MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
Preparing World-Class Students

Bernard J. Sadusky, Ed.D.
Interim State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • MarylandPublicSchools.org

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Bernard J. Sadusky, Ed.D.

DATE: May 22, 2012

SUBJECT: Approval of Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals (Restructuring Plans) for schools from Cecil, Baltimore, and Montgomery County Public Schools

---

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this action is to approve the alternative governance (AG) proposals for the following schools: Elkton Middle School (Cecil County); Deep Creek, Dundalk, White Oak, and Windsor Mill Middle Schools (Baltimore County) and Forest Oak and Neelsville Middle Schools) in Montgomery County.

BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:

In January 2002, President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Section 1116 (b)(8)(B) of this Act, in conjunction with COMAR 13A.01.04.07.C(3), places requirements on local education agencies (LEAs) with schools in the five levels of school improvement – Years 1, 2, 3 (corrective action), 4 (restructuring planning), and 5 (restructuring implementation). Years 4 and 5 coincide with Maryland's Differentiated Accountability Pilot as schools are designated "Priority" Comprehensive Needs schools or "Priority" Focused Needs schools. Schools in improvement must target their efforts on content areas and on students who are in greatest need and must develop detailed improvement plans designed to strengthen each subgroup's achievement.

Year 4 Priority Comprehensive Needs and Priority Focused Needs schools are required to select an alternative governance option under NCLB. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has developed Alternative Governance for School Improvement guidelines to lead schools through this process. Schools are asked to reflect on the action steps taken while in Year 3, involve representative school stakeholders in the planning process, create a School Academic Profile outlining changes to current strategies, and conduct a proactive analysis to identify potential challenges likely to be encountered during the implementation of the Alternative Governance model.

Although this may be the last year that Alternative Governance Plans are presented to the State Board, each LEA has been diligent in developing comprehensive plans that they intend to implement even though Maryland will likely operate under its new Flexibility Plan beginning with SY2012-2013.

The seven schools presenting today, in collaboration with central office officials, parents and school community stakeholders, have spent the last six months assessing school needs and preparing their Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals. Local Boards of Education and superintendents reviewed and approved each school's proposal prior to its submittal to the Maryland State Department of Education.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Under NCLB, there are three Alternative Governance Options:

1) Replace all or most of the school staff, including the school's principal, who are relevant to the school's failure to make AYP
2) Enter into a contract to have an outside organization with a record of effectiveness operate the school
3) Reopen the school as a charter school

Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff has been the most used alternative governance offered under NCLB for a number of reasons:

1) schools use this opportunity to strategically look at all staff to determine and replace those who may be relevant to the school not making AYP,
2) this is the only AG option that can be implemented in less than one year in order to have the school's proposal in place at the beginning of the school year following the school's designation as in restructuring planning, and
3) contracting with an outside organization and reopening a school as a charter school take a minimum of 18 months of planning which the schools do not have between the time of identification and NCLB's implementation requirement.

Based on Maryland experience, it is not the NCLB option that will bring a school out of improvement but the reforms and supporting action steps adopted and implemented with full fidelity by all staff and supported by the school's stakeholder community.

It is unknown at this point during the year of restructuring planning exactly how many staff will be replaced in the schools whose AG proposals you will be reviewing this spring. Please refer to the Attachment for information of changes to staffing patterns made over the last four years.

The following schools have submitted Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals:

Cecil County
Elkton MS   0303   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Baltimore County
Deep Creek MS   1557   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Dundalk MS   1251   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
White Oak MS   0923   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Windsor Mill MS   0256   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Montgomery County

Forest Oak MS	0248	Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Neelsville MS	0115	Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

In addition to selecting Option 1, each school has proposed to implement significant reforms and supporting action steps that they believe will increase student achievement and facilitate the school's exit from school improvement. Reform areas include: Reading/English and Mathematics/ Algebra Achievement, and School Culture and Structure. Sample action steps identified for student subgroups include:

<u>Reading Achievement – teachers will:</u>

- Participate in <u>job embedded professional development</u> through peer coaching, faculty meetings, and grade level department meetings. Student performance will be measured by Scantron Perfomance Series, curriculum based pre-assessments, and post assessments. Implementation of quality instruction will be monitored through teacher attendance, teacher evaluation and student achievement data.
- Develop <u>and implement a monitoring tool</u> that continually assesses cohort growth. Through the analysis of student work, ongoing assessments (short-cycle and benchmarks), and MSA, the monitoring tool will assess students' progress toward achieving the State Curriculum and BCPS curriculum standards, indicators, and objectives.
- Offering students the opportunity to participate in new courses. The school will add Lights, Camera, Literacy! to the student elective choices. This course increases literacy in both written and visual text, improves collaboration skills, builds confidence and motivation, and provides opportunities for high level thinking via specific strategies.

