819-93 Re: BID #36-94, RELOCATABLE BUILDINGS
FOR FOUR TRANSPORTATION DEPOT
OFFICES

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

WHEREAS, As part of the restructuring of the Division of Transportation there is a need for the office personnel to be housed at each of the four main depots rather than at their current sites; and

WHEREAS, Funds were reserved in FY 93 for the purchase of four relocatable buildings, but the purchase was held pending Corporate Partnership on Managerial Excellence review of the reorganization plan and those funds are still available for this purpose; now therefore be it

Resolved, That having been duly advertised, the following contract be awarded to the low bidder meeting specifications as shown for the bid as follows:

36-94 Relocatable Buildings for Four Transportation Depot
 Offices
 Awardee
 GE Capital Modular Apace \$178,579

RESOLUTION NO. 820-93 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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 following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Wayne Thomas Kranz	Principal Beverly Farms ES	Principal Seneca Valley MS #1 Effective: 2-1-94

RESOLUTION NO. 821-93 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

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

Resolved, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Aggie Alvez	Program Director, Office of Public Affairs, National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law Washington, D.C.	Compliance Officer Dept. of Human Relations Grade N Effective: 11-23-93

RESOLUTION NO. 822-93 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

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 following personnel appointments be approved:

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Present Position</u>	<u>As</u>
Gregory F. Bell	Consultant Family, Education, Workplace Institute Fort Wayne, Indiana and Silver Spring, Maryland	Community/Human Relations Advocate Dept. of Human Relations Grade N Effective: 11-23-93

Ginny Gong	Personnel Specialist Dept. of Staffing	Community/Human Relations Advocate Dept. of Human Relations Grade N Effective: 11-23-93
Maria Riva-Chevez	Bilingual Special Ed. Parent Coord. McFarland Spec. Ed. Ctr. District of Columbia Public Schools Washington, D.C.	Community/Human Relations Advocate Dept. of Human Relations Grade N Effective: 11-23-93

Re: LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
PLANNING (LREFP) POLICY

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

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1992, the Board of Education discussed analyses of two policies, the LREFP policy and the Quality Integrated Education (QIE) policy, and agreed to postpone any further review of the LREFP policy until action on the QIE policy was complete; and

WHEREAS, On May 17, 1993, the Board adopted a revised QIE policy that established certain key linkages to the LREFP; and

WHEREAS, On May 26, 1993, and June 3, 1993, the Board of Education resumed its study of the LREFP Policy and discussed educational facilities planning issues at both worksessions; and

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

WHEREAS, On June 29, 1993, the Board of Education took tentative action on the LREFP policy that then was sent to the public for comment; and

WHEREAS, On September 9, 1993, the Board discussed issues related to the LREFP policy on preferred high school enrollment size at a worksession; and

WHEREAS, On September 20, 1993, the Board of Education conducted a public hearing on the tentatively adopted policy; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt the following revised policy FAA: Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning.

Related Entries: ACD, JEE, JEE-RA
 Office: 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 (MCPS) 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 supports 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

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. 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)* - On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish recommendations for a capital budget and improvements program. 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 registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, student government associations, and other interested groups of its publication and availability in public libraries. The proposed CIP will be sent 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, and Montgomery County Junior Council. 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) On or 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) On or about April 1, 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 Elementary	25:1
Grades 6-12 Secondary	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 is multiplied 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. Preferred Range of Enrollment

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.

- a) A preferred 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
- b) 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. 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.

6. School Site Size

Size for school sites are:

- a) 12 usable acres for elementary schools
- b) 20 usable acres for middle schools
- c) 30 usable 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 seeking views of school communities affected by facility planning activities
 - ! cluster coordinators
 - ! local PTAs
 - ! student advocacy groups
 - ! 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, and federations of civic groups.

- 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 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.
 - (3) 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.

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 provide needed educational programs
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 all students, where feasible, in their home schools

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) New school openings and boundary adjustments demand that consideration be given to the impact of various proposals on the affected school populations. A school population consists of students assigned from a specific geographic attendance area regardless of the location of the school building itself.
- (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 participation in the Free and Reduced Meals Programs (FARMS), U.S. Census information, and other reliable indicators; the inclusion of special education programs and students; mobility rates at schools; and the mix of single family and multiple family dwellings within each service area. Data showing the impact of proposals on applicable factors shall be developed.

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 aggregate student reassignments should consider recent 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 an annual calendar that will adhere to the following calendar adjusted annually to account for holidays and other anomalies.

