

Boundary Adjustment Committee Recommendations Frequently Asked Questions (Revised 12/22/15)



1. Why is there a Boundary Adjustment Committee Report with recommendations for school closures and boundary adjustments?

The Board of Education approved the Boundary Adjustment Committee at its public meeting on February 11, 2015. The Board action item may be found at:

<http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/ccps/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=9UKCT8529F8D>.

This information explains our ongoing challenges with declining student enrollment.

The effective utilization of schools has been under public discussion between the Board of Education and the Board of County Commissioners for many years. In 2013, the Board commissioned external consultants to review our effective use of facilities. The MGT of America report may be found at:

<http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/ccps/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=9DZTBS66976C>.

2. When will the Board make a final decision on the recommendations?

The Board approved the final school closure and boundary adjustment plan on December 9, 2015. You may read Superintendent Guthrie's final recommendation and the Board's decision here:

[Superintendent Guthrie's Recommendation](#)

[Board's Final Decision](#)

[Full Report](#)

3. Where may I find more information on the process?

The school system has created a resource webpage at:

<http://www.carrollk12.org/boe/boundaryadjustment/default.asp>.

This webpage includes the full report and appendices, maps and charts, and other resources.

4. How may I provide input to the Board regarding the recommendations?

The school system has created an email address, BACReport@carrollk12.org, specifically for receiving public input on this topic. Emails sent to this account are received by all Board Members. You may also sign up for public comment at Board meetings or write to the Board.

5. Are there guidelines that must be considered when closing schools?

The Code of Maryland Administrative Regulations (COMAR) 13A.02.09 dictates the process for school closures:

http://www.dsd.state.md.us/COMAR/SubtitleSearch.aspx?search=13A.02.09.*

The Board has adopted the COMAR regulations into school system administrative procedures, which are found in the Board's Educational Facilities Master Plan (pg. 3-25):

http://www.carrollk12.org/Assets/file/School_Facilities/Educational%20Facilities%20Master%20Plan/2015-2024/Section%203.pdf.

COMAR requires that any proposed closure be considered against eight specific factors. The Boundary Adjustment Committee report addresses each of the factors individually for both Option 1 and Option 2.

6. What guidelines exist to consider when balancing enrollments across the system?

Board Policy:

<http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/ccps/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=84Q44S3BF56B> and

Administrative Regulations:

<http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/ccps/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=84Q3YK3BE55A>

JCAA – Boundary Adjustments Guideline Process for Redistricting.

7. How does the Board determine enrollment projections?

The Board receives an annual Enrollment Projections Analysis Report from the Superintendent. The most recent report (2015), along with an explanation of the process, may be found here:

<http://www.carrollk12.org/admin/facilitiesmanagement/planning/enrollment/default.asp>

<http://www.boarddocs.com/mabe/ccps/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=9DZTBS66976C>.

The Board has a scheduled work session on January 27, 2015 to review enrollment trends and the impact of our enrollment on educational services.

The Board's enrollment projections are also approved by the State.

8. How accurate are the enrollment projections?

Our enrollment projections have been very accurate over time. The accuracy of our enrollment projections was studied and remarked upon by the independent consultants in 2012. Even with the historic shift from sustained growth to sustained decline in student population, at the five-year interval our overall projections are accurate within 5%. At the ten-year interval, overall projections are accurate within 10%.

9. Didn't inaccurate enrollment projections lead to the construction of Manchester Valley High School?

This understanding is inaccurate. Although North Carroll High School was above capacity at the time of planning, our enrollment projections did indicate that a new high school in North Carroll would be unnecessary. Staff presented this information to the Board of Education and to the municipal leaders of Hampstead and Manchester in 2007, including questioning the need for the new high school. Click here to view a video of former Superintendent Ecker and then Assistant Superintendent Guthrie's presentation to the joint town councils of Hampstead and Manchester:

[Joint Town Councils Meeting](#)

[Presentation to the Town Councils](#)

10. How are school utilization rates determined?

Utilization is simply the percent of a school's capacity that is being utilized by the number of students attending the school. Utilization percentages are calculated by dividing a school's enrollment by the capacity number for the school.

At the elementary and high school levels, CCPS utilizes the State Rated Capacities of schools for the utilization calculations. The State Rated Capacity of a building is determined by using the state formula and must be approved by the Maryland Department of Planning. COMAR Regulations 23.03.02.04 dictate the how State Rated Capacities are calculated:

<http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/comarhtml/23/23.03.02.04.htm>

At the middle school level, CCPS utilizes the Functional Capacity of schools for the utilization calculations. Functional Capacities are not approved by the State and are therefore not recognized by the State during Capital Budget funding discussions with the State. However, Functional Capacities are the standard that is utilized by the Carroll County Planning and Zoning Commission when determining whether a school is considered adequate for approving new housing subdivisions. The Functional Capacity of a building is determined using the formula included in Section 4 of the Educational Facilities Master Plan.