<u>Mathematics Achievement – teachers will:</u>

- Reevaluate, realign, and monitor a <u>master schedule</u> that provides common planning periods and the incorporation of a co-teaching model aligned to the students' identified academic needs. On a weekly basis, the leadership team (principal, assistant principals, DC, and mentor) will collect and review agenda copies and meeting notes from common planning meetings to document the frequency, content (use of Skill of the Week data and co-teaching model), and active participation in the collaborative planning. Once a quarter, this data will be cross-referenced with evaluative process data to determine if the master schedule responds to the instructional needs of the school.
- Participate in summer and on-going, <u>job-embedded PD</u> including collaborative planning, interdisciplinary team meetings that are aligned to math instruction. Staff will participate in professional development sessions every other school day guided by the full-time staff development teacher and MYP coordinator.
- Initiate an <u>Extended Learning Opportunities</u> (ELO) that focuses on turning the time after school into a positive enrichment experience. ELO provides afterschool additional instructional time for the students including hands on learning and bringing connections between traditional subjects and the real world through highly engaging projects.

School Culture and Structure – teachers will

- Develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate the expansion of <u>Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies schoolwide with a focus on improving students' organizational and college preparatory skills</u>. The AVID site team comprised of the AVID coordinator/elective teacher, Department Chairs from four core subject areas, one counselor, and one special educator will use the evaluative process data, anecdotal notes, and short-cycle and benchmark data to monitor student achievement.
- Develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate an <u>action team to function as a part of the focus on safe and orderly environment,</u> teacher-based management strategies, and culturally responsive instructional strategies. The leadership team (principal, assistant principals, DCs, and mentor), in collaboration with teachers, will be part of the governance process through their engagement in action teams.
- Establish a <u>mentoring program</u> for chronically ineligible students that includes weekly data chats between the student and mentor, using EDLINE and report card data to monitor progress, set weekly goals, and determine supports needed for success. Staff will be held accountable to increasing the number of eligible students and increasing positive stakeholder feedback as determined by stakeholder climate surveys and quarterly ineligibility data.
- Implementing an <u>attendance action plan</u> that includes increased pupil personnel worker support to the school. The attendance team will increase home visits and connect families to the community resources necessary to allow their child to attend school on a regular basis.

Baltimore, Cecil, and Montgomery Counties' reforms will be monitored through leadership teams, department chairs, central office personnel, and Alternative Governance Board meetings, and through School Improvement Plan reviews. Collaborative planning will be applied to classroom instruction as evidenced by lesson plans, walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, and monitored by data analysis of formative and summative student assessments. The analysis and next steps, as appropriate, will occur with the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, and reading resource teacher) and classroom teachers.

Last month, teams of local Alternative Governance Coordinators who are experts in school improvement planning and implementation, reviewed the Alternative Governance (AG) for School Improvement proposals from these four schools. As a result of the internal review, the adopted alternative governances are recommended for approval. Full copies of all AG for School Improvement Proposals are available in the 2012 AG Binder in the Caucus Room.

ACTION:

The State Board of Education is requested to approve the Alternative Governance for School Improvement proposals for the following schools adopting Option 1 – Replace Staff:

Cecil County
Elkton MS   0303   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Baltimore County
Deep Creek MS   1557   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Dundalk MS   1251   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
White Oak MS   0923   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Windsor Mill MS   0256   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Montgomery County
Forest Oak MS   0248   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Neelsville MS   0115   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

BJS:MEDL:tak

Attachment

Alternative Governance (AG) Staffing Patterns for Schools Replacing Personnel as Reported in MSDE's 2011-2012 Staffing Survey
May 2012

Data collection followed MSDE's official definitions of personnel.