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
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 presents enrollment trends and planning issues for Board of Education information	September 30
Superintendent publishes and sends to the Board of Education and 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 holds worksession on CIP recommendations. Alternatives to recommendations may be requested by Board of Education at this time.	early November
BOE holds public hearings on recommendations and any Board adopted alternatives.	mid-November
Board of Education acts on CIP and any related facility planning recommendations.	end of November

County Executive and Montgomery County Planning Board receive Board of Education adopted CIP for review.	December 1
County Executive transmits recommended CIP to County Council	January 15
Planning Board reviews County Executive's recommended CIP	February 1
County Council holds public hearings on CIP	February-March
County Council reviews Board of Education requested and County Executive recommended CIPs	March-April
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 acts on deferred recommendations	March 30
County Council approves CIP	June 1

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 in the facilities planning process. 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) The MCPS site administrator works with the cluster coordinators to form site selection committees 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.
- (4) The superintendent evaluates this recommendation and then makes his/her recommendation to the Board.

- (5) The Board considers the committee and superintendent's 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) Representatives of adjacent 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 cases where MCPS facilities planning staff identify the need for possible changes in school service areas, an advisory committee will be formed to assist in the development of those changes. MCPS facilities planning staff and program staff will organize and work directly with this group.
 - (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(s) 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. The superintendent and Board of Education also will consider factors outlined in Section E.2 in their review of boundary proposals.
 - (3) 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 will provide data needed to develop entirely new options if the committee determines it wishes to develop its own options.
 - (4) Official membership on school boundary advisory committees will consist of individuals who are familiar with the affected school communities.
 - (5) Advisory committees may call on other community resources such as civic and homeowner associations.
 - (6) Membership on advisory committees should reflect the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the area.
 - (7) MCPS staff will notify civic and homeowner associations in the potentially affected communities of proposed boundary changes

being discussed in an area. Cluster coordinators and PTAs may also assist in notification of planning activities through their membership communication mechanism.

- (8) An advisory committee report including recommendations or other forms of information from advisory committees will be forwarded to the superintendent.
- (9) 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. The superintendent will publish his/her recommendations about November 1, with the CIP.
- (10) Copies of the recommendations are distributed to the affected communities.
- (11) 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.
- (12) 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) Public comments from individuals not represented by school or civic groups will be heard by the Board of Education at an appropriate place in the public hearing. Individuals should contact the Board Office to schedule testimony.
- (2) 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.
- (3) 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.

- (11) Except in emergency circumstances, the decision to close a school shall be announced at least 90 days before the date the school is scheduled to be closed but not later than April 30 of any school year. An emergency circumstance is one where the decision to close a school because of unforeseen circumstances cannot be announced at least 90 days before the date a school is scheduled to close or before April 30 of any school year.

F. Review and Reporting

1. The annual June publication of the Master Plan will constitute the official reporting on facility planning. This document will reflect all facilities actions taken during the year by the Board of Education and approved by the County Council, project the enrollment and utilization of each school, and identify schools that may be involved in future planning activities.
2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Policy History: Adopted by Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 823-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning be amended to add the following under A. Purpose. 1.:

The achievement of Success for Every Student through the delivery and execution of an excellent educational program is of primary importance to students and parents in Montgomery County.

RESOLUTION NO. 824-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

On motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning be amended to add "cluster coordinators, in consultation with PTA Presidents..." under a) Site Selection (3); c) School Boundary Changes (1) (a); and e) Public Hearing Process (1) (a).

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN TO AMEND
THE PROPOSED POLICY ON LONG-RANGE
FACILITIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman to amend the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning by deleting "In areas with affordable housing, there is often greater diversity in enrollment caused by immigration from outside the country" from B. Issue failed for lack of a second.

It was agreed that the last sentence under B. Issue would state "this policy provides the framework for coordinating planning..."

RESOLUTION NO. 825-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

On motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Mrs. Gordon, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities planning be amended under 4. Capacity Calculations "The capacity of a facility is determined by the space needs of educational programs. The capacity ratios shown in the following table should not be confused with staffing ratios as determined through the operating budget process."

It was agreed that 5. Preferred Range of Enrollment would read, "except those special education students receiving instruction in self-contained classrooms,..."

RESOLUTION NO. 826-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted with Ms. Baker, Dr. Cheung, Mr. Ewing, Mrs. Fanconi, and Ms. Gutierrez voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Brenneman and Mrs. Gordon abstaining:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities be amended in 5. Preferred Range of Enrollment b) to add, "Larger

enrollments for high schools may be justified for those schools in which students are academically very diverse in order to meet the programmatic needs of all students."