<http://www.carrollk12.org/admin/facilitiesmanagement/planning/educational/default.asp>

9. What is the impact of declining enrollments on school system funding?

Funding, particularly at the State level, is driven by enrollment. As enrollment declines, direct State aid declines at a level that does not consider inflationary increases and new mandates. The challenge is compounded because our enrollment has declined across the entire system and not in a concentrated area. The chart below shows the actual lost revenue CCPS has experienced in recent years under the State formula.

TOTAL DIRECT FY12 - FY16

School systems that received a decrease in funding are highlighted in red

	FY13 vs FY12	FY14 vs FY13	FY15 vs FY14	FY16 vs FY15	Total
Allegany	(3,126,220)	68,136	719,351	750,291	(1,588,442)
AA	9,866,052	11,415,135	6,774,002	8,166,800	36,221,989
Balt City	4,963,908	30,066,550	5,932,173	(22,984,682)	17,977,949
Balt Co.	16,178,248	22,715,614	17,084,747	25,752,970	81,731,579
Calvert	(1,047,146)	(714,644)	575,498	(2,181,159)	(3,367,451)
Caroline	2,295,793	1,448,140	2,078,254	1,647,194	7,469,381
Carroll	(643,072)	(2,134,630)	(3,104,346)	(2,656,812)	(8,538,860)
Cecil	378,193	(731,092)	3,915,937	(477,464)	3,085,574
Charles	662,318	2,399,037	2,425,507	640,505	6,127,367
Dorchester	1,408,810	1,498,142	2,404,330	2,339,107	7,650,389
Frederick	5,345,668	3,808,422	2,574,437	(444,960)	11,283,567
Garrett	(1,100,535)	(893,979)	(762,096)	139,448	(2,617,162)
Harford	(4,159,288)	(2,801,263)	(63,087)	353,818	(6,669,820)
Howard	4,624,776	677,018	1,151,090	6,193,768	12,646,652
Kent	98,762	(291,138)	(225,998)	(86,321)	(504,695)
Montg.	28,093,631	14,896,492	11,780,229	10,272,300	65,042,652
PG	39,083,101	36,986,987	57,370,375	39,315,570	172,756,033
Queen Anne's	116,399	938,061	616,533	199,380	1,870,373
St. Marys	2,380,060	3,153	2,793,474	2,162,923	7,339,610
Somerset	(270,072)	3,556,061	592,323	532,992	4,411,304
Talbot	492,066	261,315	475,100	663,821	1,892,302
Washington	4,138,719	3,118,827	4,961,475	149,347	12,368,368
Wicomico	4,943,634	4,632,161	3,985,105	5,263,982	18,824,882
Worcester	354,993	429,755	91,590	307,916	1,184,254
Total	115,078,798	131,352,260	124,146,003	76,020,734	446,597,795

10. Why doesn't CCPS make other reductions to address funding issues rather than school closures and redistricting?

The short answer is, we have already exhausted other significant reductions over the previous fiscal years. We have reduced almost \$30 million in expenditures during fiscal years 2009 through 2015. The list below highlights many of those major expenditure reductions. Additional information on prior reductions may be located on our operating budget webpage FAQ section -

<http://www.carrollk12.org/admin/financeservices/budget/faq/default.asp>.

- Eliminated 223.5 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions (44.3 from Central Offices)
- Reduced School Maintenance Projects

- Eliminated 40 Buses
- Eliminated After School Community Learning Centers
- Froze Employee Salaries – Five of the Last Six Years
- Reduced Work Year for Selected Employees
- Restructured Judy Center Program
- Eliminated General Spending in All Categories
- Eliminated Stabilization Funds – Transportation/Utilities
- Increased Fiber Optic Network Efficiencies
- Increased Other Revenue Sources (athletic fee, fingerprinting)

In large part, the budget has been balanced in these prior fiscal years by not offering our employees meaningful, permanent salary increases. The following information shows salary increases for our employees and the impact on our market competitiveness.

Fiscal Year	Step	COLA	One-Time Bonus
2010	No	0.0%	0.0%
2011	No	0.0%	0.0%
2012	No	0.0%	0.0%
2013	Yes	0.0%	0.0%
2014	No	0.0%	2.5%
2015	No	0.0%	3.0%
2016	No	2.5%	1.0%

CCPS Salary Comparison

- Only Maryland local system with employees six steps behind experience
- One of the lowest beginning teacher salaries
- Rank of 20th or 18th at 5-year level
- Rank of 19th, 18th or 16th at 10-year level
- Rank of 21st in average teacher salary
- No scheduled step increase through FY16
- FY16 – First COLA since FY09