Data Collected from Eight LEAs and 58 schools:

Anne Arundel (3)	Baltimore City (21)	Baltimore County (6)
Dorchester (1)	Harford (1)	Prince George's (24)
St. Mary's (1)	Wicomico (1)	

Survey Response Rate: 58 of possible 67 alternative governance schools responded

Year and number of schools approved by State Board:

2008 (27 schools)	2010 (11 schools)
2009 (9 schools)	2011 (11 schools)

Alternative Governance Options Selected By 58 schools

Option 1 – Replace Staff	40 schools
Option 2 – Education Management Co.	3
Option 3 – Charter	1
Option 4 – Appoint Distinguished Principal	14

2011-2012 Staffing Report – August 2011

Background Information

Staffing Patterns

- Administrative Staff (Principals, Assistant Principals, Etc.)
- Grade Level Instructional Staff In Core Tested MSA Or HSA Content Areas
- Other Classroom Teachers – Non Core Content Areas)
- Professional Academic Staff
- Student Services Staff

For each of the five classifications of staff, schools are asked to report on...
   a. individuals **retained** from the previous year,
   b. individuals **new to the school or changing positions within the school**, and
   c. individuals filling **newly created positions.**

Percent Change Calculation

Q. #	I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ANALYSIS:	Number
7	Number of RI schools opening with its allocated FTE positions fully staffed by the students' first day of school for the 2012 school year (SY)	25*
8	Number of RI schools opening with long term substitutes on the students' first day of 2012 SY	26*
9	Number of allocated FTE positions eliminated prior to the opening of the 2012 SY	170.9

Comments:

The breakdown of the total number of FTE positions eliminated:

Mentors/Coaches	19	
Teachers	13.2	
Paraprofessionals	3	
Special Education positions	3	
Student Services	2.5	
	40.7	40.7
Eliminated – no description		130.2
Total Eliminated Positions		170.9

* 7 schools misreported

Principal Changes:

Q. # 10	Number of Years SY 2011 Principals have served in Alternative Governance Schools by Year of State Board Approval	Year AG Plan was approved by State Board			
		2008	2009	2010	2011
	1 – Principal new this year or came during the last school year.	6	2	6	6
	2 – Principal in school for 1 year of Planning followed by 1 year of Restructuring Imp (RI)	1	2	1	0
	3 – Principal in the school for Planning and 2 years of RI	8	3	0	1
	4 – Principal in the school for Planning and 3 years of RI	4	1	3	0
	5 – Principal in the school for Planning and 4 or more years of RI	8	1	1	4
	Total Counts	**27**	**9**	**11**	**11**

Q. #	II. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF (principals, assistant principals, etc.)	Number
12	Number of allocated FTE administrators who were retained in the same positions from the previous SY – 2011	145
13	Number of allocated FTE administrators new to the school or changing positions within the school for the 2012 SY	32
14	Number of newly created allocated FTE administrators positions for the 2012 school year.	1
	Total Administrative FTE Staff Positions Reported	**178**

Q. #	III. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF IN CORE TESTED MSA or HSA CONTENT AREAS	Number
17	Number of allocated FTE Instructional staff who were <u>retained in the same positions</u> from the previous SY – 2011	830
18	Number of allocated FTE Instructional staff <u>new to the school or changing positions within the school</u> for the 2012 SY	299.59
19	Number of <u>newly created allocated</u> FTE Instructional staff positions for the 2012 school year.	39.41
	Total Instructional FTE Staff Positions in Core Content Areas Reported	1169

Q. #	IV. OTHER CLASSROOM TEACHERS (Not included in Section III above – core content area teachers)	Number
21	Number of allocated FTE other classroom teachers who were <u>retained in the same positions</u> from the previous SY – 2011	897.55
22	Number of allocated FTE other classroom teachers <u>new to the school or changing positions within the school</u> for the 2012 SY	232.69
23	Number of <u>newly created</u> allocated FTE other classroom teachers positions for the 2012 school year.	24.31
	Total Other FTE Classroom Teachers	1154.55