RESOLUTION NO. 827-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

On motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mrs. Brenneman, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities be amended in 5. Preferred Range of Enrollment b) to substitute, "If larger or smaller schools are built or created, alternative approaches to school construction, management, organization, or staffing will be considered in order to facilitate effective delivery of educational programs."

RESOLUTION NO. 828-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities be amended to add the following to Position E. 2 a) as (3):

When the Board of Education moves special education programs, physical modifications to the facility will be made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

It was agreed that "receives" would be substituted for "requests" in E. Implementation Strategies 1. c). It was also agreed that "from the school community" be added after "request advice" in E. Implementation Strategies 1. d).

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN TO
AMEND THE PROPOSED POLICY ON
LONG-RANGE FACILITIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman to amend the proposed policy on long-range facilities by deleting "Consistent with the school system policy on Site-based Participatory Management," from c) Area of Focus: Geography (2) failed for lack of a second.

RESOLUTION NO. 829-93 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities be amended after Paragraph 2 under c) Area of Focus: Geography, add the following:

d) Area of Focus: Stability

1. Recognizing that at times changes to facilities and boundaries may occur, plans should result in as long a period as possible of stable assignment patterns.
2. Recommendations for aggregate student reassignments should consider recent boundary changes and/or school closings and consolidations which may have affected the same communities.

RESOLUTION NO. 830-93

Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
POLICY ON LONG-RANGE FACILITIES

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

Resolved, That the proposed policy on long-range facilities be amended under 3. Calendar after enrollment trends to add the following:

The County Council passes spending affordability guidelines that set limits on bonding debt the County can undertake.
Early October.

For the record, Mrs. Fanconi made the following statement:

"I think the timeline for the capital budget adoption by the Board of Education is incredible, and we need to continue to evaluate ways to address this."

Under Site Selection, the Board agreed to substitute "requirements based on existing and proposed residential development" for "requirements based on proposed residential development."

Re: A MOTION BY MRS. BRENNEMAN TO
AMEND THE PROPOSED POLICY ON
LONG-RANGE FACILITIES (FAILED)

A motion by Mrs. Brenneman to add "that the principal, cluster coordinator, and MCPS staff" would identify representatives of homeowner and civic associations under 4. b) Facility Design (1) (c) failed for lack of a second.

It was agreed that under the Public Hearing Process e) (2) would read, "Written comments from any interested parties...." It was also agreed that under School Closures and Consolidations d) (1) it would read, "The superintendent shall request...."

achievement of Success for Every Student through the delivery and execution of an excellent educational program is of primary importance to students and parents in Montgomery County.

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 (MCPS) 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 supports 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 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. 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 provides the framework for coordinating planning for these capital improvements.

C. Position

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

1. *Capital Improvements Program (CIP)* - On or about November 1, the superintendent will publish recommendations for a capital budget and improvements program. 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 registered with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, student government associations, and other interested groups of its publication and availability in public libraries. The proposed CIP will be sent 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, and Montgomery County Junior Council. 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) On or 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) On or about April 1, 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 the space needs of educational programs. The capacity ratios shown in the following table should not be confused with staffing ratios as determined through the operating budget process. 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 Elementary	25:1
Grades 6-12 Secondary	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 is multiplied 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. Preferred Range of Enrollment

The description of preferred ranges of enrollment for schools refers to all students, except those special education students receiving instruction in self-contained classrooms, whose numbers are added to these ranges.

- a) A preferred 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
- b) 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. Larger enrollments for high schools may be justified for those schools in which students are academically very diverse in order to meet the programmatic needs of all students. Fiscal constraints may also require MCPS to build schools of other sizes. If larger or smaller schools are built or created, alternative approaches to school construction, management, organization, or staffing will be considered in order to facilitate effective delivery of educational programs.

6. School Site Size

Size for school sites are:

- a) 12 usable acres for elementary schools
- b) 20 usable acres for middle schools
- c) 30 usable 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 seeking views of school communities affected by facility planning activities
 - ! cluster coordinators
 - ! local PTAs
 - ! student advocacy groups
 - ! 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, and federations of civic groups.
- 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 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.
 - (3) 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.