11. What is the impact of declining enrollment on educational services to students?

Students	Teachers	Schedules
Smaller elementary and middle school teams result in fewer options to place a student on a grade-level team.	Smaller schools often require more part-time teachers due to fewer course offerings; it is difficult to find teachers willing to work part time.	In general, there are fewer course options offered to students in smaller schools.
Smaller student populations result in more instructional levels in each class.	In smaller schools, more teachers teach outside of their certification areas.	Elective programs struggle in smaller schools. Participation in world languages, fine arts, career and technology education, physical education and health is difficult to sustain in smaller schools.
Fewer teachers make it challenging to find class/club advisors; as a result, students in smaller schools have fewer options for clubs than students in larger schools.	Teachers in smaller schools typically have more preparation than teachers in larger schools.	There are fewer complete programs offered in the smaller comprehensive schools.
Smaller schools find it difficult to field the full complement of athletic teams.	As staffing reductions are made commensurate with declining student enrollment, teachers feel a sense of less job security.	Smaller schools often need to run courses on an every-other-year basis in an attempt to have enough students sign up for the course.
As enrollments decline, fewer interventions for struggling students are available due to corresponding decreases in state aid (i.e., Community Learning Centers, high school crisis counselors, etc.)	Collaborative planning among teachers in like content areas in a building becomes challenging in smaller schools.	Students in smaller schools often are offered the chance to take a course not offered at their school at a larger school.
In smaller schools, it is difficult to separate students who are having conflict issues.		Attendance at CCC&TC is more difficult for students in smaller schools due to limited options of classes offered during mods 1 and 4.

12. What is the MGT of America Facility Utilization Study and what was its purpose?

In 2012 the Board directed staff to analyze the effective utilization of school facilities. The primary purpose of the study was not to recommend schools for closing but rather to determine the overall effective utilization of schools.

No consensus formed around the process and the Board decided to contract with MGT of America on May 8, 2013 to complete the study. MGT examined every school in the system, completed an online county-wide survey, and held town hall meetings throughout the county. They analyzed existing data (2012 enrollment figures and projections), created their own methodology, and issued a report to the Board in December 2013.

Taken directly from the MGT Report, "The goals of the Comprehensive Facility Utilization Study were:

- ♦ Complete detailed analysis of available functional space in all facilities.
- ♦ Examine and recommend student programs that maximize services and/or efficiencies and increase opportunities for student success.
- ♦ Examine and recommend non-student programs that serve CCPS student needs or common community interests.
- ♦ Examine the fiscal and operational impacts for all recommendations.
- ♦ Make recommendations for student program alignment and/or expansion, opportunities for non-student program actions, and facility utilization and/or consolidation.
- ♦ Define the processes and procedures necessary to implement all recommendations."

Thus, MGT did not analyze the question of closing schools relative to state and local revenue availability. The only fiscal analysis completed by MGT was specific to their recommendations in the report.

13. Was the MGT report considered in this process?

Yes, the MGT Report was considered as part of the BAC's analysis. MGT recommended a new K-8 school to replace Charles Carroll, William Winchester, and East Middle School. The School Board requested the K-8 school project in its FY15 CIP and the Commissioners voted in April 2013 not to fund the project. The lack of funding for the MGT recommended project was an important consideration in developing their recommendations.

MGT also recommended redistricting to balance enrollments across the system and to develop clean feeder patterns in the process. The BAC had similar goals in balancing enrollments across the school system and in improving feeder patterns, elementary to middle, elementary to high, and middle to high school. Superintendent Guthrie's final recommendation proposed a two-year process in which balanced enrollments will be addressed in the second year.

14. Did the BAC, Superintendent, and Board consider other grade configurations for schools?

Yes, the BAC did consider alternative grade level configurations, other than those which presently exist in CCPS. For example, the BAC analyzed concepts that included grade 6-12 schools, grade 7-12 schools, and grade K-8 models. Ultimately, the BAC did not endorse any of these models in its final report.

In large part, the reason for not recommending different grade configurations was the potential effect on the delivery of instructional programs. Such configurations would have been located inconsistently across the school system, impacting how we staff schools, provide professional development, and deliver instruction. The BAC concluded that the instructional goals of CCPS could be met differently through closing the schools recommended and by balancing enrollment for more consistent facility utilization across the system.

The Superintendent also considered alternative grade considerations and discussed them with the Board at the work sessions. The Superintendent and the Board concluded that alternative configurations were not viable if they created inconsistencies across the overall school system. Instructional programs should inform facility decisions and not the other way around.

15. What happens to a closed school and the school grounds?

Ultimately, it is a decision of the County Government. Under Maryland law, if a board of education determines that no school system use is required for the school or property, ownership transfers to the County.

There are no specific plans for any of the schools in the plan. In Superintendent's recommendation, he requested a joint committee between the Board of Education and the County Commissioners to begin this process.