Q. #	V. PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF										
	Dept Chair/s	ESOL / ELL	Library /Media	Math Coach / Resource Teacher	Mentors	Prof Dev - Academic	Reading Coach / Resource Teacher	Sp Ed / Resource	Special Prog.	Other	Totals
25. Retained	40	36.35	29.9	8	6	17	21	178.7	34	6.5	377.45
26. New to school or position	7	5	11.6	1	5.4	5	3	37	6	4	85
27. Newly created positions	1	2	0.9	2	2	3	1	8	1	3.5	24.4
Total Professional Academic Staff Reported											486.85

Q #	V. STUDENT SERVICES STAFF													
	Attendance Monitors	Behavior Intervention	Guidance Counselor/s	Parent Liaison	Peer Mediator/s	PD - Student Services	Psychologist/s	Reg Paras	Sp Ed Paras	School Social Worker/s	Speech Path	Stud. Personnel Worker/s	Other	Totals
Retained	17.5	21	86	4	0	0	23.8	111.4	242.5	32.4	26.2	10.2	10	585
New to School	2.8	7	15	2	0	0	8.4	16	21	1.9	7.7	4.4	2	88.2
Newly Created	1	2	1.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	17	0	1	0	6	29.5
	Total Student Services Staff Reported													702.7

Percent and Range of Overall Staff Change (by grade level) from the 2010 school year.

Staff included in formula: Administrative, grade level instructional, professional academic, and student services staff.

Formula Abbreviations: NSP = new to the school or position
NCP = newly created position
RP = retained position

Percent of Change: Formula (Total NSP + total NCP) divided by the (total RP + total NSP + total NCP) equals: Percent of staff change from the previous year

Grade Levels	Number of Schools (n-58)	Median Percent of Change	Range of Percent Change
Pre-K to 5th	16	22.51	4.46 to 47.83
Pre-K to 8th	10	29.81	12.75 to 51.69
Middle Grades 6th -8th	16	22.64	15.70 to 55.55
Middle/High 6th to 12th	7	20.86	7.90 to 26.24
High 9th to 12th	9	14.60	6.98 to 41.90

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
Preparing World-Class Students

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • MarylandPublicSchools.org

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Bernard J. Sadusky, Ed.D.

DATE: May 22, 2012

SUBJECT: Approval of Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals
(Restructuring Plans) for schools from Cecil, Baltimore, and Montgomery County
Public Schools

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this action is to approve the alternative governance (AG) proposals for the
following schools: Elkton Middle School (Cecil County); Deep Creek, Dundalk, White Oak, and
Windsor Mill Middle Schools (Baltimore County) and Forest Oak and Neelsville Middle
Schools) in Montgomery County.

BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:

In January 2002, President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Section 1116
(b)(8)(B) of this Act, in conjunction with COMAR 13A.01.04.07.C(3), places requirements on
local education agencies (LEAs) with schools in the five levels of school improvement – Years
1, 2, 3 (corrective action), 4 (restructuring planning), and 5 (restructuring implementation). Years
4 and 5 coincide with Maryland's Differentiated Accountability Pilot as schools are designated
"Priority" Comprehensive Needs schools or "Priority" Focused Needs schools. Schools in
improvement must target their efforts on content areas and on students who are in greatest need
and must develop detailed improvement plans designed to strengthen each subgroup's
achievement.

Year 4 Priority Comprehensive Needs and Priority Focused Needs schools are required to select
an alternative governance option under NCLB. The Maryland State Department of Education
(MSDE) has developed Alternative Governance for School Improvement guidelines to lead
schools through this process. Schools are asked to reflect on the action steps taken while in Year
3, involve representative school stakeholders in the planning process, create a School Academic
Profile outlining changes to current strategies, and conduct a proactive analysis to identify
potential challenges likely to be encountered during the implementation of the Alternative
Governance model.

Although this may be the last year that Alternative Governance Plans are presented to the State
Board, each LEA has been diligent in developing comprehensive plans that they intend to
implement even though Maryland will likely operate under its new Flexibility Plan beginning
with SY2012-2013.