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 provide needed educational programs
- 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 all students, where feasible, in their home schools
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 receives advice from a school boundary advisory committee.
 - d) The superintendent also may request advice from the school community 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) When the Board of Education moves special education programs, physical modifications to the facility will be made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- (4) 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) New school openings and boundary adjustments demand that consideration be given to the impact of various proposals on the affected school populations. A school population consists of students assigned from a specific geographic attendance area regardless of the location of the school building itself.
- (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 participation in the Free and Reduced Meals Programs (FARMS), U.S. Census information, and other reliable indicators; the inclusion of special education programs and students; mobility rates at schools; and the mix of single family and multiple family dwellings within each service area. Data showing the impact of proposals on applicable factors shall be developed.

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.
- (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 aggregate student reassignments should consider recent boundary changes and/or school closings and consolidations which may have affected the same communities.

d) Area of Focus: Stability

- (1) Recognizing that at times changes to facilities and boundaries may occur, plans should result in as long a period as possible of stable assignment patterns.
- (2) Recommendations for aggregate student reassignments should consider recent 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 an annual calendar that will adhere to the following calendar adjusted annually to account for holidays and other anomalies.

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
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 presents enrollment trends and planning issues for Board of Education information	September 30

The County Council passes spending affordability guidelines that set limits on bounding debt the County can undertake	Early October
Superintendent publishes and sends to the Board of Education and 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 holds worksession on CIP recommendations. Alternatives to recommendations may be requested by Board of Education at this time.	early November
BOE holds public hearings on recommendations and any Board adopted alternatives.	mid-November
Board of Education acts on CIP and any related facility planning recommendations.	end of November
County Executive and Montgomery County Planning Board receive Board of Education adopted CIP for review.	December 1
County Executive transmits recommended CIP to County Council	January 15
Planning Board reviews County Executive's recommended CIP	February 1
County Council holds public hearings on CIP	February-March
County Council reviews Board of Education requested and County Executive recommended CIPs	March-April
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 acts on deferred recommendations	March 30
County Council approves CIP	June 1

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 in the facilities planning process. 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 existing and 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) The MCPS site administrator works with the cluster coordinators, in consultation with PTA presidents, to form site selection committees 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.
- (4) The superintendent evaluates this recommendation and then makes his/her recommendation to the Board.
- (5) The Board considers the committee and superintendent's 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) Representatives of adjacent 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 cases where MCPS facilities planning staff identify the need for possible changes in school service areas, an advisory committee will be formed to assist in the development of those changes. MCPS facilities planning staff and program staff will organize and work directly with this group.
 - (a) The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) and PTA presidents will identify parent representation from areas potentially affected by boundary changes.
 - (b) At the secondary level, the school principal(s) will identify interested students to serve on the committee.
 - (c) The cluster coordinator(s) in consultation with the school principal(s) and PTA presidents 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. The superintendent and Board of Education also will consider factors outlined in Section E.2 in their review of boundary proposals.
- (3) 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 will provide data needed to develop entirely new options if the committee determines it wishes to develop its own options.

- (4) Official membership on school boundary advisory committees will consist of individuals who are familiar with the affected school communities.
- (5) Advisory committees may call on other community resources such as civic and homeowner associations.
- (6) Membership on advisory committees should reflect the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity of the area.
- (7) MCPS staff will notify civic and homeowner associations in the potentially affected communities of proposed boundary changes being discussed in an area. Cluster coordinators and PTAs may also assist in notification of planning activities through their membership communication mechanism.
- (8) An advisory committee report including recommendations or other forms of information from advisory committees will be forwarded to the superintendent.
- (9) 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. The superintendent will publish his/her recommendations about November 1, with the CIP.
- (10) Copies of the recommendations are distributed to the affected communities.
- (11) 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.
- (12) 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, in consultation with PTA presidents, 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) Public comments from individuals not represented by school or civic groups will be heard by the Board of Education at an appropriate place in the public hearing. Individuals should contact the Board Office to schedule testimony.
- (2) Written comments from any 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.

- (3) 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 shall 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.
- (11) Except in emergency circumstances, the decision to close a school shall be announced at least 90 days before the date the school is scheduled to be closed but not later than April 30 of any school year. An emergency circumstance is one where the decision to close a school because of unforeseen circumstances cannot be announced at least 90 days before the date a school is scheduled to close or before April 30 of any school year.

F. Review and Reporting

1. The annual June publication of the Master Plan will constitute the official reporting on facility planning. This document will reflect all facilities actions taken during the year by the Board of Education and approved by the County Council, project the enrollment and utilization of each school, and identify schools that may be involved in future planning activities.
2. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education's policy review process.

Policy History: Adopted by Resolution

Re: YEAR ROUND SCHOOLS

Dr. Vance invited Ms. Ann Briggs, director of facilities planning; Dr. Mary Helen Smith, director of the Department of Student, Community, and Staff Support; and Mrs. Nancy King, president of MCCPTA to come to the table. He stated that his recommendations on year round education put the issue on the table for the Board and the community. Some community members had testified on this issue at the public hearings on facilities. On Saturday about 15 Montgomery County residents attended the governor's conference on year round schools in Catonsville. He believed that the process he was recommending would allow them to gain the insight they needed on this subject.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that the conference was very good although she had started with a negative bias because she had relatives who teach in the California school system. The conference taught her that there were a few issues they had to address. The first was whether they wanted an exploration of how this might apply to Montgomery County. In order to do this, they would need to define why they would need to do this. Secondly, they should assure the community that even though they decided to explore this, they would not mandate it. There would be a process through which the community would come to some consensus as a way of addressing shortfalls and educational challenges.

Ms. Briggs reported that about 300 people representing all 24 jurisdictions attended the conference. There were definitions of year round education. The first was 180 days but on a different cycle. The 180 cycle was divided into shorter periods with vacations interspersed. For example, they might have nine weeks in school and then three weeks off. In the single cycle, the population stayed together but utilized the buildings all year long. The other type of year round education consisted of the same number of days, but the enrollment was divided into several groups and groups of students would be in school while other groups were on vacation. In some cases it allowed 100 percent utilization of a classroom rather than having that classroom vacant for certain portions of the year. The other type of year round school was where more days were included in the instructional year, and one of the former state superintendents had recommended a 200-day school year.

Ms. Briggs explained that people looked at year round education to determine whether it could reduce the need to build additional space and save money. The other reason for considering year round education was the feeling that it did offer opportunities for better education. Half the schools offering year round education used a single cycle which was done for educational

reasons rather than cost savings. She stated that year round education could reduce the need to build if they used a multicycle. It offered better education when there were increased opportunities. The intersessions offered opportunities for remedial work, reinforcement, and enrichment.

Educators at the conference explained that when they were faced with the need to reduce capital expenditures there were several options including double sessions, half day sessions, portable classrooms, reopening closed schools, increase class size, new construction, and year round multicycle schooling. MCPS had portable classrooms, had reopened closed schools, and had an active construction process. If they were going to consider year round schools, they had to determine why they wanted to make a change. What was it they wanted to accomplish? For example, did they only want to save money? Did they want to reduce expenditures and also offer more opportunity for a better education? They had to answer the "why" before they got into the details.

Ms. Briggs showed the Board several charts illustrating how it was possible to save money through using buildings on a multitrack system. She also showed how three classrooms could serve four classes of students. She pointed out that money saved from the capital program could be redirected for operating purposes. In California they had legislation that returned funds to districts which had mechanisms for exceeding program capacity by 10 to 15 percent. In Oxnard district, individual schools were receiving \$100,000 for operating purposes.

The task force would have to look at issues related to child care, options for year round school, extra curricular activities, student performance, support services, organizing schools, educational facilities including air conditioning and maintenance, public awareness, operating budget cost benefits, family, employment opportunities, staff development, intersessions for education, curriculum, and case studies. Dr. Cheung would add the community use of schools to this list. Ms. Briggs noted that in Florida they took two years before they implemented a pilot program.

Mrs. Fanconi indicated that she had lots of materials from the conference and would share them with staff. She had learned there were start up costs of about \$40,000 to \$60,000 per school, and this was without air conditioning. This includes a position for leadership, staff development costs, teacher storage units, and student storage units. They needed to have computer-assisted registration, and they needed to retrofit schools with air conditioning, storage cabinets, and heavy duty exhaust fans for kitchens. The MCPS kitchens were not air conditioned, and they would need additional fans. Florida started with a five-year plan on building schools, and they found they would not be able

to build as many as they needed. They then looked at year round schools and double sessions.

Mrs. Fanconi reported that year round school would give them an opportunity to go to an extended year calendar. With state funds, Florida was able to run intersessions that were remedial and enrichment activities. There was an opportunity for extended day programs. A school system in Tennessee lengthened the school day by providing activities including day care, recreation, and instruction. The children were in the building from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. The system cut back on transportation by requiring parents to bring their children to school, and they charged a fee for parents who could not transport their children. In South Orange County, they saved \$63 million by building only three of the 12 elementary schools they needed for capacity. They sponsored legislation to transfer the savings into their operating budget and bought hardware and technology. They also used the elementary money to provide construction funds for secondary schools. She commented that the purpose of school was to help children learn, and it would be critical to evaluate the achievement levels. She said that one superintendent in California had reported that for limited English speakers, low income students, students with high mobility, and at risk students year round education was a much better education. He indicated that his test scores had gone up over three years.