The seven schools presenting today, in collaboration with central office officials, parents and school community stakeholders, have spent the last six months assessing school needs and preparing their Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals. Local Boards of Education and superintendents reviewed and approved each school's proposal prior to its submittal to the Maryland State Department of Education.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Under NCLB, there are three Alternative Governance Options:

1) Replace all or most of the school staff, including the school's principal, who are relevant to the school's failure to make AYP
2) Enter into a contract to have an outside organization with a record of effectiveness operate the school
3) Reopen the school as a charter school

Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff has been the most used alternative governance offered under NCLB for a number of reasons:

1) schools use this opportunity to strategically look at all staff to determine and replace those who may be relevant to the school not making AYP,
2) this is the only AG option that can be implemented in less than one year in order to have the school's proposal in place at the beginning of the school year following the school's designation as in restructuring planning, and
3) contracting with an outside organization and reopening a school as a charter school take a minimum of 18 months of planning which the schools do not have between the time of identification and NCLB's implementation requirement.

Based on Maryland experience, it is not the NCLB option that will bring a school out of improvement but the reforms and supporting action steps adopted and implemented with full fidelity by all staff and supported by the school's stakeholder community.

It is unknown at this point during the year of restructuring planning exactly how many staff will be replaced in the schools whose AG proposals you will be reviewing this spring. Please refer to the Attachment for information of changes to staffing patterns made over the last four years.

The following schools have submitted Alternative Governance for School Improvement Proposals:

Cecil County
Elkton MS   0303   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Baltimore County
Deep Creek MS   1557   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Dundalk MS   1251   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
White Oak MS   0923   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Windsor Mill MS   0256   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Montgomery County

Forest Oak MS	0248	Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Neelsville MS	0115	Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

In addition to selecting Option 1, each school has proposed to implement significant reforms and supporting action steps that they believe will increase student achievement and facilitate the school's exit from school improvement. Reform areas include: Reading/English and Mathematics/ Algebra Achievement, and School Culture and Structure. Sample action steps identified for student subgroups include:

<u>*Reading Achievement – teachers will:*</u>

- Participate in <u>job embedded professional development</u> through peer coaching, faculty meetings, and grade level department meetings. Student performance will be measured by Scantron Perfomance Series, curriculum based pre-assessments, and post assessments. Implementation of quality instruction will be monitored through teacher attendance, teacher evaluation and student achievement data.
- Develop <u>and implement a monitoring tool</u> that continually assesses cohort growth. Through the analysis of student work, ongoing assessments (short-cycle and benchmarks), and MSA, the monitoring tool will assess students' progress toward achieving the State Curriculum and BCPS curriculum standards, indicators, and objectives.
- Offering students the opportunity to participate in new courses. The school will add Lights, Camera, Literacy! to the student elective choices. This course increases literacy in both written and visual text, improves collaboration skills, builds confidence and motivation, and provides opportunities for high level thinking via specific strategies.

<u>*Mathematics Achievement – teachers will:*</u>

- Reevaluate, realign, and monitor a <u>master schedule</u> that provides common planning periods and the incorporation of a co-teaching model aligned to the students' identified academic needs. On a weekly basis, the leadership team (principal, assistant principals, DC, and mentor) will collect and review agenda copies and meeting notes from common planning meetings to document the frequency, content (use of Skill of the Week data and co-teaching model), and active participation in the collaborative planning. Once a quarter, this data will be cross-referenced with evaluative process data to determine if the master schedule responds to the instructional needs of the school.
- Participate in summer and on-going, <u>job-embedded PD</u> including collaborative planning, interdisciplinary team meetings that are aligned to math instruction. Staff will participate in professional development sessions every other school day guided by the full-time staff development teacher and MYP coordinator.
- Initiate an <u>Extended Learning Opportunities</u> (ELO) that focuses on turning the time after school into a positive enrichment experience. ELO provides afterschool additional instructional time for the students including hands on learning and bringing connections between traditional subjects and the real world through highly engaging projects.