Dr. Vance remarked that Orange County had a student population closely approximating the MCPS students. They had revamped their Chapter 1 and ESOL programs, and during the intersessions these youngsters were in school receiving remediation and acceleration.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that she was more familiar with the concept of multi-track year round schooling. She had been surprised to learn that in Orange County of the 42 schools on the year-round education, only 12 were on the multi-track. The other 30 schools were on the single track and were Chapter 1 schools focusing on acceleration during the intersessions. During intersessions, they ran a full six-hour day with special Chapter 1 teachers. They had done attitude surveys with students, teachers, and parents. In three years the rate had gone from 25 percent satisfaction to 75 percent satisfaction for students and for teachers.

Mrs. Gemberling reported that another issue was staff development. For example, if they had master teachers teaching during the regular session, other teachers on intersession could observe these master teachers, teach, and earn credit for recertification. This would not be costly to the staff or the system. They also heard some very candid issues from principals about the administrative logistics. For example, lockers had to be reissued at the end of every session. However, there were some pluses regarding job training programs because four students

could constitute a full-time employee. They found much better cooperation with business. One thing that was clear was that year round school required a lot of planning. In addition, there had to be choice on the part of the family, the community, students, and the staff in terms of what type of a schedule was selected. People had to have ownership in picking their options which resulted in a much better success rate.

Dr. Rohr commented that he had attended sessions on logistics and budgets. In regard to food services, they had to consider how to handle kitchens that were not air conditioned. There were concerns about revenue balancing year-long labor costs. There were concerns about 10-month employees who did not want to become 12-month employees. Transportation had been described as a logistical nightmare because they had to keep neighborhoods and families on the same system. There was an initial savings on not having as many buses, but the maintenance costs went up significantly because of the extra use of the buses. For elementary schools, the operating budget costs went up, but this was offset by a reduction in capital costs. However, under current law in Maryland, they might find their operating costs going up but another agency would get credit for capital costs going down. A rule of thumb that was given was that a school had to be 15 percent above capacity before it started to pay for itself on a multi-track system.

Mrs. King reported that she had attended the workshops on child care and the family. The day care people had before and after school programs, and students on intersession were taken by bus to a recreation area to spend the day. The day care people changed their programs with the seasons, and it was a positive experience. Mrs. King said there were a few questions that did not have positive answers. For example, what happened to the family with a child in elementary school, a child in middle school, and a child in high school? All three children could be on the same track, but it wasn't necessarily the same track as their friends in the neighborhood. There was the issue of team sports and what would be done with a football player whose intersession was in the middle of the season. Another issue was funding day care for people who could not afford it. There was the issue of finding day care for the intersessions. She indicated that participants talked about how successful the program was in elementary school, but when asked about high school, it was the consensus that scheduling was a nightmare. This left her with some concern about programming in the high school.

Mrs. Gordon asked if the all-day session had changed the superintendent's proposal for Montgomery County. Participants in the session had talked about the need for planning, and the superintendent had suggested a pilot for next year. Dr. Vance replied that he was holding fast in his recommendation to appoint

a task group to initiate that process. As a consequence of that, he would bring forth a modified time schedule or recommendations to drop the idea all together.

Mrs. King commented that when participants talked about day care, it was almost as if the family would be out of this because children would be in school all of the time. She stressed that they had to keep in mind that the family was a very important part of this process and that schools and day care could not fill that need. It concerned her that they wanted to fill children's lives with school because children had to have some off time when they were not in a structured activity.