School Culture and Structure – teachers will

- Develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate the expansion of <u>Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) strategies schoolwide with a focus on improving students' organizational and college preparatory skills</u>. The AVID site team comprised of the AVID coordinator/elective teacher, Department Chairs from four core subject areas, one counselor, and one special educator will use the evaluative process data, anecdotal notes, and short-cycle and benchmark data to monitor student achievement.
- Develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate an <u>action team to function as a part of the focus on safe and orderly environment,</u> teacher-based management strategies, and culturally responsive instructional strategies. The leadership team (principal, assistant principals, DCs, and mentor), in collaboration with teachers, will be part of the governance process through their engagement in action teams.
- Establish a <u>mentoring program</u> for chronically ineligible students that includes weekly data chats between the student and mentor, using EDLINE and report card data to monitor progress, set weekly goals, and determine supports needed for success. Staff will be held accountable to increasing the number of eligible students and increasing positive stakeholder feedback as determined by stakeholder climate surveys and quarterly ineligibility data.
- Implementing an <u>attendance action plan</u> that includes increased pupil personnel worker support to the school. The attendance team will increase home visits and connect families to the community resources necessary to allow their child to attend school on a regular basis.

Baltimore, Cecil, and Montgomery Counties' reforms will be monitored through leadership teams, department chairs, central office personnel, and Alternative Governance Board meetings, and through School Improvement Plan reviews. Collaborative planning will be applied to classroom instruction as evidenced by lesson plans, walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, and monitored by data analysis of formative and summative student assessments. The analysis and next steps, as appropriate, will occur with the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, and reading resource teacher) and classroom teachers.

Last month, teams of local Alternative Governance Coordinators who are experts in school improvement planning and implementation, reviewed the Alternative Governance (AG) for School Improvement proposals from these four schools. As a result of the internal review, the adopted alternative governances are recommended for approval. Full copies of all AG for School Improvement Proposals are available in the 2012 AG Binder in the Caucus Room.

ACTION:

The State Board of Education is requested to approve the Alternative Governance for School Improvement proposals for the following schools adopting Option 1 – Replace Staff:

Cecil County
Elkton MS   0303   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Baltimore County
Deep Creek MS   1557   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Dundalk MS   1251   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
White Oak MS   0923   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Windsor Mill MS   0256   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

Montgomery County
Forest Oak MS   0248   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff
Neelsville MS   0115   Option 1 – Replace all or most of the school staff

BJS:MEDL:tak

Attachment

Alternative Governance (AG) Staffing Patterns for Schools Replacing Personnel as Reported in MSDE's 2011-2012 Staffing Survey
May 2012

Data collection followed MSDE's official definitions of personnel.

Data Collected from Eight LEAs and 58 schools:

Anne Arundel (3)	Baltimore City (21)	Baltimore County (6)
Dorchester (1)	Harford (1)	Prince George's (24)
St. Mary's (1)	Wicomico (1)	

Survey Response Rate: 58 of possible 67 alternative governance schools responded

Year and number of schools approved by State Board:

2008 (27 schools)	2010 (11 schools)
2009 (9 schools)	2011 (11 schools)

Alternative Governance	Option 1 – Replace Staff	40 schools
Options Selected	Option 2 – Education Management Co.	3
By 58 schools	Option 3 – Charter	1
	Option 4 – Appoint Distinguished Principal	14

2011-2012 Staffing Report – August 2011

Background Information

Staffing Patterns

- Administrative Staff (Principals, Assistant Principals, Etc.)
- Grade Level Instructional Staff In Core Tested MSA Or HSA Content Areas
- Other Classroom Teachers – Non Core Content Areas)
- Professional Academic Staff
- Student Services Staff

For each of the five classifications of staff, schools are asked to report on...
   a. individuals **retained** from the previous year,
   b. individuals **new to the school or changing positions within the school**, and
   c. individuals filling **newly created positions.**

Percent Change Calculation

Q. #	I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ANALYSIS:	Number
7	Number of RI schools opening with its allocated FTE positions fully staffed by the students' first day of school for the 2012 school year (SY)	25*
8	Number of RI schools opening with long term substitutes on the students' first day of 2012 SY	26*
9	Number of allocated FTE positions eliminated prior to the opening of the 2012 SY	170.9
	Comments: The breakdown of the total number of FTE positions eliminated:	

Mentors/Coaches	19	
Teachers	13.2	
Paraprofessionals	3	
Special Education positions	3	
Student Services	2.5	
	40.7	40.7
Eliminated – no description		130.2
Total Eliminated Positions		170.9

* 7 schools misreported

Principal Changes:

Q. # 10	Number of Years SY 2011 Principals have served in Alternative Governance Schools by Year of State Board Approval	Year AG Plan was approved by State Board			
		2008	2009	2010	2011
	1 – Principal new this year or came during the last school year.	6	2	6	6
	2 – Principal in school for 1 year of Planning followed by 1 year of Restructuring Imp (RI)	1	2	1	0
	3 – Principal in the school for Planning and 2 years of RI	8	3	0	1
	4 – Principal in the school for Planning and 3 years of RI	4	1	3	0
	5 – Principal in the school for Planning and 4 or more years of RI	8	1	1	4
	Total Counts	**27**	**9**	**11**	**11**

Q. #	II. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF (principals, assistant principals, etc.)	Number
12	Number of allocated FTE administrators who were retained in the same positions from the previous SY – 2011	145
13	Number of allocated FTE administrators new to the school or changing positions within the school for the 2012 SY	32
14	Number of newly created allocated FTE administrators positions for the 2012 school year.	1
	Total Administrative FTE Staff Positions Reported	**178**

Q. #	III. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF IN CORE TESTED MSA or HSA CONTENT AREAS	Number
17	Number of allocated FTE Instructional staff who were <u>retained in the same positions</u> from the previous SY – 2011	830
18	Number of allocated FTE Instructional staff <u>new to the school or changing positions within the school</u> for the 2012 SY	299.59
19	Number of <u>newly created allocated</u> FTE Instructional staff positions for the 2012 school year.	39.41
	Total Instructional FTE Staff Positions in Core Content Areas Reported	**1169**

Q. #	IV. OTHER CLASSROOM TEACHERS (Not included in Section III above – core content area teachers)	Number
21	Number of allocated FTE other classroom teachers who were <u>retained in the same positions</u> from the previous SY – 2011	897.55
22	Number of allocated FTE other classroom teachers <u>new to the school or changing positions within the school</u> for the 2012 SY	232.69
23	Number of <u>newly created</u> allocated FTE other classroom teachers positions for the 2012 school year.	24.31
	Total Other FTE Classroom Teachers	**1154.55**

Q. #	V. PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF										
	Dept Chair/s	ESOL / ELL	Library /Media	Math Coach / Resource Teacher	Mentors	Prof Dev - Academic	Reading Coach / Resource Teacher	Sp Ed / Resource	Special Prog.	Other	Totals
25. Retained	40	36.35	29.9	8	6	17	21	178.7	34	6.5	377.45
26. New to school or position	7	5	11.6	1	5.4	5	3	37	6	4	85
27. Newly created positions	1	2	0.9	2	2	3	1	8	1	3.5	24.4
	Total Professional Academic Staff Reported										**486.85**

Q #	V. STUDENT SERVICES STAFF													
	Attend-ance Monitors	Behavior Interven-tion	Guidance Counselor /s	Parent Liaison	Peer Mediator/s	PD - Student Services	Psycho-logist/s	Reg Paras	Sp Ed Paras	School Social Worker /s	Speech Path	Stud. Person-nel Worker /s	Other	Totals
Retained	17.5	21	86	4	0	0	23.8	111.4	242.5	32.4	26.2	10.2	10	585
New to School	2.8	7	15	2	0	0	8.4	16	21	1.9	7.7	4.4	2	88.2
Newly Created	1	2	1.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	17	0	1	0	6	29.5
Total Student Services Staff Reported														702.7

Percent and Range of Overall Staff Change (by grade level) from the 2010 school year.

Staff included in formula: Administrative, grade level instructional, professional academic, and student services staff.

Formula Abbreviations: NSP = new to the school or position
NCP = newly created position
RP = retained position

Percent of Change: (Total NSP + total NCP) divided by the (total RP + total NSP + total
Formula NCP) equals: Percent of staff change from the previous year

Grade Levels	Number of Schools (n-58)	Median Percent of Change	Range of Percent Change
Pre-K to 5th	16	22.51	4.46 to 47.83
Pre-K to 8th	10	29.81	12.75 to 51.69
Middle Grades 6th -8th	16	22.64	15.70 to 55.55
Middle/High 6th to 12th	7	20.86	7.90 to 26.24
High 9th to 12th	9	14.60	6.98 to 41.90