Mr. Ewing remarked that the more he learned about year round schooling, the worse it sounded. He was very concerned that they might forward a grant application within the next 60 days because this would be viewed in the community as a firm commitment to move ahead with this. He could not imagine doing this without public hearings, detailed estimates of savings and investments, a commitment from the Council to make the initial investments, a full-blown plan, and an impact analysis. It was unreasonable to expect the Board and the community to go forward with this for just \$100,000 which would pay for at most a couple of schools. It was a proposal by a lame duck governor who didn't know much about education.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that at most the Board ought to take ample time and make sure there would be real money from the state and county. They should not get caught up in something that would cause them endless woe from the public and a vast amount of work on the part of the staff. He could not see a payoff in either dollars or an educational advantage. Rising test scores did not prove that year round education was the sole cause or even the major cause. He said there were advantages to extending the school year which would be a lot simpler. He thought that there were far too many questions for the Board to commit itself to this at this juncture. While he would not support this, he would support only a continuing examination. He pointed out that the burden of implementing this would fall on central office personnel and school principals, and both were severely overburdened. He would guess that it would take more administrative staff to manage this, and they were already thin in administration.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she had an opposite view. She had lived in many countries with different educational models, and she had seen the benefits of these models. In her mind it was not a problem to be looking at something other than the current agrarian model of education. She thought today's presentation had been valuable. It seemed to her the conference was very well organized and provoked a lot of thinking. As leaders of a premier school system, the Board could not take a position of

"prove it to me and then we'll try it." There was evidence that this was an opportunity for students to get a better education. While there were many questions, they could not answer them if they did not begin to look for some answers. A pilot would be an initial effort to move forward to see how this would work in Montgomery County. They might come to the conclusion that it was not a workable model in Montgomery County. She agreed with Mr. Ewing's warnings that they should not go into this blindly. They should recognize that it would take a lot of effort and that commitments were needed. The implementation plan would permit them to study the issue the first year, the second year would be a continuation of planning, and the third year a small implementation of the program. She thought this was a very prudent approach. Her point was that year round schools did have the potential to offer opportunities for improved educational achievement for their students. As a Board member, she was obligated to support this, to pursue the concept, and to understand better what it could mean for Montgomery County.

Mrs. Fanconi had spoken to a day care representative who thought one of the first questions would be about day care and that MCPS should work very closely with the child care community. The day care providers had to understand the implications of year round school. The day care representative thought year round schools would be better because the calendar would be set for the whole year and would not change every year. She thought that if the Board went forward with the task force, they ought to talk to the Council about some extra money for staff. Right now, MCPS did not have enough staff to do this.

In regard to Mr. Ewing's questions about the grant, Mrs. Fanconi said she was very disappointed about the RFP. While it had been stated that the grant could be used for study, it was not apparent from the RFP. She was not willing to be on the governor's timeline because it would take more time if MCPS wanted to do this.

Mrs. Brenneman stated that the more she read about this, the more concerns she had. Their main goal was to improve education, but this would take planning time on the part of principals, teachers, and staff. She wondered how many dollars this would cost which might be used to reduce class size. She wondered what this did to existing policies because some of them might be in conflict. She would want discussions and public hearings because the community would need to buy into this. She would be willing to support a committee, but she did have some real reservations.

Mrs. Gordon commented that she valued the time of summer break because she enjoyed this as a parent. Therefore, she was coming at this with a negative feeling; however, she thought that this was something they had to consider and study. She did not think they had to buy into it just because they studied it. She did

not want to rush into this; however, she knew that the state tended to come up with an idea and implement it for everyone. Therefore, she would hope that Montgomery County would look at how they might implement it for MCPS and rely on the state to tell them how to do it.

Mrs. Gordon said she was skeptical about pilot that would be in place for the next school year given the information that it would take a lot more time. It would take time to educate the system, parents, and the greater community. For example, how would this impact on internship programs, summer jobs, and summer activities? How would the ICB be involved in this? She thought they had to keep in mind the education issue, not the money issue. If they found they could save money but educationally it was not better, she thought they needed to stop. However, she agreed that they had to explore all the possibilities. She did not necessarily think the way they delivered services right now was the best way, and she thought this was an opportunity for them to look at a different way of delivering services. This would also be an opportunity to look at delivery of services at the secondary level. For example, an intersession might be an opportunity for community service and internships. However, she did not want to see students booked into things at every intersession because students needed some unstructured time.

Ms. Baker expressed her agreement with Mrs. Gordon's remarks. She did support looking into year round school. She pointed out that some students had to have summer jobs to pay for college, and students travelled abroad for educational reasons. Some students took summer courses for college credit. A lot of students worked in summer camps. She did agree that this was something they had to look at.

Dr. Cheung explained that Board members had expressed his views. The most important thing was to look at educational and instructional reasons. He pointed out that construction costs were one time, but operating costs were continuous. He agreed that they needed to be creative and look at various ways to improve what they were doing. They needed a plan to plan. There were many unanswered questions, and they needed to proceed very cautiously. He thanked the staff and Mrs. King for the information they provided the Board.

Mr. Ewing stated that he did not want the session to end with the notion that those who were not pleased with year round schooling were somehow conservatives not interested in innovation. He felt that this was not an innovative idea because it had been around for over 30 years. There was plenty of evidence about it but not very much proof. He cautioned the Board to keep in mind that a little over a year from now the governor would be gone and the state superintendent might be gone. The new governor would probably have a totally new agenda for the Maryland State

Department of Education which might not include year round schools.

Re: BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT COMMENTS

1. Mr. Ewing commented that he was concerned a matter that came up earlier in the evening during Public Comments on the Board's position on health clinics. He had checked the record, and the Board had agreed to send a letter to the state superintendent. It also agreed that the letter should say that the Board had not taken an official public position on this matter. This was not what the public was being told. He thought they needed to correct this matter. The Board agreed to support a letter endorsing the concept, but the Board did not take a public vote. If Board members wanted to put the Board on record, it would take a new business item. He thought it important that the record of what the Board did be reflected in what they were saying.

2. Mr. Ewing reported that tomorrow they would be voting in the capital budget including year round schools. He urged the Board to think carefully about the matter of what was needed versus what it was that spending affordability would allow. He suggested they had to figure out a way to convey to the County Council and the county executive that spending affordability limits did not allow for a budget that met real needs and to list for them what would meet the needs of MCPS. He would guess it would take another \$120 million over the next six years to meet those real needs.

3. Dr. Cheung indicated that last week he had met with some school board members from the greater metropolitan area. This meeting had been called by the District of Columbia, and its purpose was to share information among the various jurisdictions concerning the budgetary process and problems faced by various jurisdictions. He thought it was a very worthwhile meeting and a nice forum for exchange of information.

RESOLUTION NO. 832-93 Re: CLOSED SESSIONS - DECEMBER 1 AND
14, 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:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a meeting on December 1, 1993, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss contract negotiations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on December 14, 1993, at 9 a.m. to discuss personnel matters, matters protected from public disclosure by law, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That the meeting on December 14, 1993, continue at noon; and be it further

Resolved, That these meetings be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such meetings shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 833-93 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 12, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 12, 1993, be approved as corrected.

Mrs. Fanconi assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 834-93 Re: MINUTES OF OCTOBER 25, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of October 25, 1993, be approved.

Dr. Cheung assumed the chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 835-93 Re: MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 11, 1993

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

Resolved, That the minutes of November 11, 1993, be approved.

Re: REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION - NOVEMBER
9, 1993

On October 25, 1993, by the unanimous vote of members present, the Board of Education voted to conduct a closed session on November 9, 1993, as permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501.

The Montgomery County Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, November 9, 1993, from 9 a.m. to 10:10 a.m. and from 1:10 to 1:35 p.m. The meetings took place in room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland.

The Board of Education met to discuss the personnel monthly report. The vote on the report was confirmed in open session. Dr. Vance updated the Board on a principalship situation. The Board reviewed the legal services report.

The Board also discussed the purchase of additional land at an elementary school and agreed to give staff authority to negotiate for the land. The Board also discussed a recent informal offer from the owners of potential school site. Dr. Vance reported that he had appealed the decision not to permit the Whitman girls track team to participate in the state championship. The Board discussed construction costs and legal fees with counsel. The Board also reviewed appeals and voted on T-1993-29 and 1993-24. These votes were confirmed in open session.

In attendance at the closed session were Stephen Abrams, Melissa Bahr, Carrie Baker, Fran Brenneman, Alan Cheung, Blair Ewing, Carol Fanconi, Phinnize Fisher, Katheryn Gemberling, Bea Gordon, Zvi Greismann, Ana Sol Gutierrez, Dick Hawes, Marie Heck, Jeff Krew, Elfreda Massie, Brian Porter, Philip Rohr, Roger Titus, Paul Vance, William Wilder, and Mary Lou Wood.

RESOLUTION NO. 836-93 Re: COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

On motion of Ms. Gutierrez seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to work with Board staff and Board members to review and enhance the process for identifying, recruiting, and maintaining a source of interested candidates to our advisory committees in order to ensure broader multi-cultural, multi-racial, and multi-ethnic representation of the many diverse cultures of our students and our parents.

RESOLUTION NO. 837-93 RE: BOE APPEAL NO. 1993-24

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1993-24, a tuition matter.

Re: ITEM OF INFORMATION

The Board received an Update on Issues Related to Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED) as an item of information.

RESOLUTION NO. 838-93 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11:10 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw