


**COST AND PERFORMANCE OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY
PUBLIC SCHOOLS' HIGH SCHOOL CONSORTIA**



OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT
REPORT NUMBER 2009-4

November 25, 2008

Elaine Bonner-Tompkins
Kristen Latham

**COST AND PERFORMANCE OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS’
HIGH SCHOOL CONSORTIA
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT REPORT 2009-4
NOVEMBER 25, 2008**

The purpose of this Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) report is to improve the Council’s understanding of the costs and performance results associated with Montgomery County Public Schools’ two high school consortiums: the Northeast Consortium and the Downcounty Consortium.

Overview of the Consortia

The MCPS Board of Education developed the two high school consortiums to address overcrowding, support integration, improve student achievement, and narrow the achievement gap in the eastern portion of the County. MCPS uses three main strategies to implement the high school consortiums: Signature Programs, Freshmen Academies, and Student Choice.

Signature Programs: MCPS currently offers signature programs and academies in 23 of its 24 comprehensive high schools. The chart below lists the signature programs for the consortia high schools.

Consortium	High School	Signature and Academy Programs
Northeast Consortium	Blake	Humanities and Public Service, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, Business and Consumer Services
	Paint Branch	Science and Media, Finance, Engineering Technology, Child Development and Education, NJROTC, and Restaurant Management
	Springbrook	International Studies and Technology
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	Human Services, Entrepreneurship, Media Literacy, Science, Math and Technology and International Studies
	Einstein	Finance, International Studies, and Visual and Performing Arts
	Kennedy	International Studies, Multimedia and Telecommunications, Sports Medicine and Management, and NJROTC
	Northwood	Environmental Sciences, Political Science and Public Advocacy, Humanities and Film, and Musical Theater
	Wheaton	Information Technology, Engineering, and Biosciences and Medicine, and Global and Cultural Studies

Freshmen Academies: Seven of the eight consortia high schools house freshmen academies aimed at improving the performance of Grade 9 students. Common features of the academies include:

- Smaller learning communities with dedicated faculty;
- Double period literacy and mathematics courses for students two or more grades behind; and
- A freshman seminar that introduces students to career and higher education options.

Student Choice: The choice process encourages students to rank high schools based on their interest in the schools’ signature programs. MCPS guarantees students assignment to their base school if it is their first choice or it is their second choice and their first choice is not available. MCPS assigns students to schools based on students’ ranking of choices, the number of students selecting their base school, the capacities of high schools, gender, and the socioeconomic status of students. MCPS also offers bus service to students who attend consortia high schools outside of their base areas.

Student Enrollment

From FY05 to FY08, approximately 14,000 or a third of all MCPS high school students were enrolled in a Northeast or Downcounty Consortium high school. Currently, a third (5,044) of the high school consortia students are enrolled in schools outside of their home school areas. In FY08, 90% of consortia students received their first choice school and half selected their home school as their top choice.

Marginal Costs of the Consortia

In FY09, MCPS budgeted \$3.2 million for the high school consortia; County dollars fund 90% of total consortia costs. The chart below summarizes current staffing for the high school consortia and current and cumulative costs since FY98. The amounts listed represent the marginal costs of the consortia, that is, the additional expenses incurred as a result of offering the consortia programs and option of school choice.

The estimated 11-year cumulative cost of the high school consortia (from FY98-09) totals \$27.4 million. The County funded 77% of this amount, and federal grants totaling \$6.3 millions paid for the other 23%.

Cost Categories	FY09 Staffing	FY09 Budget	FY1998-FY2009 Cumulative Costs
Northeast Consortium	6.1 teachers	\$963,000	\$11.6 million
Downcounty Consortium	5.6 teachers	\$891,000	\$7.0 million
Division of Transportation	14,776 bus operator hours	\$856,000	\$4.8 million
Division of Consortia (field office)	3.6 positions	\$532,000	\$4.0 million
Total	15.3 FTE's	\$3.2 million	\$27.4 million

Trends in Racial and Socio-economic Integration

The demographic data in the table below show that neither consortium reversed minority isolation nor improved socio-economic integration. For the most part, the decreases in White enrollment among consortia high schools mirrored trends experienced among all MCPS high schools. However, consortia increases among students *ever* eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Meals exceeded districtwide trends.

High Schools	Percent White Enrollment			Percent Ever FARMS*		
	FY99	FY08	Change	FY99	FY08	Change
All MCPS	52.2%	42.1%	-10.1%	32.5%	38.9%	6.4%
Blake	43.2%	37.3%	-5.9%	32.9%	36.5%	3.9%
Paint Branch	40.2%	22.5%	-17.7%	28.1%	43.7%	15.6%
Springbrook	27.5%	14.5%	-13.0%	43.1%	56.2%	13.1%
	FY05	FY08	Change	FY05	FY08	Change
All MCPS	46.2%	42.1%	-4.1%	36.4%	38.9%	2.5%
Montgomery Blair	27.2%	25.4%	-1.8%	52.7%	53.1%	0.4%
Einstein	26.2%	22.6%	-3.6%	60.2%	65.6%	5.4%
Kennedy	17.4%	12.4%	-5.0%	63.3%	67.8%	4.5%
Northwood	30.1%	25.4%	-4.7%	49.7%	56.0%	6.3%
Wheaton	15.3%	10.7%	-4.6%	78.3%	81.4%	3.1%

* Refers to students who have ever received free or reduced priced meals.

Trends in Student Performance

The tables below summarize consortia trends for student performance. In sum, the **Northeast Consortium** achieved mixed progress in improving student performance on five measures that generally aligned with the progress made by all MCPS high schools. The **Downcounty Consortium** achieved progress on seven of ten measures of student performance and exceeded the gains made by all MCPS high schools on five of these measures.

Summary of Northeast Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9	FY99-FY03	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-FY07	No	Less progress
2. Increase percent of graduates who take at least one Advanced Placement (AP) exam	FY00-FY04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-FY07	Yes	Same progress
3. Increase percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score	FY00-FY04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-FY07	Yes	Less progress
4. Increase percent of graduates who take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	FY98-FY01	Yes	Greater progress
	FY01-FY05	No	Less progress
	FY06-FY08	No	Same progress
5. Increase SAT scores of graduates	FY98-FY01	No	Same progress
	FY01-FY05	Yes	Same progress
	FY06-FY08	No	Same progress

Summary of Downcounty Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase student promotion rate from Grade 9 to 10	FY05-FY08	Yes	Greater progress
2. Decrease freshmen course failure rate by subgroup	FY04-FY08	No	Less progress
3. Increase freshmen grade point average by subgroup	FY04-FY08	No	Less progress
4. Decrease student ineligibility by subgroup*	FY04-FY08	Yes	Greater progress
5. Increase student promotion rate from Gr. 9 to graduation	FY05-FY08	Yes	Greater progress
6. Increase graduation rate	FY04-FY07	No	Less progress
7. Increase AP participation among graduates by subgroup	FY04-FY07	Yes	Same progress
8. Increase AP performance among graduates by subgroup	FY04-FY07	Yes	Same progress
9. Increase SAT participation among graduate by subgroup	FY06-FY08	Yes	Greater progress
10. Increase SAT scores among graduates by subgroup	FY06-FY08	Yes	Greater progress

* Refers to ineligibility data for all high school students, not just freshmen.

Recommended Discussion Issues

OLO recommends the Council discuss the following issues with representatives from the Board of Education and Montgomery County Public Schools.

Issue #1: Assessing the investment in MCPS' high school consortiums.

Since FY98, MCPS has spent an estimated \$27.4 million on the consortiums; local dollars have funded 77% of total costs. About 90% of consortia students receive their first school choice and currently, 5,044 consortia students attend schools outside of their base areas. Each consortium has achieved some progress in improving student achievement, but neither has improved racial or socio-economic integration. Given this context, OLO recommends two questions for discussion:

- Has the investment in the two high school consortiums been “worth it”?
- What plans (if any) does MCPS have to change the approach to operating the consortiums?

Issue #2: The high school consortiums as a strategy for meeting the extra-learning needs of students in the “red-zone.”

To improve the Council’s understanding of how MCPS targets resources to meet the extra-learning needs of secondary students at-risk, OLO recommends the following questions for discussion:

- Does MCPS consider the high school consortiums a strategy for meeting the extra-learning needs of secondary students in the red-zone?
- What other MCPS initiatives target secondary students in the red-zone and with what impacts?

Issue #3: MCPS' practices with respect to grant-funded positions.

MCPS was awarded \$6.4 million in federal funds to support the high school consortiums and subsequently received local funding to continue ten positions initially funded with federal grants. With respect to grant-funded positions, OLO recommends the following questions for discussion:

- What are MCPS' policies and practices for determining whether County-funding should replace grant-funding when a grant ends?
- What is MCPS' record over the past five years in terms of eliminating grant-funded positions at the end of the grant period?

Issue #4: The potential fiscal, enrollment, and performance impact of discontinuing the high school consortiums.

OLO recommends the following discussion questions to clarify the potential cost savings and changes in student enrollment and performance that may result from discontinuing the consortiums:

- In addition to the \$3.2 million in savings identified by OLO, does MCPS see the potential for additional savings if the two high school consortiums were discontinued?
- In what ways does MCPS anticipate student performance would be affected?
- Would ending the consortiums necessitate formal boundary studies for each campus? If so, what would be the associated cost, timing, and process?

For a complete copy of OLO-Report 2009-494, go to: www.montgomerycountymd.gov/olo

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT REPORT 2009-4
Costs and Performance of Montgomery County Public Schools'
High School Consortia

Executive Summary

I.	Authority, Scope, and Organization.....	1
II.	Background	4
III.	Implementation and Operations	10
IV.	Marginal Costs and Funding	16
V.	School Assignment Process and Trends.....	32
VI.	Consortia Demographics and Performance.....	39
VII.	Summary of Findings.....	52
VIII.	Recommended Discussion Issues	60
IX.	Agency Comments	64

List of Appendices (see page viii)

LIST OF TABLES

Number	Tables	Begins on Page
CHAPTER II		
1	Northeast Consortium Timeline	6
2	Downcounty Consortium Timeline	8
CHAPTER IV		
3	MCPS Budget and Staffing Data Sources by High School Consortia Cost Category	17
4	Total High School Consortia Costs, FY98-09	18
5	Annual High School Consortia Costs, FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	19
6	Budgeted Costs by Funding Source for the Northeast Consortium, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	21
7	Annual Budgeted Costs for the Northeast Consortium FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	22
8	Northeast Consortium Budgeted Local Costs, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	24
9	Budgeted Costs for the Downcounty Consortium, Total FY03-09 (\$ in 000s)	25
10	Annual Downcounty Consortium Budgeted Costs, FY03-09 (\$ in 000s)	25
11	Downcounty Consortium Budgeted Local Costs, Total FY04-09 (\$ in 000s)	26
12	MCPS Calculations of Additional Buses for High School Consortia, FY08	27
13	MCPS Calculations of Costs Associated with Additional Buses for High School Consortia, FY99-09 (\$ in 000s)	28
14	Division of Consortia Personnel and Allocation to High School Consortia Functions, FY98-09	29
15	Budgeted Costs by Funding Source for the Division of Consortia for High School Consortia Functions, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	30
16	Division of Consortia Budgeted Costs for High School Consortia Functions, FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)	30
17	MCPS Program Budget and Additional Costs of High School Consortia, FY09	31

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

Number	Tables	Begins on Page
CHAPTER V		
18	Choice Application Process Timeline, FY09	32
19	Round 1 Student Choice Trends by High School Consortium, FY04-08	34
20	High School Enrollment for MCPS and by Consortium, FY05-09	35
21	High School Enrollment Compared to CIP Program Capacity, FY08	35
22	Base Area Student Enrollment by Consortium School, FY05-09	36
23	Non-Base Area and Outside Student Enrollment by Consortium School, FY05-09	37
CHAPTER VI		
24	Demographics of Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-02	40
25	Demographics of Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY03-08	41
26	FARMS Eligibility Rates for Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08	42
27	Ever FARMS Eligibility Rates for Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08	42
28	Demographics of MCPS and Downcounty Consortium High Schools, FY04-08	43
29	Summary of Northeast Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals	47
30	Summary of Downcounty Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals	49
CHAPTER VII		
31	High School Enrollment for MCPS and by Consortium, FY05-09	55
32	Round 1 Student Choice Trends by High School Consortium, FY04-08	56
33	Base and Non-Base Area Student Enrollment by Consortium, FY05-09	56
34	White Enrollment for MCPS and Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08	57
35	Ever FARMS Enrollment for MCPS and Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08	57
36	Demographics of MCPS and Downcounty Consortium High Schools, FY04-08	58
37	Summary of Northeast Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals	59
38	Summary of Downcounty Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals	59
CHAPTER VIII		
39	Estimated Marginal Costs of High School Consortia, FY09	62

LIST OF EXHIBITS AND CHARTS

Number	EXHIBIT	Page
	CHAPTER IV	
1	High School Consortia Budget as a Percentage of High School Instruction Program Budget, FY09	20

CHARTS		
	CHAPTER VII	
1	Student Performance Goals by Federal Grant for High School Consortia	54
2	Signature Programs by Consortia High School	54

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Appendix Name	Begins on ©
A	Detailed Cost Tables for High School Consortia	1
B	Description of High School Consortia Progress on Consortia Goals	25
C	OLO memorandum to the Education Committee, May 7, 2008 re: Update of Data on MCPS Per Student Costs	48
D	Office of Legislative Oversight Bibliography	55
E	Base Area Maps for Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums	62

CHAPTER I: Authority, Scope, and Organization

A. Authority

Council Resolution 16-673, *FY 2009 Work Program for the Office of Legislative Oversight*, adopted July 29, 2008.

B. Scope, Purpose, and Methodology

The purpose of this Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) report is to improve the Council's understanding of the costs and results associated with Montgomery County Public Schools' two high school consortiums. The Northeast Consortium became operational in 1998 and consists of three high schools: Paint Branch, Springbrook, and James Hubert Blake. The Downcounty Consortium became operational in 2004 and consists of five high schools: Montgomery Blair, Albert Einstein, John F. Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton.

The Board of Education identified specific goals and objectives associated with the establishment of each high school consortium. For example, the stated goals of the Downcounty Consortium include increasing rates of student retention from 9th to 10th grade, increasing SAT scores, and decreasing the percent of freshmen who fail one or more courses.

This OLO report compiles available data and information on both high school consortiums to:

- Review funding sources and cumulative costs for each consortium;
- Describe the goals and measurable objectives for each consortium;
- Analyze changes in student performance among consortia high schools; and
- Report trends in student demographics among consortia high schools since the establishment of each consortium.

The report concludes with findings and recommendations for Council discussion to enhance the Council's oversight of County resources appropriated for high school instruction and the high school consortia in particular.

Methodology: OLO Senior Legislative Analyst Elaine Bonner-Tompkins and Legislative Analyst Kristen Latham prepared this report with production assistance from Teri Busch. OLO's method for developing this report was to:

- Consult with key MCPS staff
- Review the federal grant proposals for each consortium;
- Review Board of Education and MCPS' records regarding the decision to establish the consortiums; and
- Compile and analyze the relevant budget, student enrollment, demographic, and performance data provided by MCPS.

C. Organization of Report

Chapter II, Background, describes the changes in student enrollment, planning activities, and Board of Education decisions that led to the formation of each consortium.

Chapter III, Implementation and Operations, provides an overview of the federal grants initially used to implement each consortium, the stated objectives of each consortium, and how MCPS has implemented the high school consortiums to reach their intended goals.

Chapter IV, Marginal Costs and Funding, describes the additional costs and sources of funding associated with operating the Northeast Consortium and Downcounty Consortium, including the additional costs of bus transportation.

Chapter V, School Assignment Process and Trends, describes the school choice process and trends in student choice, assignment, and enrollment for consortia high schools.

Chapter VI, Consortia Demographics and Performance, describes changes in student demographics and tracks trends in student performance for each high school consortium.

Chapter VII, Summary of Findings, presents OLO's key project findings in four areas – costs and funding, consortia goals and strategies, trends in school choice and enrollment, and trends in student performance.

Chapter VIII, Recommended Discussion Issues, concludes this report with a set of recommended discussion issues aimed at improving the Council's oversight of funds appropriated to MCPS for the consortiums.

The **Appendix** includes data tables and analysis, a list of resources used in this report, and base area maps for the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums.

D. Acknowledgements

OLO received a high level of cooperation from everyone involved in this study. In particular, OLO appreciates the assistance of Mr. Larry Bowers, Chief Operating Officer, and Dr. Frieda Lacey, Deputy Superintendent of Schools. We also acknowledge the MCPS staff listed below who provided invaluable assistance with this project.

Mr. Erick Lang
Mr. Marty Creel
Dr. Marshall Spatz
Ms. Carol Mathews
Ms. Nicola Diamond
Mr. Bruce Crispell
Ms. Jeannie Franklin
Dr. Stacy Scott
Dr. Clare Von Secker

Ms. Suzanne Raber
Mr. Robert Doody
Mr. David McCoy
Mr. John Matthews
Mr. Todd Watkins
Mr. Jack Dodson
Ms. Loretta Hornbeck
Ms. Regina Powell

We greatly appreciate the time and effort extended to OLO to improve our understanding of this important issue.

E. Key Terms and Definitions

OLO used the following terminology in this report to describe subgroups of students by race, ethnicity, and service group status.

- **Asian** refers to students who refer to themselves as Asian or Asian American.
- **Black** refers to students who refer to themselves as Black/Non-Hispanic or African American. To be consistent with other groups, Black is capitalized throughout the report.
- **Latino** refers to students who refer to themselves as either Latino or Hispanic. Latino students can be of any race (e.g., White, Black, or Asian).
- **White** refers to students who refer to themselves as White/Non-Hispanic or Caucasian. To be consistent with other groups, White is capitalized throughout the report.
- **Students receiving free and reduced price meals (FARMS)** are students who are currently receiving free and reduced price meals. These students are also referred to as “low-income” students in the report.
- **Students ever receiving free and reduced price meals (ever FARMS)** are students who have ever received free and reduced price meals.

OLO also used the following terms to describe key aspects of MCPS' high school consortia.

- **Base area high school** refers to a student's “home” high school within a consortium. Although each consortium combines high school clusters into a consortium, each student has a base area high school based on where they live (i.e., home high school). MCPS guarantees student assignment to their base area high school if: (a) it is their first choice, (b) it is their second choice and they did not receive their first choice, or (c) they did not participate in the school choice application process.
- **Non-base area high schools** refer to high schools outside of a student's base area, but within their consortium. For example, a student residing within the base area for Paint Branch high school has two non-base area high schools within their (Northeast) consortium: Blake and Springbrook high schools. MCPS does not guarantee consortia student assignments to non-base area schools.
- **Signature programs and academies** refer to specialized programs offered by comprehensive high schools that aim to integrate a specific focus or theme into some portion of the school's curriculum. Some high schools adopt a school-wide signature focus; others have created themed academies to engage students through small learning communities. All but one of MCPS' comprehensive high schools (Whitman) offers one or more signature or academy programs, including each high school within the Northeast and Downcounty Consortia.

CHAPTER II: Background

MCPS' high school consortiums provide students residing within each consortium the opportunity to choose the high school they would like to attend. The Northeast Consortium became operational in 1998 with the opening of James Hubert Blake High School and the combining of the Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook high school clusters. The Downcounty Consortium became operational in 2004 with the reopening of Northwood High School and the combining of the Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton clusters.

This chapter describes the planning activities and Board of Education decisions that led to the formation of each consortium:

- **Part A, Enrollment and Demographics in the Eastern Area of the County**, describes the enrollment and demographic patterns that led to the creation of the two consortiums;
- **Part B, Origins of the Northeast Consortium**, describes the committees and Board actions that led to the formation of this consortium; and
- **Part C, Origins of the Downcounty Consortium**, describes the committees and Board actions that led to the formation of this consortium.

In sum, the Board of Education developed the two high school consortiums to address overcrowding, reduce minority isolation, improve student achievement, and narrow the achievement gap by race, ethnicity, and income in the eastern portion of Montgomery County.

A. Enrollment and Demographics in the Eastern Area of the County

During the 1980's and 1990's, MCPS' enrollment and diversity of the student body increased significantly. From 1984 to 1994, MCPS' total enrollment increased by 28% from 91,704 to 117,082 students. During this time frame, students of color (i.e., Black, Latino, Asian, and Native American students) increased from 29% of all MCPS students in 1984 to 43% of all MCPS students in 1994.

The increases in student enrollment and diversity, particularly in the eastern portion of the County, created a double challenge for the Board of Education: How could MCPS (a) relieve overcrowding and (b) increase voluntarily integration within the eastern portion of the county whose school-age population was increasingly minority-majority? A summary of the Board policies that shaped their decision making follows.

Overcrowding. The Board of Education's Long-Range Educational Facilities Planning Policy states that the Board can initiate a boundary study to reassign students from overcrowded schools to schools with excess capacity.¹ Boundary studies, however, can be contentious, often resulting in "winners" and "losers," defined as students assigned to schools that are perceived as more or less desirable. Moreover, boundary studies can be insufficient for remedying severe overcrowding if additional classrooms or schools are needed.

¹ Board of Education Policy FAA-RA, Long Range Planning Policy, Revised June 8, 2008

Integration. The Board's Policy on Quality Integrated Education states that the Board can take reasonable measures to enhance the diversity of student enrollment.² In particular, MCPS can:

- Monitor and regulate all interschool transfer requests from parents pursuant to the transfer policy;
- Plan for balanced school populations when facility space needs require change in service areas, including consideration of socioeconomic diversity;
- Consider the acquisition of school sites that have the potential to maintain or improve diversity, including socioeconomic diversity;
- Pair, cluster, or create consortia of schools; and
- Implement magnet and special programs.

Historically, the Board has developed magnet programs and used school pairing to attract or stabilize White student populations when there was a risk of racial or ethnic isolation occurring at a school. However, the potential impact of this option was limited for the eastern area of the County since many of the area high schools were minority-majority campuses by the late 1980's.

Ultimately, the Board's approach to enhancing integration in the eastern portion of the County included elements of each of the policy options summarized above. However, as described in the next sections, the Board's ability to promote racial integration was diminished by the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision that prohibited MCPS from using race or ethnicity as a factor in student transfers.³

B. Origins of the Northeastern Consortium

Table 1 on the next page summarizes the activities that led to the formation of the Northeast Consortium and reflect the Board's commitment to open an integrated new high school (James Hubert Blake) in the eastern portion of the County that lessened minority isolation at Paint Branch and Springbrook high schools.

In 1991, community and MCPS staff planning was initiated with two community advisory committees to address overcrowding in the eastern portion of the County.⁴ The first committee reviewed the option of wholesale redistricting in 1992 and rejected it as "undesirable and unworkable, given the demographic characteristics of the eastern part of the County and the rapidly rising enrollment throughout the County."⁵ In 1992, the Board also determined that redistricting would "not serve the best interests of students" and would "cause massive disruption throughout the County for non-discernible benefit."⁶

² Board of Education Policy ACD, Quality Integrated Education, Board Resolution 401-93, May 17, 1993

³ *Eisenberg v. Montgomery County Public Schools (1999)*; also *Tuttle v. Arlington County School Board (2000)* struck down the Arlington County School Board's policy of using race in public school admissions.

⁴ The timeline presented in Table 1 is based in part from Superintendent Paul Vance's memo to the Board of Education on "Northeast Area High School Solutions" - November 25, 1996.

⁵ Board Resolution 288-92 - April 14, 1992

⁶ *Ibid*

Table 1: Northeast Consortium Timeline

Year	Planning Activities and Events
1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCPS initiates planning based on County Council request for plan for secondary space in the eastern part of the County.
1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Area Study Group convenes representing nine clusters.
1993	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of Education amends FY 1993-98 Capital Improvement Program to include new northeast area high school. Board adopts Policy Framework for Eastern Area Facilities that includes formation of two high school consortiums.
1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Area Boundary Committee convenes and recommends “controlled choice” for assigning students to new Northeast High School, Paint Branch, Sherwood, and Springbrook.
1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controlled Choice Study Group convenes.
1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Controlled Choice Planning Team convenes. Board drops Sherwood from planned Northeast Consortium and adopts Preferred Choice approach to student assignment.
1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary study convened for Sherwood cluster. MCPS develops base areas for Northeast Consortium high schools.⁷
1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> James Blake High School opens. MCPS awarded 3-year federal grant for Northeast Consortium. Northeast Consortium schools enroll first cohort of 9th and 10th graders.
1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eisenberg and Tuttle decisions from 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals prohibit MCPS from using race or ethnicity as a factor in student transfers.

In 1993, the Board developed its policy framework for Eastern Area Facilities Decisions to achieve four major goals:⁸

1. The construction of a new high school to relieve overcrowding at Paint Branch, Sherwood, and Springbrook;
2. The construction of a replacement facility for Montgomery Blair;
3. The construction of major additions and modernizations at five other eastern high schools; and
4. The establishment of two high school consortiums.

The Board’s policy framework noted that each consortium was viewed as “as an innovative approach to sharing resources, disseminating information, and learning from the achievements of each individual school to scale up best practices.” Each consortium was also viewed as a strategy for addressing “special concerns about program and resource equity” associated with magnets by building upon the successes of the magnet initiatives and sharing these successes within the Eastern clusters.

⁷ See Appendix E for map of Northeast Consortium high schools’ base areas.

⁸ Board Resolution 278-93 - March 22, 1993

In 1994, the Board's policy framework and recommendations from the community planning groups helped to form a comprehensive plan for high school space in nine clusters in the eastern portion of Montgomery County. One critical feature of this plan was the use of a controlled choice process to assign students to consortia schools. Several community and staff based groups met in 1995 and 1996 to explore this option and a public information campaign was launched to inform the northeast communities about controlled choice and to elicit their views.

In 1996, the Board dropped Sherwood from the Northeast Consortium and authorized a separate boundary study for that campus in response to community concerns.⁹ The Board also adopted the preferred choice model to guarantee a base school assignment for students while providing choice among other high schools.¹⁰

To stabilize and equalize enrollment across the Northeast Consortium, the Board also resolved that the student assignment process would balance: (a) school utilization within the 80 to 100% range, (b) the racial and ethnic composition of the student body, and (c) gender distribution across Northeast Consortium high schools.

The Board viewed school choice as a way to improve parent and student engagement at the secondary level and the performance of high schools that would have to compete for students under preferred choice.¹¹ In the fall of 1998, the State of Maryland's first foray into public school choice began with the enrollment of 9th and 10th grader in the Northeast Consortium's Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook high schools.

The Board also envisioned the Northeast Consortium as a "paradigm shift" from the older desegregation model designed to bring White students into a minority-isolated school to a total school magnet designed to foster integration in the school as a whole and in all of its classes and activities.¹² MCPS' opportunity to promote voluntary desegregation, however, was undermined with the October 1999 decision of the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that prohibited MCPS from using race or ethnicity as a factor in student transfers.¹³ As a result, the use of race and ethnicity to assign students was discontinued in the consortium in November of 1999.

C. Origins of the Downcounty Consortium

Like the Northeast Consortium, the intent of the Downcounty Consortium was to address overcrowding, improve student achievement, and balance demographics across consortium high schools. Table 2 on the next page summarizes the activities that led to the formation of the Downcounty Consortium.

⁹ Board Resolution 799-96 - November 25, 1996

¹⁰ Students are guaranteed assignment to their base school if: (a) it is their first choice, (b) it is their second choice and their first choice is not available, or (c) they do not participate in the school choice application process.

¹¹ Conversation with Bruce Crispell, August 21, 2008.

¹² Northeast Consortium federal proposal

¹³ *Eisenberg v. Montgomery County Public Schools (1999)*; also *Tuttle v. Arlington County School Board (2000)* struck down the Arlington County School Board's policy of using race in public school admissions.

Table 2: Downcounty Consortium Timeline

Year	Planning Activities and Events
1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCPS initiates planning based on County Council request for a plan for secondary space in the eastern party of the county.
1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Area Study Group convenes representing nine clusters.
1993	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board adopts Policy Framework for Eastern Area Facilities that includes formation of two high school consortiums and construction of Montgomery Blair High School on Kay Tract.
1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, and Springbrook (BEKS) Consortium begins as collaborative focused on technology, networking, team teaching, interdisciplinary approaches, and distance learning.
1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Montgomery Blair High School opens.
1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eisenberg and Tuttle decisions from 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals prohibiting MCPS from using race or ethnicity as a factor in student transfers. Community advisory committee representing the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Montgomery Blair, Albert Einstein, and John F. Kennedy clusters, the Northeast Consortium, and area civic associations convened.
2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board creates the Downcounty Consortium inclusive of Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton and approves preferred choice approach for student assignment.
2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCPS awarded 3-year federal grant for Downcounty Consortium.
2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board approves base areas for Downcounty Consortium campuses.¹⁴ Board approves use of demographic controls (gender and ever FARMS status) in the student assignment process for the Downcounty Consortium.¹⁵
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northwood High School re-opens. Downcounty Consortium high schools enroll first cohort of consortium 9th graders.
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board adds ever FARMS participation as a potential factor in student assignment process for the Northeast Consortium.

In the early 1990's, planning for the Downcounty Consortium overlapped with planning for the Northeast consortium. Planning for the Downcounty Consortium became discrete in 1993 with the inclusion of new construction for a Montgomery Blair High School on the Kay Tract in the Board's Policy Framework for Eastern Area Facilities. The previous Montgomery Blair facility had a capacity for 2,200 students compared to a projected student enrollment of 2,800 by 2005.¹⁶

¹⁴ See Appendix E for map of Downcounty Consortium high schools' base areas.

¹⁵ Attachment A, Board Resolution, 335-03 adopted on June 23, 2003.

¹⁶ Board Resolution 289-92 adopted on April 14, 1992.

The Board's Policy Framework also called for the formation of two high school consortiums that began in the downcounty area as the Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, and Springbrook high schools (BEKS) Consortium in 1994. Extending the benefits of magnet programs to all students served as the intent of this pre-cursor to the Downcounty Consortium.¹⁷ Strategies employed by BEKS included a focus on technology, networking, team teaching, interdisciplinary approaches, and distance learning to improve student achievement.

In December of 1999, the Superintendent of Schools convened a community advisory committee representing the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Montgomery Blair, Albert Einstein, and John F. Kennedy clusters, the Northeast Consortium, and area civic associations to advance the Downcounty Consortium.¹⁸

In February of 2000, the boundary advisory committee completed its work and as a result, the Superintendent formulated a recommendation to reopen Northwood High School as part of a high school consortium with Montgomery Blair, Einstein, and Kennedy high schools.¹⁹ In March of 2000, the Board endorsed the Superintendent's recommendation for the Downcounty Consortium and later added the Wheaton Cluster to this consortium.²⁰

From 2001 to 2004, MCPS developed goals and objectives for the Downcounty Consortium, identified base areas for each Downcounty campus, adopted a student assignment process for this consortium that included gender and ever FARMS status as potential factors, bolstered signature programs at each campus, began freshmen academies at most campuses, and re-opened Northwood high school.

In the fall of 2004, the Downcounty Consortium became operational with the enrollment of 9th graders at the five campuses: Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton high schools.

In September 2005, the Board amended the choice process to include "ever" FARMS participation as a potential factor in the student assignment process for the Northeast Consortium as well.²¹ In June 2003, the Board approved the tenet that student assignment decisions would be guided by the principle that comparable demographics at the five high schools will provide educational benefits to all students.²² As a result, MCPS has applied ever FARMS participation as a potential factor in the choice application process for both high school consortiums since FY06.

¹⁷ Board Resolution 278-93 adopted on March 22, 1993.

¹⁸ Board of Education Minutes - March 22, 2000.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Board Resolution 203-00 adopted on March 22, 2000.

²¹ Board Resolution 482-05 adopted on September 13, 2005.

²² See Attachment A of Board Resolution 335-03 adopted on June 23, 2003.

CHAPTER III: Implementation and Operations

This chapter provides an overview of the performance goals that each high school consortium seeks to attain, and describes how MCPS has implemented its consortiums to reach their intended goals. This chapter is presented in three parts.

- **Part A, Federal Grants and Goals for High School Consortiums**, describes the grants that were awarded to MCPS and the performance goals identified for each consortium;
- **Part B, High School Consortia Administration**, summarizes MCPS' current administration of the high school consortia; and
- **Part C, High School Consortia Programming and Key Features**, describes current programming for the consortium campuses.

In sum, this chapter identifies three key findings:

- MCPS has been awarded \$6.3 million in federal grants to launch and program for both consortiums;
- Gains in student performance and a narrowing of the achievement gap by race, ethnicity, and income serve as the goals of each consortium; and
- MCPS relies on three strategies to implement each consortium—signature programs, freshmen academies aimed at improving the performance and transition of Grade 9 students, and student choice that includes transportation for students selecting non-base area high schools.

A. Federal Grants and Goals for High School Consortiums

In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education's Magnet School Assistance Program awarded MCPS a three-year, \$2.9 million grant to support the Northeast Consortium. In 2002, MCPS was awarded a three-year, \$2.0 million grant from the Department's Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) Program to support the Downcounty Consortium. In 2005, MCPS was awarded another federal SLC grant of \$1.5 million to support two of the three Northeast Consortium campuses: Blake and Paint Branch. A description of the federal grants and the goals that MCPS committed to pursue with each follows.

Northeast Consortium. The USDE's Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) provides grants to eligible school districts to establish and operate magnet schools that are operated under a court-ordered or federally approved voluntary desegregation plan. MSAP grants support the elimination, reduction, and prevention of minority group isolation in public elementary and secondary schools with substantial numbers of students of color.

MCPS requested MSAP funds for the Northeast Consortium to hire magnet teachers and provide staff development, supplies, and materials for high school signature programs. With MSAP funding, MCPS committed to achieving four core objectives in the Northeast Consortium:²³

²³ Northeast Consortium proposal

1. Reduce the degree of minority isolation within the consortium and in curricular and extracurricular activities in the three high school magnets;
2. Implement systemic reforms that align the magnet programs with challenging state content standards and expectations for student performance;
3. Establish school-wide magnet schools that feature innovative educational methods and practices to meet student needs and interests; and
4. Assist Northeast Consortium high schools in the development of programs and courses of instruction that strengthen students' knowledge of academic subjects and their grasp of tangible and marketable vocational skills.

In 2005, MCPS secured another federal grant of \$1.5 million from the USDE's Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) program for two Northeast Consortium high schools – Blake and Paint Branch. This federal program awards grants to local school systems to implement small learning communities that improve student academic achievement in large public high schools. SLCs include structures such as freshman academies, multi-grade academies organized around career interests or other themes, and autonomous schools-within-a-school.

MCPS has targeted SLC funding at Blake and Paint Branch to narrow the achievement gap by race, ethnicity, English language proficiency, and income. More specifically, the grants at Blake and Paint Branch have been used to develop freshmen academies on both campuses, "wall to wall" career academies at Blake for every student in Grades 10-12, and to expand Paint Branch's existing career academies for science and math, and for finance. With this grant, MCPS committed to reaching the following goals at Blake and Paint Branch:

1. Improve the percentage of students who earn "Proficient" scores on state reading, algebra, and geometry tests administered at the end of Grade 10;
2. Increase AP course enrollment among students in each racial group while maintaining average scores overall and by subgroup;
3. Decrease the percent of freshman losing credit or failing one or more courses;
4. Increase mean freshman GPA;
5. Increase the percent of freshmen eligible to participate in extracurricular activities;
6. Increase SAT scores and participation;
7. Increase percent of freshmen who pass all countywide and state examinations;
8. Decrease the number of negative activities at each school such as suspensions for fighting, possessing a weapon, drugs, or alcohol on campus;
9. Increase the number of students participating in extracurricular activities by subgroup; and
10. Improve attendance rates by subgroup.

Currently, MCPS is in the second to final year of this five-year award.

Downcounty Consortium. MCPS also used federal SLC funds to jump start the Downcounty Consortium at Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, and Wheaton in 2002. These funds were used to develop a freshman seminar introducing students to career and higher education options and to staff academy programs among the Downcounty Consortium campuses. With these funds, MCPS committed to achieving the following goals within the Downcounty Consortium:²⁴

1. Increase student retention from Grades 9 to 10 and from Grades 9 to 12;
2. Decrease the percent of students losing credit and/or failing one or more courses during the freshman year;
3. Increase the average GPA of freshmen for each subgroup of the population;
4. Increase the percent of freshmen who pass the countywide end of course exam and/or the High School Assessments;
5. Increase the percent of freshmen eligible to participate in extracurricular activities and participation levels in these activities;
6. Improve the academic rigor rating of each high school with the goal of eliminating the category of “Minimally Prepared”;
7. Increase the percent of students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses in each consortium high school for each subgroup of the population;
8. Increase the percent of students earning college credit while in high school;
9. Increase SAT scores for each subgroup and test participation rates; and
10. Increase job satisfaction among teachers and staff assigned to freshmen academies and signature academies.

B. High School Consortia Administration

The Office of School Performance (OSP) and community superintendents assigned to the Northeast and Downcounty Consortia assist the high school principals in the day-to-day operations of each consortium high school. The primary function of the Office of School Performance “is to ensure that schools are focused on improving student results through effective instruction.”²⁵ Toward this end, OSP monitors the implementation of Board policies and student progress, selects and evaluates principals, and allocates staff and other resources to schools.

The Department of Enriched and Innovative Programs (DEIP) within the Office of Curriculum and Instruction for Montgomery County Public Schools coordinates with the Office of School Performance to help manage the school system’s High School Consortia. DEIP’s mission is to “support the development, implementation, and monitoring of programs that enhance and accelerate instruction for all.” DEIP assists in managing the consortia high schools in two ways.

²⁴ Downcounty Consortium webpage (<http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/schools/downcounty/info/goals.shtml>)

²⁵ Office of School Performance webpage (<http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/clusteradmin/sch...>)

First, the Division of Consortia Choice and Application Program Services within DEIP administers the application processes for MCPS' high school consortiums, the Middle School Magnet Consortium, and countywide magnets. Both the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums follow the same application timeline, beginning in October with student orientations at each middle school, and evening information meetings and open houses at each of the participating high schools. The Division of Consortia's responsibilities include hosting parent information meetings and assigning students to consortia high schools.

Second, DEIP supports the signature/academy program coordinators at 23 out of 24 of the County's comprehensive high schools. There is a coordinator assigned to each consortia high school to support its signature programs and themed academies. The signature program coordinators at 15 of the remaining 16 comprehensive MCPS high schools are also supported by a DEIP specialist for training and professional development.

Additionally, MCPS Department of Transportation provides bus transportation to all high school consortia students who do not live within walking distance of their school, including students who attend consortium schools outside of their base areas (e.g., students residing in the Springbrook base area that attend Paint Branch). MCPS leases additional buses and utilizes excess capacity in its existing fleet of general and special education buses to transport high school students attending non-base area schools within their consortium.

C. High School Consortia Programming and Key Features

MDRC states that for “nearly 40 years, Career Academies have offered high schools – particularly those in urban communities – a systematic approach for addressing the challenges young people face as they confront the demands of high school and prepare for post secondary education and the world of work.”²⁶ MDRC identifies three key features of Career Academies:

- They are organized as small learning communities to create a more supportive, personalized learning environment;
- They combine academic and career and technical curricula around a career theme to enrich teaching and learning; and
- They establish partnerships with local employers to provide career awareness and work-based learning opportunities for students.

The career-focused specialized programs offered at each MCPS consortia high school generally align with the features of Career Academies described by MDRC. Each consortia high school houses one or more specialized programs that “focus on fields of high interest to young people” and incorporate these themes throughout the instructional program.

²⁶ Kemple, 2008

The development of specialized programs at the consortia high schools has varied, with some beginning before the consortiums began (such as the visual and performing arts program at Einstein), and some added when a consortium began or after its start (such as the “wall to wall” career academies for every Grade 10 – 12 student developed at Blake). Specialized programs in consortia schools are considered signature programs or academies; there are MCPS academy or signature programs in 23 of 24 comprehensive high schools in the County.

A description of the common features and specific programming for each consortium follows.

Northeast Consortium. The three campuses – Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook – were designed to share five common features aimed at improving student performance:²⁷

- Create opportunities for every student to develop a technical competence, to use information technology to research ideas; to communicate information and ideas through several media; and to gather, organize, and analyze data;
- Offer professional development for staff to change instructional strategies and practices so that classrooms become places where students work in teams to solve problems or create products and communicate ideas and values;
- Forge a closer relationship between the school curriculum and the institutions and issues of the “real world” through various forms of problem solving, simulations, case studies, field study, internships, and the like;
- Use assessments of both traditional academic skills and the ability to integrate and apply these skills through projects, demonstrations, performances, portfolios, etc.; and
- Provide opportunities for students to explore and prepare for careers in a variety of fields.

Within this common framework, each Northeast campus offers a specialized program. More specifically, Springbrook houses programs for international studies (i.e., International Baccalaureate) and technology; Paint Branch houses a science and media program, academy of engineering technology, child development and education academy, Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (NJROTC), restaurant management program, and an academy of finance; and Blake houses a humanities and public service program, academy of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and academy of business and consumer services.

Blake and Paint Branch have also recently developed freshmen academies aimed at enhancing the transition of Grade 9 students into high school and into each school’s signature programs.

Downcounty Consortium. The five campuses - Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton – also create opportunities for students to connect to higher education and the workforce with the aim of increasing student performance. Common features of the Downcounty high school programs include:²⁸

- Accelerated, double period literacy and mathematics courses for students two or more grades behind in literacy and/or math;

²⁷ Northeast Consortium proposal

²⁸ Downcounty Consortium proposal

- Connections, a freshman seminar to introduce students to career and higher education options;
- Smaller learning communities with freshman and signature academies;²⁹
- Faculty dedicated to specific academies;
- Connections to higher education;
- Connections to business partners; and
- Internship and mentorship opportunities.

The list of signature and academy programs per Downcounty high school follows:

- Human services; entrepreneurship; media literacy; science, math and technology; and international studies at Montgomery Blair;
- Finance, international studies, and visual and performing arts at Einstein;
- International studies, multimedia and telecommunications, sports medicine and management, and Navy Junior Reserve Office Training Corps (NJROTC) at Kennedy;
- Environmental sciences, political science and public advocacy; humanities and film, and musical theater at Northwood; and
- Information technology, engineering, and biosciences and medicine, and global and cultural studies at Wheaton.

²⁹ In addition to seven of the eight consortia high schools, two other MCPS high schools – Seneca Valley and Gaithersburg – also house freshmen academies. The Seneca Valley and Gaithersburg freshmen academies began with a 2002 federal grant of \$1,000,000 from the USED's SLC Program.

CHAPTER IV: Marginal Costs and Funding

This chapter analyzes MCPS' additional cost of delivering consortia services in the Northeast and Downcounty Consortia. In sum, MCPS' FY09 operating budget includes \$3.2 million for the high school consortia. Local dollars funded 90% of consortia costs. Of the total FY09 costs of the consortia:

- \$963,000 is budgeted to the Northeast Consortium;
- \$891,000 is budgeted to the Downcounty Consortium;
- \$856,000 is included in the Department of Transportation budget; and
- \$532,000 is budgeted to the Division of Consortia Choice.

From FY98 to FY09, MCPS budgeted \$27.4 million to operate the high school consortia. Federal grants funded 23% of total costs. Of the cumulative high school consortia costs:

- \$11.6 million was budgeted for the Northeast Consortium;
- \$7.0 million was budgeted for the Downcounty Consortium;
- \$4.8 million was budgeted to support additional transportation services; and
- \$4.0 million was budgeted for the Division of Consortia and its precursors.

The remainder of this chapter describes budget, staffing, and funding data for the high school consortia from FY98 through FY09 in greater detail. This chapter is presented in three parts:

- **Part A, Overview of Consortia Costs**, summarizes total high school consortia costs from FY98 to FY09 with comparisons to MCPS' High School Instruction Budget for FY09;
- **Part B, Budgeted Costs and Personnel Trends**, describes separately the grant and local funding budgets for the Northeast Consortium from FY98 to FY09, the Downcounty Consortium from FY04 to FY09, consortia transportation costs from FY99 to FY09, and central office staff to support high school choice from FY98 to FY09; and
- **Part C, Comparison of MCPS and OLO Calculations**, describes the difference between the FY09 marginal costs of MCPS' high school consortia estimated in this report to MCPS' FY09 High School Consortia Program Budget.

A description and discussion of the MCPS budget data sources used in this chapter follows in the text box on the next page.

BUDGET DATA SOURCES

OLO accessed a combination of data sources to identify the costs, personnel, and funding dedicated to MCPS' high school consortia. These sources did not have consistent cost categories across sources or across years. For this project, OLO generally used the most consistent cost data available across cost categories - budget data.

The three primary sources of cost data used for this project were the MCPS Program Budgets, MCPS Operating Budgets, and the MCPS Account Tracking Summary that describes actual program expenditures. To supplement these data sources, OLO relied on MCPS staff to provide budgeted cost information for data that was not available through these sources, including grant award information and internal MCPS staff budgets.

Table 3 provides a summary of the key data sources used in this chapter.

Table 3: MCPS Budget and Staffing Data Sources by High School Consortia Cost Category

<u>Data Sources</u>	Northeast Consortium	Downcounty Consortium	Division of Consortia	Consortia Transportation
Program Budgets	FY98-03	FY04-07	FY08-09	Not Available
Operating Budgets	Selected Information FY98-09 for Staffing	Selected Information FY04-09 for Staffing	FY08-09	Not Available
Expenditure Data from Account Tracking Summaries	Not Available	FY05-09	FY04-09	Not Available

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

The high school consortia cost category with the most consistent data was the Downcounty Consortium. At the other end of the spectrum, OLO used MCPS transportation staff calculations of consortia transportation costs from FY99-09. For the Northeast Consortium, OLO used federal grant and MCPS program budget data from FY98-01, and internal budget data from FY02-09. For central office consortia staff, OLO used budget and expenditure data from recent years, and estimations of costs in earlier years.

To identify the additional (i.e., marginal) costs of the high school consortia, OLO reviewed MCPS documentation and identified costs budgeted specifically to the consortia. OLO then worked with MCPS staff to identify which of these costs were not specific to the consortia, but rather a countywide practice. For example, MCPS' FY09 High School Consortia Program Budget includes a resource teacher that serves as the signature program coordinator for every consortia campus. However, MCPS staff indicated that all but one of MCPS' comprehensive high schools had such a position. Therefore, these positions were eliminated from this project's analysis.

A. Overview of Consortia Costs

For this study, OLO identified budgeted costs and personnel associated with the additional cost of converting eight comprehensive high schools into consortia high schools. The budgeted costs and staffing described fund the three key features of MCPS' high school consortia – signature programs, freshmen academies, and student choice.

MCPS' specific costs for the high school consortiums include personnel costs for wages, salaries and employee benefits; non-personnel costs for supplies, equipment, and contracts; and transportation costs for neighborhood bus services provided to eligible students attending high schools outside their base area.

Table 4 provides a summary of high school consortia's cumulative costs by budget category from FY98-09. Overall, MCPS has budgeted \$27.4 million to fund the high school consortiums.

Table 4: Total High School Consortia Costs, FY98-09

Budget Categories		Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)
Northeast Consortium	Personnel	\$6,649
	Non-Personnel	\$5,919
	Transportation	\$2,418
	Subtotal	\$13,986
Downcounty Consortium	Personnel	\$4,205
	Non-Personnel	\$2,575
	Transportation	\$2,377
	Subtotal	\$9,371
Division of Consortia	Personnel	\$3,920
	Non-Personnel	\$103
	Subtotal	\$4,023
Total High School Consortia Costs		\$27,360

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY04-FY09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY04-FY09, Account Summary Tracking, FY04-FY09, Magnet School Program Grant Application, Smaller Learning Communities Grant Application

Table 5 on the next page describes annual high school consortia costs by budget category and function from FY98 to FY09. The annual costs of the high school consortia range from \$320,693 in FY98 to \$3.6 million in FY08. The current fiscal year, FY09, has an annual cost of \$3.2 million.


Table 5: Annual High School Consortia Costs, FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
Northeast Consortium	Personnel		\$420	\$572	\$580	\$304	\$327	\$418	\$436	\$542	\$696	\$724	\$721
	Non-Personnel	\$130	\$1,176	\$908	\$700	\$200	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$527	\$522	\$456	\$242
	Transportation		\$217	\$220	\$226	\$229	\$233	\$237	\$152	\$168	\$199	\$251	\$286
	Subtotal	\$130	\$1,813	\$1,699	\$1,505	\$734	\$912	\$1,007	\$940	\$1,238	\$1,418	\$1,431	\$1,249
Downcounty Consortium	Personnel						\$214	\$755	\$946	\$582	\$609	\$671	\$642
	Non-Personnel						\$186	\$434	\$427	\$423	\$359	\$497	\$249
	Transportation								\$409	\$416	\$454	\$527	\$571
	Subtotal						\$401	\$1,189	\$1,783	\$1,421	\$1,421	\$1,694	\$1,461
Division of Consortia	Personnel	\$191	\$197	\$201	\$210	\$199	\$199	\$415	\$421	\$448	\$445	\$474	\$501
	Non-Personnel										\$38	\$33	\$31
	Subtotal							\$414	\$421	\$448	\$483	\$508	\$532
Total High School Consortia Costs		\$321	\$2,010	\$1,900	\$1,715	\$933	\$1,512	\$2,611	\$3,145	\$3,106	\$3,564	\$3,633	\$3,242

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY04-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY04-09, Account Summary Tracking, FY04-FY09, Magnet School Program Grant Application, Smaller Learning Communities Grant Application

Comparison to MCPS High School Instruction Budget. To offer context for the size of the high school consortia budget, OLO compared it to the MCPS High School Instruction Program Budget, which provides a measure of the costs to provide all MCPS high school students with a comprehensive instructional program. For FY09, the high consortia budget was \$3.2 million compared to a high school instruction budget of \$276.1 million. As noted in Exhibit 1, the high school consortia budget equates to about 1% of MCPS' total budget for high school instruction.

Exhibit 1: High School Consortia Budget as a Percentage of High School Instruction Program Budget, FY09



Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets-FY09, MCPS Program Budgets FY09, Account Summary Tracking, FY09, Smaller Learning Communities Grant Application

Per Student Cost. OLO calculated the per pupil cost of the consortia as the ratio of the estimated cost of the consortia in FY09 (\$3.2 million) to the total number of students who have selected to attend a consortium high school outside of their base area (5,044)³⁰ in FY09. Based on this calculation, the additional cost per consortia student who exercises choice to attend a non-base high school is \$643 per year.

B. Budgeted Costs, Personnel, and Funding

MCPS total funding for the consortium includes the individual costs of each consortium, the transportation needs of each consortium, and central administration staff that assign students to consortia high schools. This part details the additional costs associated with operating the two high school consortiums in four sections:

- **Section 1, Northeast Consortium,** reviews the personnel, budgeted costs, and funding of the Northeast Consortium, including the federal Magnet School Assistance Program and the Smaller Learning Communities Grants;
- **Section 2, Downcounty Consortium,** examines the personnel, budgeted costs, and funding of the Downcounty Consortium;

³⁰In FY09, there were 5,044 students who attended a consortium school outside of their base area. For more details on student assignment data, see Chapter V.

- **Section 3, Transportation**, reviews the additional costs of transportation services that MCPS provides eligible students to attend non-base area schools within each consortium; and
- **Section 4, MCPS Central Office Staff**, analyzes the personnel and budgeted costs of the Division of Consortia Choice and Application Program Services that assign students to consortia schools.

1. Northeast Consortium

At the beginning of the consortium and for the last few years, funding for the Northeast Consortium has been a combination of federal grants and local funding. In between the first and second federal grants, the Northeast Consortium was maintained through local funding. The following section outlines the budgeted costs for this consortium by grant and local funding.

In sum, the Northeast Consortium has cost a total of \$11.6 million for the 11 years of its implementation. As described by the data in Table 6, 63% of the funding has been from local sources. Since FY98, personnel and non-personnel expenses have each represented one half of the Northeast Consortium's cumulative costs.

Table 6: Budgeted Costs by Funding Source for the Northeast Consortium, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		Total FY98-09	% of Total
Personnel	Grant	\$2,352	
	Local	\$3,297	
	Subtotal	\$5,649	
Non-Personnel	Grant	\$1,895	
	Local	\$4,024	
	Subtotal	\$5,919	
Total Grant		\$4,246	37%
Total Local		\$7,321	63%
Total Northeast Consortium		\$11,568	100%

Sources: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09
MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, MSAP and SLC Grant Applications

The table on the next page outlines the grant versus local funding breakdown annually for the Northeast Consortium from FY98-09. The data in the table demonstrates that the total budgeted costs for the Northeast Consortium ranged from \$130,000 in FY98 to \$1.22 million in FY07. No data was available for non-personnel costs from FY03-FY05 so OLO used FY06 data to estimate these costs. For more detailed budgeted costs tables, see Appendix A, ©7.

Table 7: Annual Budgeted Costs for the Northeast Consortium FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
Personnel	Grant		\$420	\$572	\$580					\$100	\$208	\$236	\$237
	Local					\$304	\$327	\$327	\$436	\$442	\$489	\$488	\$484
	Subtotal	\$0	\$420	\$572	\$580	\$304	\$327	\$327	\$436	\$542	\$696	\$724	\$721
Non Personnel	Grant		\$660	\$391	\$293					\$174	\$156	\$118	\$102
	Local	\$130	\$515	\$516	\$407	\$200	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$366	\$338	\$140
	Subtotal	\$130	\$1,176	\$908	\$700	\$200	\$353	\$353	\$353	\$527	\$522	\$456	\$242
Total Grant		\$0	\$1,080	\$963	\$873	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$275	\$364	\$353	\$339
Total Local		\$130	\$515	\$516	\$407	\$505	\$679	\$680	\$788	\$795	\$855	\$826	\$624
Total Northeast Consortium		\$130	\$1,595	\$1,479	\$1,280	\$505	\$679	\$680	\$788	\$1,070	\$1,219	\$1,180	\$963

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, MSAP and SLC Grant Applications

Grant Funding. MCPS has been awarded two federal grants totaling \$4.4 million for the Northeast Consortium high schools: a Magnet School Assistance Program Grant (MSAP) of \$2.9 million in 1999 and a Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) Grant of \$1.5 million in 2006. The United States Department of Education (USDE) awarded the MSAP Grant specifically for the implementation of the Northeast Consortium. The SLC grant was awarded to enhance consortia programming at Blake and Paint Branch.

Magnet School Assistance Program Grant (MSAP). In 1998, MCPS was awarded a three-year MSAP grant for \$2.9 million to launch the Northeast Consortium that budgeted \$1.57 million (54%) for personnel costs and \$1.34 million (46%) for non-personnel costs.

Non-personnel costs included contractual services for staff development and basic equipment needs such as computers, a portable sound system, and Ethernet. Personnel costs included staff time for program development, curriculum writing, professional development, services to students (summer institutes, SAT prep, extra-curricular stipends), and conference attendance. Additionally, each Northeast Consortium high school added a part-time teacher and business/intern coordinator positions, Springbrook added a secretary, Paint Branch added a technology specialist, and Blake added a technical support person.

At the end of the grant, there were 7.3 grant-funded positions; in FY02, 4.4 of these positions continued with local funding. For a detailed description of grant costs, see Appendix A, ©9.

Smaller Learning Communities Grant (SLC). In 2005, MCPS was awarded a five-year SLC grant for \$1.5 million to create Grade 9 academies at Blake and Paint Branch and to bolster Blake's signature programs by adding an academy for hospitality and tourism. Blake received \$799,503 and Paint Branch received \$679,343. The funding included \$852,668 (58%) for personnel costs and \$625,457 (42%) for non-personnel costs.

Non-personnel costs funded by this grant include trainers, professionals-in-residence programs, evaluator services, travel and expenses for staff to attend professional conferences and training, instructional materials, and technical theater equipment for Blake. Personnel costs include 1.7 FTEs at Blake. MCPS staff report that these positions may not be transitioned into local funding once this grant ends. Personnel costs at Paint Branch include staff time for a program director, and stipends for academic intervention teachers, academy coordinators, Saturday School teachers, Tuesday and Thursday School teachers and the Freshman Advisory Team. For a more detailed breakdown of this grant, see Appendix A, ©10.

Local Funding. The remaining costs for the consortium were budgeted within MCPS' operating budget. Table 8 on the next page describes total locally funded budgeted costs for the Northeast Consortium. For a full detailed budgeted cost table by year, see Appendix A, ©11.

Personnel costs accounted for 45% of all costs from FY98 to FY09, and include salaries, stipends, professional part-time, support services part-time, and employee benefits. OLO estimated the teacher salary and benefits for the 4.4 FTE's supported by local funds since FY02 based on an FY09 cost of \$73,791 per teacher with 26% for employee benefits for a total of \$92,977 per position. For a full description of OLO's methodology for determining the cost of teachers and benefits in prior years, please see Appendix A, ©5 and ©6.

Non-personnel costs accounted for the other 55%. Of special note, the costs budgeted to "Special Program Funds" from FY98 through FY02 were diversified into other non-personnel categories after FY02.

Table 8: Northeast Consortium Budgeted Local Costs, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		Total FY98-09
Personnel	Teacher Salaries & Employee Benefits ³¹	\$2,582
	Other Personnel Costs	\$715
	Subtotal	\$3,297
Non-Personnel	Special Program Funds	\$1,769
	Contractual	\$319
	Supplies and Materials	\$1,247
	Travel	\$16
	Other	\$249
	Equipment	\$326
	Subtotal	\$4,024
Total Northeast Consortium		\$7,321

Sources: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, MSAP and SLC Grant Applications

2. The Downcounty Consortium

For the first few years of the Downcounty Consortium, the funds for the program were a combination of federal grant funding and local funding. After the grant ended, the Downcounty Consortium was maintained through local funding. The following section outlines the grant funding and the local funds appropriated for the Downcounty Consortium.

Table 9 reviews grant versus local funding for budgeted costs for the Downcounty Consortium. As the data in the table shows, the total cost of the Downcounty Consortium from FY03 to FY09 was \$7.0 million, with approximately 72% of the total cost locally funded. Personnel costs represent 63% of the total budget and non-personnel costs represent the remaining 37%.

³¹ To see how OLO calculated the cost of teacher salaries from FY02 to FY09, see Appendix A3, ©6; for calculations of employee benefits for this report, see Appendix A2, ©5.

Table 9: Budgeted Costs for the Downcounty Consortium, Total FY03-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		Total FY03-09	% of Total
Personnel	Grant	\$1,365	63%
	Local	\$3,055	
	Subtotal	\$4,419	
Non-Personnel	Grant	\$617	37%
	Local	\$1,957	
	Subtotal	\$2,575	
Total Grant		\$1,982	28%
Total Local		\$5,012	72%
Total Downcounty Consortium		\$6,994	100%

Sources: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09
MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09 SLC Grant Applications

Table 10 outlines the annual budgeted costs for the Downcounty Consortium from FY03 to FY09. Annual costs have ranged from \$400,000 in FY03 to \$1.4 million for FY05.

Table 10: Annual Downcounty Consortium Budgeted Costs, FY03-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
Personnel	Grant	\$214	\$515	\$624	\$12			
	Local		\$240	\$323	\$571	\$609	\$671	\$642
	Subtotal	\$214	\$755	\$946	\$582	\$609	\$671	\$642
Non-Personnel	Grant	\$186	\$250	\$176	\$5			
	Local		\$183	\$251	\$419	\$359	\$497	\$249
	Subtotal	\$186	\$434	\$427	\$423	\$359	\$497	\$249
Total Grant		\$401	\$765	\$800	\$16	\$0	\$0	
Total Local		\$0	\$424	\$574	\$989	\$967	\$1,168	\$891
Total Downcounty Consortium		\$401	\$1,189	\$1,374	\$1,006	\$967	\$1,168	\$891

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, Account Tracking Summaries FY04-FY09, and SLC Grant Applications

Grant Funding. In 2003, the USDE awarded MCPS a Smaller Learning Communities grant for \$2.0 million to launch the Downcounty Consortium. These resources were used to bolster the signature programs at Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy and Wheaton and to implement Grade 9 academies on each campus. In particular, MCPS used this grant to develop the Connection course for freshmen to expand their awareness of higher education and workforce options after graduation.

The largest expense for this grant was personnel, which accounted for 69% of all grant funding from FY03 through FY06. The personnel costs included the cost of 5.6 Academy Head positions within the consortium. The non-personnel costs (31% of funding) include costs for consultants, evaluations, instructional materials, and travel expenses. For more details on the grant funding, see Appendix A, ©14.

Local Funding. Local funding for the additional costs of the Downcounty Consortium began in FY04. Table 11 describes total locally funded budgeted costs for the Downcounty Consortium from FY04 through FY09 that totaled \$5.4 million.

Table 11: Downcounty Consortium Budgeted Local Costs, Total FY04-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		Total FY04-09
Personnel	Teacher salaries and benefits ³²	\$1,904
	Professional PT	\$104
	Stipends	\$578
	Support Services PT	\$229
	Non-position Salaries	\$240
	Subtotal	\$3,055
Non-Personnel	Instructional Materials	\$1,025
	Contractual Services	\$308
	Lease	\$108
	Other	\$209
	Non-capital Equipment	\$249
	Subtotal	\$1,900
Total Downcounty Consortium		\$4,954

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, Account Tracking Summaries FY04-FY09, and SLC Grant Applications

Personnel accounted for 66% of the local costs compared with 34% for non-personnel costs. In FY07, the 5.6 grant funded positions were transferred to the MCPS operating budget to continue the academy teacher positions that reduced student to staff ratios for Grade 9 academic classes.

Because the Downcounty Consortium teacher positions are not differentiated from High School Instruction positions, OLO estimated the teacher salary and benefit costs for the 5.6 FTEs in the Consortium budgeted costs. OLO estimated the teacher salary and benefits for the 4.4 FTE's supported by local funds since FY07 based on an FY09 cost of \$73,791 per teacher with 26% for employee benefits for a total of \$92,977 per position. For a full description of OLO's methodology for calculating of teacher and benefit costs, see Appendix A2 and A3 at ©5-6.

³² To see how OLO calculated the cost of teacher salaries from FY07 to FY09, see Appendix A3, © 6; for calculations of employee benefits for this report, see Appendix A2, ©5.

3. Transportation

MCPS does not budget specifically for the transportation costs associated with the High School Consortia. However, MCPS' Department of Transportation staff estimated the cost of transportation for both consortiums from FY99 to the present. MCPS funded all transportation costs for both consortiums with local dollars.

MCPS assigns each student a base area based on the student's home address. This is the school that the student would be assigned to if there was no consortium. As part of the consortia programs, all students within the consortium attendance area who do not reside within walking distance of their chosen school are provided with bus transportation.

To estimate the additional cost of transporting high school consortia students to non-base area campuses, MCPS transportation staff calculated the difference between its current costs and the estimated costs of transporting all eligible students to their base area high schools. MCPS staff completed the following steps to complete this estimation:

1. Determined the total number of eligible riders and the average number of riders per bus;
2. Calculated the number of buses needed if all students attended their base school based on current riders per bus averages;
3. Identified the actual number of buses being used for consortia high schools; and
4. Subtracted current buses from estimated buses needed to transport all consortia students to base area schools to determine the additional buses needed to transport non-base area students within each consortium.

The following table outlines the FY08 transportation needs for each consortium by school. The data show that MCPS needed an additional 18.28 buses to accommodate student choice needs including 2.40 buses in the Northeast Consortium and 15.89 in the Downcounty Consortium.

Table 12: MCPS Calculations of Additional Buses for High School Consortia, FY08

	School	Eligible Riders	Riders Per Bus	# Buses for Base	# Current Buses	Extra Buses Needed
Northeast Consortium	Paint Branch	1,601	48.52	37.89	33	-4.89
	Blake	1,814	60.47	28.86	30	1.14
	Springbrook	1,540	49.68	24.86	31	6.14
	Subtotal	4,955	52.71	91.60	94.00	2.40
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	2,057	62.33	30.22	33	2.78
	Wheaton	530	48.18	11.91	11	-0.91
	Einstein	798	49.88	10.47	16	5.53
	Northwood	780	52.00	7.56	15	7.44
	Kennedy	979	54.39	16.95	18	1.05
	Subtotal	5,144	55.31	77.11	93.00	15.89
Total High School Consortia		10,099	54.01	168.72	187.00	18.28

Source: MCPS Division of Transportation Staff, 2008

After determining the additional buses needed, MCPS transportation staff identified the costs associated with the operation of the additional buses (e.g., salaries and wages, benefits, fuel, and maintenance). MCPS estimated additional transportation costs for FY08 and used a CPI deflator to estimate these costs for FY99 through FY07 and an inflator for FY09.

MCPS' calculations are based on a constant transportation need of 4,578 hours (calculated for FY08) of annual bus operator hours from FY99 to FY09. This assumption appears reasonable given the small changes in enrollment among consortia schools from FY05 to FY09 described in Chapter V.

The following table outlines the transportation costs for the consortia based on MCPS estimates. The first part of the table describes the Northeast Consortium transportation costs prior to FY05. The second part of the table provides the transportation costs of both consortia from FY05 to FY09. The personnel costs include salary and employee benefits for both full time equivalent (FTE) and substitute positions. The daily mileage for the consortiums was estimated by MCPS Transportation Administration staff and includes bus fuel and parts.

Table 13: MCPS Calculations of Costs Associated with Additional Buses for High School Consortia, FY99-09 (\$ in 000s)

<u>Costs</u>		FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Northeast Consortium	Personnel	\$84	\$86	\$90	\$93	\$96	\$99
	Mileage	\$45	\$46	\$47	\$48	\$49	\$50
	Lease	\$88	\$88	\$88	\$88	\$88	\$88
	Subtotal	\$217	\$220	\$226	\$229	\$233	\$237
Total Transportation Costs		\$217	\$220	\$226	\$229	\$233	\$237
<u>Costs</u>		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Total FY99-09
Northeast Consortium	Personnel	\$101	\$104	\$108	\$123	\$130	\$1,113
	Mileage	\$51	\$64	\$92	\$128	\$156	\$776
	Lease	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$530
	Subtotal	\$152	\$168	\$199	\$251	\$286	\$2,418
Downcounty Consortium	Total Personnel	\$225	\$230	\$240	\$274	\$289	\$1,003
	Mileage Cost	\$67	\$67	\$96	\$134	\$163	\$460
	Lease Cost	\$119	\$119	\$119	\$119	\$119	\$474
	Subtotal	\$410	\$416	\$454	\$527	\$571	\$1,967
Total Transportation Costs		\$562	\$583	\$654	\$778	\$856	\$4,385

Source: MCPS Division of Transportation Staff, 2008

The data in Table 13 describe the cost of the additional 18.3 buses needed to transport eligible students to high schools outside their base area. In FY09, this amounted to \$856,397 or an average cost of \$46,849 per additional bus or of \$170 per non-base area student.³³ The total additional transportation costs from FY98 to FY09 for the high school consortia were \$4.4 million. For additional information regarding MCPS' estimates of high school consortia transportation costs, see Appendix A, ©16.

4. MCPS Central Office Staff

In FY06, MCPS established a Division of Consortia Choice and Application Program Services (Division of Consortia) to assign students to the high school consortium programs, the middle school magnet programs, and the countywide application programs. Before FY06, central office staff in the Office of Curriculum and Instruction had performed these functions. A description of Division of Consortia personnel and costs follows.

Division of Consortia Personnel. MCPS staff provided OLO with a detailed breakdown of Division of Consortia Choice staff time dedicated to the high school consortiums. Because the Division did not exist until recently, MCPS staff identified central staff dedicated to the consortium programs over the past ten years. The table below shows a comparison of the MCPS staffing allocated to the Division and percentage of Division staff allocated to supporting high school consortia functions. For a specific breakdown by positions, see Appendix A, ©19.

Table 14: Division of Consortia Personnel and Allocation to High School Consortia Functions, FY98-09

Position	FY98-03	FY04	FY05	FY06-09
Total Division of Consortia Staff	3.0	5.0	6.75	9.25
Allocation to High School Consortia Functions	2.8	5.0	5.9	3.6
% of Division of Consortia Staff Allocated to High School Consortia Functions	93%	100%	87%	38%

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, Account Tracking Summaries FY04-FY09

Division of Consortia Costs. Table 15 describes the total budgeted cost for the Division of Consortia relative to its high school consortia functions. The total cost of the Division of Consortia from FY98 to FY09 was \$4.0 million; there were no grant funds used for personnel or non-personnel expenses. Personnel costs that include salaries, wages and employee benefits, accounted for 97% of total expenditures; non-personnel costs accounted for 3% of total costs.

³³ OLO determined the per student cost by dividing the total costs of additional bus services (\$856,397) by the total number of non-base students attending consortium schools (5,044), which is discussed in Chapter V.

Table 15: Budgeted Costs by Funding Source for the Division of Consortia for High School Consortia Functions, Total FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories		Total FY98-09	% of Total
Personnel	Grant	\$0	97%
	Local	\$3,920	
	Subtotal	\$3,920	
Non-Personnel	Grant	\$0	3%
	Local	\$103	
	Subtotal	\$103	
Total Grant		\$0	0%
Total Local		\$4,023	100%
Total Division of Consortia		\$4,023	100%

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, Account Tracking Summaries FY04-FY09, and SLC Grant Applications

Table 16 outlines the annual budgeted costs for the Division of Consortia from FY98 to FY09. Annual costs have ranged from \$194,000 in FY98 to \$532,000 for FY08.

Table 16: Division of Consortia Budgeted Costs for High School Consortia Functions, FY98-09 (\$ in 000s)

Budget Categories	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
Personnel	\$191	\$197	\$201	\$210	\$219	\$199	\$415	\$421	\$448	\$445	\$474	\$501
Non-Personnel	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38	\$34	\$31
Total	\$191	\$197	\$201	\$210	\$219	\$199	\$415	\$421	\$448	\$483	\$508	\$532

Source: MCPS Recommended Operating Budgets, FY98-09, MCPS Program Budgets, FY98-09, Account Tracking Summaries FY04-FY09, and SLC Grant Applications

C. Comparison of MCPS and OLO Calculations

OLO’s calculations of high school consortia costs refers to MCPS’ costs to support three features of the high school consortiums – signature programs, freshmen academies, and student choice. In particular, OLO’s calculations seek to identify the additional costs of the high school consortia compared to the allocations the eight consortia high schools, the Division of Consortia, and Department of Transportation would have received if the high school consortiums did not exist.

MCPS does not routinely report on the costs of the high school consortia in a way that isolates the additional costs of the high school consortiums. For example, MCPS’ FY09 Approved Program Budget attributes 55.7 FTE’s to the high school consortia and an overall cost of \$4.9 million. However, class size reduction teachers in the Downcounty Consortium (17.6 FTEs) and signature program coordinators (8.0 FTEs) that are assigned to all but one comprehensive high school are included among these positions.

The data in Table 17 compares the MCPS' FY09 Program Budget for the High School Consortia to OLO's calculations of high school consortia costs. Unlike MCPS' program budget, OLO's calculations include the cost of employee benefits for high school consortia personnel, and the additional costs of transportation for eligible consortia students. However, OLO's estimates of FY09 high school consortia costs are \$1.7 million less than MCPS' estimate because OLO attributes 15.3 FTE's to the high school consortia compared to 55.7 positions included in MCPS' calculations.

Table 17: MCPS Program Budget and Additional Costs of High School Consortia, FY09

Description	FY09 Program Budget	OLO Calculations	Difference
Positions (FTE's)	55.7	15.3	40.4
Salaries and Wages	\$4,520,127	\$1,863,607	\$2,656,520
Employee Benefits	Not included		
Non-personnel costs	\$409,726	\$500,620	(\$90,894)
Transportation costs	Not included	\$856,397	(\$856,397)
Total Costs	\$4,929,853	\$3,220,624	\$1,709,229

Source: OLO calculations of MCPS data

CHAPTER V: School Assignment Process and Trends

This chapter describes the school choice process and trends in student choice and assignment for the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums as follows:

- **Part A, Choice Application and School Assignment Process**, summarizes the application timeline and process for students applying to consortia high schools;
- **Part B, Trends in Student Choice and Assignment**, describes patterns in student applications, student choice, and assignment to consortia high schools; and
- **Part C, Trends in Student Enrollment**, describes patterns in student enrollment at each consortia high school among base and non-base area student assignments.

In sum, this chapter finds that about a third of MCPS' overall high school population (roughly 14,000 students) have been enrolled in a Northeast or Downcounty Consortium high school since FY05; last year, about half of all applicants selected their base school as their first choice and 89-90% of applicants received their school first choice; and currently, about a third of the high school consortia enrollment (5,044 students) exercises choice by attending a consortium high school outside of their base area (a non-base area school).

A. Choice Application and School Assignment Process

Both the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums follow the same application timeline. Table 18 summarizes the choice application process for FY09.

Table 18: Choice Application Process Timeline, FY09

Month	Planning Activities and Events
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northeast and Downcounty Consortium High School Options Fair
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northeast and Downcounty Consortium High School Options Fair • High School Open House • Students Round 1 Choice forms in the mail
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School Open House • Deadline for private school/home schooled student applications, 11/14 • Deadline for Consortia middle school applications, 11/14
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round 1 assignment letters mailed to Grade 8 students • Change of Choice forms available for Grade 9 – 11 students
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of Choice deadline, 2/23 • Round 2 deadline for students who did not receive first choice in Round 1, transfer students, and new students, 2/23
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round 2 assignment letters mailed to Grade 8 students
April/May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deadline for parents to submit school assignment appeals

Grade 8 students within each consortium rank their order of preference for a high school primarily based on their interest in the schools' signature programs.³⁴ Northeast Consortium students rank three choices; Downcounty Consortium students rank five choices. Both consortiums also use a common student assignment process.

Each student has a base school, which is determined by where the student lives. Students are guaranteed assignment to their base school if:

- (a) It is their first choice,
- (b) It is their second choice and their first choice is not available, or
- (c) They do not participate in the choice application process for the Northeast Consortium.³⁵

MCPS uses high school capacities and projected student enrollments in the student assignment process to prevent schools from becoming disproportionately over utilized. The following variables can also impact school assignments:

- Ranking of school choices;
- Number of students selecting their base school;
- Socioeconomic status (ever FARMS participation); and
- Gender.

In addition, MCPS attempts to assign siblings to the same consortia school if indicated on their application. Additionally, there are some students who live outside a consortium area and apply to attend a consortium school. These students participate in Round 2 of the Choice process.

B. Trends in Student Choice and Assignment

Table 19 on the next page summarizes MCPS data describing trends in student choice patterns for the Northeast and Downcounty Consortia from FY04 to FY08 among Grade 8 students participating in Round 1 of the choice application process. The data demonstrate that the number of Grade 8 students eligible to participate in choice process has diminished over time due to declining enrollment, but the percentage of eligible students applying to each consortium has increased. In particular, all but one eligible Northeast applicant participated in the school choice process for FY08.

The data in Table 19 further demonstrate that the percent of students receiving their first choice declined from 91% to 89% for the Northeast Consortium from FY04 to FY08, and from 97% to 90% for the Downcounty Consortium. The Superintendent's annual updates to the Board of Education for the consortia indicated that more Northeast Consortium students selected Blake as a first choice than seats available and more Downcounty Consortium students selected Montgomery Blair and Einstein than seats available.³⁶

³⁴ 2008-09 parent survey data collected by Division of Consortia Choice and Application Program Services indicates that 53% of students in the Northeast Consortium and 61% of students in the Downcounty Consortium cite signature programs as their primary reason for selecting their first choice school.

³⁵ Downcounty Consortium students who do not participate in the choice process are randomly assigned to a school within this consortium.

³⁶ See Superintendent Weast's memos to the Board of Education dated March 12, 2004; October 25, 2004; February 23, 2005; April 20, 2006; April 21, 2006; March 21, 2007; May 15, 2007; and April 2, 2008.

The data in Table 19 also demonstrate an increasing trend in the percentage of students selecting a non-base school as their first choice. In FY04, 40% of Northeast Consortium students and 46% of Downcounty Consortium students selected a non-base school as their first choice compared to 44% of Northeast Consortium students and 50% of Downcounty Consortium students in FY08.

Table 19: Round 1 Student Choice Trends by High School Consortium, FY04-08

	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change 04-08
Northeast Consortium						
Number of Grade 8 eligible students	1,452	1,376	1,346	1,305	1,241	-211
Number of Grade 8 applicants	1,287	1,297	1,277	1,241	1,240	-47
Percent eligible who apply	89%	94%	95%	95%	100%	11%
Percent received 1 st choice	91%	93%	85%	94%	89%	-2%
Percent selected base as 1 st choice	60%	56%	54%	56%	56%	-4%
Downcounty Consortium						
Number of Grade 8 eligible students	2,126	1,941	1,966	1,938	1,966	-160
Number of Grade 8 applicants	1,909	1,842	1,865	1,854	1,865	-44
Percent eligible who apply	90%	95%	95%	96%	95%	5%
Percent received 1 st choice	97%	86%	83%	86%	90%	-7%
Percent selected base as 1 st choice	54%	51%	53%	56%	50%	-4%

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

C. Trends in Student Enrollment

This section describes trends in high school enrollment for MCPS and each consortium. Table 20 on the next page compares consortia enrollment to MCPS' overall high school enrollment from FY05 to FY08.

In sum, about 14,000 students were enrolled in both consortiums from FY05 to FY09 and represented 32% of MCPS' high school enrollment. Within the high school consortiums, Northeast Consortium students represented 40% of all high school consortia enrollment and Downcounty Consortium students represented the remaining 60%.

Table 20: High School Enrollment for MCPS and by Consortium, FY05-09

Student Enrollment		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09*	Change 05-09
MCPS	All High Schools	44,084	44,677	44,515	44,201	44,396	312
Northeast Consortium	Blake	1,936	1,983	1,852	1,858	1,820	-116
	Paint Branch	1,810	1,754	1,745	1,776	1,809	-1
	Springbrook	1,995	2,039	1,974	1,852	1,890	-105
	Subtotal	5,741	5,776	5,571	5,486	5,519	-222
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	3,263	2,996	2,896	2,763	2,714	-549
	Einstein	1,761	1,727	1,714	1,588	1,579	-182
	Kennedy	1,508	1,469	1,487	1,448	1,556	48
	Northwood	369	716	1,011	1,278	1,325	956
	Wheaton	1,477	1,429	1,394	1,310	1,325	-152
	Subtotal	8,378	8,337	8,502	8,387	8,499	121
High School Consortia Total		14,119	14,113	14,073	13,873	14,018	-101
% of MCPS enrollment		32.0%	31.6%	31.6%	31.4%	31.6%	-0.4%

*MCPS FY09 data for all high schools based on preliminary September 30, 2008 enrollment.
Source: MCPS

Table 21 compares each consortium's enrollment to the Capital Improvement Program's (CIP) calculations for program capacity for each campus. The data demonstrate that the current enrollment of two Northeast Consortium campuses exceeds capacity, but that all but one Downcounty campus had excess capacity. Overall, MCPS' high school consortia program capacity exceeded FY08 student enrollment in consortia high schools by 646 students.

Table 21: High School Enrollment Compared to CIP Program Capacity, FY08

		Program Capacity	FY08 Enrollment	Excess Capacity*
Northeast Consortium	Blake	1,715	1,858	-143
	Paint Branch	1,584	1,776	-192
	Springbrook	2,086	1,852	234
	Subtotal	5,385	5,486	-101
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	2,885	2,763	122
	Einstein	1,565	1,588	-23
	Kennedy	1,725	1,448	277
	Northwood	1,526	1,278	248
	Wheaton	1,433	1,310	123
	Subtotal	9,134	8,387	747
Consortia Total		14,519	13,873	646

*Excess capacity is the difference between program capacity and enrollment. Positive numbers reflect additional space or under-enrollment at a school; negative numbers reflect potential overcrowding.
Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 22 describes trends in consortia enrollment among students attending their base area high school (i.e., their “home” high school). The data demonstrate that the enrollment of base area students diminished for one Northeast campus – Springbrook – and for four of five Downcounty campuses from FY05 to FY09. The data also show that base area students as a proportion of consortia enrollment diminished from 63% in FY05 to 60% in FY08. The largest declines occurred at Einstein, Kennedy, and Wheaton high schools.

Table 22: Base Area Student Enrollment by Consortium School, FY05-09

<u>Student Enrollment</u>		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Change 05-09
# of base area students enrolled by school							
Northeast Consortium	Blake	1,017	1,083	1,077	1,097	1,087	70
	Paint Branch	1,290	1,220	1,263	1,307	1,297	7
	Springbrook	1,145	1,146	1,130	1,081	1,107	-38
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	1,970	1,733	1,673	1,614	1,592	-378
	Einstein	1,240	1,167	1,120	905	895	-345
	Kennedy	1,014	938	906	887	854	-160
	Northwood*	149	298	462	639	710	561
	Wheaton	1,129	1,031	990	894	864	-265
Consortia Total		8,954	8,616	8,621	8,424	8,406	-548
Base students as a % of enrollment							
Northeast Consortium	Blake	52.5%	54.6%	58.2%	59.0%	59.6%	7.1%
	Paint Branch	71.3%	69.6%	72.4%	73.6%	71.4%	0.1%
	Springbrook	57.4%	56.2%	57.2%	58.4%	58.5%	1.1%
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	60.4%	57.8%	57.8%	58.4%	58.2%	-2.2%
	Einstein	70.4%	67.6%	65.3%	57.0%	55.6%	-14.9%
	Kennedy	67.2%	63.9%	60.9%	61.3%	54.5%	-12.8%
	Northwood	40.4%	41.6%	45.7%	50.0%	52.5%	12.1%
	Wheaton	76.4%	72.1%	71.0%	68.2%	65.2%	-11.3%
Consortia Total		63.4%	61.1%	61.3%	60.7%	59.5%	-3.9%

* Northwood enrolled Grade 9 in FY05, 9-10 in FY06, 9-11 in FY07, and 9-12 in FY08

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 23 on the following page describes consortia enrollment trends among two student types:

- Students residing within their school’s consortium that attend a high school outside of their base area (e.g., students in the Blake base area that attend Springbrook). These students are eligible for neighborhood based bus services from MCPS.
- Magnet and transfer students who attend a high school outside of their consortium or cluster. Magnet students are eligible for limited bus services (typically at central locations) from MCPS while transfer students are not eligible for any MCPS bus services.

Table 23: Non-Base Area and Outside Student Enrollment by Consortium School, FY05-09

<u>Student Enrollment</u>		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Change 05-09
(a) Number of non-base students							
Northeast Consortium	Blake	879	860	750	733	705	-174
	Paint Branch	496	503	463	450	499	3
	Springbrook	816	859	803	734	739	-77
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	846	816	790	729	726	-120
	Einstein	480	517	548	642	677	197
	Kennedy	450	482	513	505	649	199
	Northwood*	218	403	528	604	607	389
	Wheaton	329	375	386	396	442	113
Subtotal		4,514	4,815	4,781	4,793	5,044	530
(b) Number of students residing outside consortium (magnet and transfer students)							
Northeast Consortium	Blake	40	40	25	28	31	-9
	Paint Branch	24	31	19	19	21	-3
	Springbrook	34	34	41	37	47	13
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	447	447	433	420	418	-29
	Einstein	41	43	46	41	39	-2
	Kennedy	44	49	68	56	65	21
	Northwood*	2	15	21	35	35	33
	Wheaton	19	23	18	20	20	1
Subtotal		651	682	671	656	676	25
(c) Total number of students from non-base areas and outside consortiums							
Northeast Consortium	Blake	919	900	775	761	736	-183
	Paint Branch	520	534	482	469	520	0
	Springbrook	850	893	844	771	786	-64
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	1,293	1,263	1,223	1,149	1,144	-149
	Einstein	521	560	594	683	716	195
	Kennedy	494	531	581	561	714	220
	Northwood*	220	418	549	639	642	422
	Wheaton	348	398	404	416	462	114
Total		5,165	5,497	5,452	5,449	5,720	555
Non-base and outside consortium students as % of consortia enrollment							
(a) Non-base students		32.0%	34.1%	34.0%	34.5%	35.7%	3.7%
(b) Outside consortium students		4.6%	4.8%	4.8%	4.7%	4.8%	0.2%
(c) Total non-base and outside enrollment		36.6%	38.9%	38.7%	39.3%	40.5%	3.9%

* * Northwood enrolled Grade 9 in FY05, 9-10 in FY06, 9-11 in FY07, and 9-12 in FY08

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

An analysis of data from Table 23 on the prior page evidences the following findings:

- For both consortiums, the combined number of non-base and outside consortium students enrolled in consortia schools increased by 555 students (11%) from 5,165 in FY05 to 5,720 in FY09.
- The number of non-base area enrollees eligible for neighborhood bus service increased by 530 students from 4,514 students in FY05 to 5,044 students in FY09.
- Ninety-five percent of the increase in combined non-base area and outside consortium enrollment arose from increases in non-base area enrollment rather than from increases in transfer and magnet students from outside each consortium.
- The number of non-base students attending consortia schools decreased for two of three Northeast campuses, but increased for four of five Downcounty campuses.
- Non-base students as a percentage of overall high school consortia enrollment increased from 32.0% in FY05 to 35.7% in FY09.

CHAPTER VI: Consortia Demographics and Performance

This chapter reviews changes in measures of student demographics and performance associated with each of MCPS' high school consortiums.

- **Section I, Changes in Demographics of Enrolled Students**, describes changes in student demographics for the two MCPS high school consortiums and all MCPS high schools. Racial integration was an explicit goal of the Northeast Consortium, but not the Downcounty Consortium. However, income integration has been an objective of both consortiums in recent years.
- **Section II, Progress on Consortia Goals for Student Performance**, tracks the progress the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums has achieved on measures articulated by MCPS as core student performance goals for each consortium. Most of these goals emerged from the federal grant applications that initiated each consortium. This section also compares trends for each consortium to all MCPS high schools.

I. Changes in Demographics of Enrolled Students

This section reviews data on the demographics of students enrolled in the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums as follows:

- **Part A, Integration Objectives**, describes MCPS' racial and socio-economic integration goals for the consortiums;
- **Part B, Northeast Consortium**, analyzes changes in student demographics since this consortium became operational in 1998; and
- **Part C, Downcounty Consortium**, analyzes changes in student demographics since this consortium became operational in 2004.

In sum, similar to all MCPS high schools, the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums have experienced increases in the diversity of their student bodies. In recent years, however, the rates of poverty in both consortiums, as measured by ever FARMS rates, increased at a faster rate when compared to changes in the poverty rate across all MCPS high schools. As a result, neither high school consortium reduced "minority isolation" or enhanced socio-economic integration.

A. Integration Objectives

MCPS' student assignment process for the high school consortiums has reflected the Board of Education's goals for racial and later socio-economic integration within each consortium. The Board's integration goals and related actions are described below.

Racial Integration. An explicit goal of the Northeast Consortium was to reduce the degree of minority isolation at Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook high schools. In 1997, to promote integration and relieve overcrowding at Sherwood High School, MCPS allocated two majority white Sherwood neighborhoods into Blake's base area, and focused on recruiting private school students into the Northeast Consortium.

MCPS had planned to use student race and ethnicity in the assignment of students to consortium high schools to enhance integration. More specifically, if demand among choice and transfer applicants to the Northeast Consortium schools exceeded supply, race and ethnicity could have been used as factors in the student assignment process to demographically balance school enrollment. However, a 4th Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in 1999 disallowed MCPS from using student race and ethnicity in student assignments and transfers.³⁷

Socio-economic Integration. The current student assignment process identifies socio-economic (income) integration as a goal of both high school consortiums. In 2003, the Board approved the use of ever FARMS status as a potential factor in the student assignment process to balance demographics across the five Downcounty Consortium high schools;³⁸ in 2005, the Board extended the application of ever FARMS status as a potential factor in the student assignment process for the Northeast Consortium.³⁹

In practical terms, if student demand exceeds space at a relatively low-poverty consortium high school (e.g., Blake), then MCPS may assign more “ever” FARMS applicants to this school to balance demographics across the consortium’s schools. Conversely, if demand exceeds space at relatively high-poverty consortium high school (e.g., Springbrook), then MCPS may assign more applicants who have never received FARMS to this school.

B. Northeast Consortium

Table 24 contains student data by race and ethnicity for the Northeast Consortium high schools for the first five years of the consortium (FY98 to FY02) to determine whether this consortium reached its racial integration goals.

In sum, the data indicate that two of three campuses were unable to reverse minority isolation in the first five years of this consortium. Specifically, the data show that White enrollment in all MCPS high schools declined by 3% compared to a decline of 5-6% at Springbrook and Paint Branch and an increase of 5 % at Blake.

Table 24: Demographics of Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-02

	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	Change*
% White						
MCPS**	52.9%	52.2%	51.9%	51.1%	50.1%	-2.8%
Blake	**	43.2%	47.0%	47.2%	47.8%	4.6%
Paint Branch	41.5%	40.2%	39.8%	38.6%	35.9%	-5.6%
Springbrook	28.7%	27.5%	27.2%	25.7%	23.8%	-4.9%
% Asian						
MCPS	14.5%	14.4%	14.3%	14.3%	14.6%	0.1%
Blake	**	11.7%	10.1%	9.7%	8.8%	-2.9%
Paint Branch	16.9%	19.6%	18.9%	20.5%	21.9%	5.0%
Springbrook	21.1%	22.5%	22.7%	22.2%	21.1%	0.0%

³⁷ See Chapter II for discussion.

³⁸ Board Resolution 335-03 adopted on June 23, 2003.

³⁹ Board Resolution 482-05 adopted on September 13, 2005.

Table 24: Demographics of Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-02, Continued

	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	Change*
% Black						
MCPS	19.8%	20.4%	20.4%	20.4%	20.5%	0.7%
Blake	**	36.7%	34.8%	34.8%	34.7%	-2.0%
Paint Branch	34.1%	33.9%	34.2%	33.3%	35.3%	1.1%
Springbrook	34.7%	34.2%	35.0%	34.9%	36.6%	1.8%
% Latino						
MCPS	12.5%	12.6%	13.2%	13.9%	14.5%	2.0%
Blake	**	8.3%	7.9%	8.0%	8.2%	-0.1%
Paint Branch	6.4%	6.1%	6.8%	7.0%	6.7%	0.3%
Springbrook	15.1%	15.5%	14.9%	16.9%	18.1%	3.0%

* Change for Blake is FY99 – 02.

** MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 25 contains student demographic data for the Northeast Consortium and all MCPS high schools for the most recent six year period. The data show that between FY03 and FY08 the decline in White students experienced by all three Northeast Consortium high schools mirrored MCPS' overall decline in White high school enrollment.

Table 25: Demographics of Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY03-08

	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change 03-08
% White							
MCPS*	49.2%	47.4%	46.2%	45.0%	43.5%	42.1%	-7.1%
Blake	47.4%	45.5%	45.8%	45.6%	42.3%	37.3%	-10.1%
Paint Branch	33.7%	31.2%	29.7%	25.7%	24.1%	22.5%	-11.2%
Springbrook	22.6%	19.9%	17.2%	16.1%	16.2%	14.5%	-8.1%
% Asian							
MCPS	14.6%	14.5%	14.3%	14.4%	14.6%	14.8%	0.2%
Blake	8.6%	9.2%	9.2%	9.1%	9.6%	9.3%	0.7%
Paint Branch	20.5%	20.1%	18.9%	19.9%	19.6%	20.0%	-0.5%
Springbrook	21.3%	19.8%	18.7%	17.6%	16.0%	16.1%	-5.2%
% Black							
MCPS	20.8%	21.5%	22.2%	22.5%	22.9%	23.2%	2.4%
Blake	35.4%	35.6%	34.9%	34.0%	34.4%	38.7%	3.3%
Paint Branch	38.6%	40.2%	42.1%	45.0%	46.6%	46.5%	7.9%
Springbrook	37.8%	40.7%	43.5%	44.4%	45.7%	46.4%	8.6%
% Latino							
MCPS	15.2%	16.2%	17.0%	17.9%	18.7%	19.5%	4.3%
Blake	8.2%	9.3%	9.6%	10.8%	13.3%	14.1%	5.9%
Paint Branch	7.0%	8.2%	9.1%	9.3%	9.5%	10.6%	3.6%
Springbrook	18.2%	19.2%	20.3%	21.7%	21.7%	22.6%	4.4%

* MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 26 contains data on rates of current eligibility for free and reduced priced meals (FARMS) among all MCPS and Northeast Consortium high school students from FY98 to FY08. The data show that from FY98 to FY08, rates of current eligibility for FARMS increased by 5% for all MCPS high schools compared to a 2% increase at Blake, a 6% increase at Springbrook, and a 9% increase at Paint Branch.

Table 26: FARMS Eligibility Rates for Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08

<u>High School</u>	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
MCPS*	14.4%	13.6%	13.2%	12.2%	11.9%	12.7%
Blake	**	14.3%	11.5%	9.7%	7.0%	8.6%
Paint Branch	11.5%	10.1%	10.5%	10.3%	10.2%	13.0%
Springbrook	24.6%	23.2%	22.4%	21.2%	20.2%	21.1%
<u>High School</u>	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change* FY98-08
MCPS*	13.5%	14.2%	16.7%	17.2%	19.2%	4.8%
Blake	9.8%	10.9%	10.7%	13.3%	16.5%	2.2%
Paint Branch	12.9%	13.7%	17.9%	18.8%	20.9%	9.4%
Springbrook	22.0%	22.7%	26.9%	27.9%	31.0%	6.4%

* MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools ** Change for Blake FY99-FY08.
Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 27 contains data on high school students who have ever received FARMS for all MCPS and Northeast Consortium high school students from FY98 to FY08. This data shows that over this eleven year period, Paint Branch and Springbrook high schools had twice the rate of growth in their ever FARMS population compared to all MCPS high schools.

Table 27: Ever FARMS Eligibility Rates for Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08

<u>High School</u>	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
MCPS*	32.7%	32.5%	32.7%	33.2%	33.5%	34.3%
Blake	**	32.9%	28.5%	27.3%	25.8%	27.3%
Paint Branch	28.4%	28.1%	29.0%	30.4%	31.5%	34.9%
Springbrook	43.1%	43.1%	44.3%	45.3%	47.8%	48.2%
<u>High School</u>	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change* FY98-08
MCPS*	35.4%	36.4%	37.5%	37.8%	38.9%	6.2%
Blake	29.3%	29.8%	29.7%	33.8%	36.5%	3.6%
Paint Branch	37.9%	39.4%	42.1%	43.3%	43.7%	15.3%
Springbrook	50.4%	53.6%	56.1%	55.4%	56.2%	13.1%

* MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools ** Change for Blake FY99-FY08.
Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

C. Downcounty Consortium

Table 28 contains student demographic data by race, ethnicity, and poverty for the Downcounty Consortium high schools and across all MCPS high schools from FY04 to FY08. The data indicate that between FY04 and FY08:

- White student enrollment among the Downcounty Consortium high schools declined 3-7%. This mirrored the overall decline of 5.5% in White student enrollment across all MCPS high schools.
- Four of the Downcounty high schools experienced growth in their Latino enrollment of 5-8%, which was higher than the 3.3% increase across all MCPS high schools.
- Four of the Downcounty high schools also had greater growth in their “ever” FARMS enrollment at 4-7% compared to an increase of 3.5% for all MCPS high schools.

Table 28: Demographics of MCPS and Downcounty Consortium High Schools, FY04-08

		FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change*
% White	MCPS**	47.4%	46.2%	45.0%	43.5%	42.1%	-5.3%
	Montgomery Blair	28.1%	27.2%	27.0%	26.1%	25.4%	-2.7%
	Einstein	26.7%	26.2%	23.9%	24.0%	22.6%	-4.1%
	Kennedy	18.8%	17.4%	15.8%	15.2%	12.4%	-6.4%
	Northwood		30.1%	28.2%	25.5%	25.4%	-4.7%
	Wheaton	17.8%	15.3%	12.7%	11.0%	10.7%	-7.1
% Asian	MCPS	14.5%	14.3%	14.4%	14.6%	14.8%	0.3%
	Montgomery Blair	14.1%	14.8%	15.9%	16.5%	17.7%	3.6%
	Einstein	12.3%	11.9%	13.1%	12.9%	11.7%	-0.6%
	Kennedy	11.8%	11.4%	11.5%	11.3%	10.4%	-1.4%
	Northwood		5.5%	4.7%	4.5%	6.2%	0.7%
	Wheaton	9.8%	10.6%	10.2%	10.7%	11.7%	1.9
% Black	MCPS	21.6%	22.2%	22.5%	22.9%	23.2%	1.6%
	Montgomery Blair	32.0%	31.8%	31.2%	30.8%	29.8%	-2.2%
	Einstein	25.6%	24.7%	24.2%	24.3%	23.8%	-1.8%
	Kennedy	41.1%	42.1%	41.5%	42.4%	44.2%	3.1%
	Northwood		35.9%	34.2%	36.8%	34.8%	-1.1%
	Wheaton	26.4%	27.4%	26.3%	25.6%	23.4%	-3.0%
% Latino	MCPS	16.2%	17.0%	17.9%	18.7%	19.5%	3.3%
	Montgomery Blair	25.6%	26.0%	25.5%	26.4%	27.0%	1.4%
	Einstein	35.0%	36.8%	38.5%	38.4%	41.4%	6.4%
	Kennedy	27.7%	28.7%	31.1%	30.8%	32.8%	5.1%
	Northwood		27.9%	32.8%	33.1%	33.1%	5.2%
	Wheaton	45.7%	46.4%	50.6%	52.6%	54.0%	8.3%

Table 28: Demographics of MCPS and Downcounty Consortium High Schools, FY04-08, Continued

		FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change*
% FARMS	MCPS	13.5%	14.2%	16.7%	17.2%	19.2%	5.7%
	Montgomery Blair	23.4%	21.3%	25.7%	29.0%	31.4%	8.0%
	Einstein	30.1%	29.2%	32.0%	32.1%	36.0%	5.9%
	Kennedy	26.6%	28.2%	29.9%	30.8%	36.5%	9.9%
	Northwood		27.6%	25.5%	29.0%	30.4%	2.8%
	Wheaton	41.5%	36.6%	40.4%	41.1%	47.7%	6.2%
% Ever FARMS	MCPS	35.4%	36.4%	37.5%	37.8%	38.9%	3.5%
	Montgomery Blair	52.4%	52.7%	52.0%	52.6%	53.1%	0.7%
	Einstein	59.2%	60.2%	62.7%	62.8%	65.6%	6.4%
	Kennedy	60.9%	63.3%	64.5%	63.8%	67.8%	6.9%
	Northwood		49.7%	53.2%	55.4%	56.0%	6.3%
	Wheaton	77.2%	78.3%	79.1%	80.7%	81.4%	4.2%

* Change for Northwood based on FY05 – 08 data.

** MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

II. Progress on Consortia Goals for Student Performance

This section tracks the progress that the Northeast and Downcounty Consortia achieved in improving student performance goals articulated by MCPS. It is organized as follows:

Part A, The Northeast Consortium, summarizes the progress made since FY98 “to strengthen students’ knowledge of academic skills and their marketable skills” by tracking this consortium’s progress on five student performance goals in the initial and later years of this consortium:

1. Increase the percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9;
2. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one Advanced Placement (AP) exam;
3. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score;
4. Increase the percent of graduates who take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT); and
5. Increase the SAT scores of graduates.

In sum, the data indicate that the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress on achieving the five student performance goals listed above. While progress was made in SAT participation from FY98 to FY01, in Algebra I completion by the end of Grade 9 from FY99 to FY03, and in AP participation and performance from FY00 to FY07, the Northeast Consortium lost ground in rates of Algebra I completion by the end of Grade 9 from FY04 to FY07, in SAT participation from FY01 to FY08, and in SAT scores from FY06 to FY08.

Part B, The Downcounty Consortium, summarizes the progress made since FY04 on the following ten student performance goals with available data that align with the core objectives of the Downcounty Consortium:

1. Increase the student promotion rate from Grade 9 to Grade 10;
2. Decrease the percent of freshmen who fail one or more classes by subgroup;
3. Increase freshmen grade point averages by subgroup;
4. Decrease the percent of freshmen ineligible to participate in extracurricular activities by subgroup;
5. Increase the cumulative student promotion rate from Grade 9 to graduation;
6. Increase the graduation rate;
7. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least AP exam by subgroup;
8. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score;
9. Increase the percent of graduates who take the SAT by subgroup; and
10. Increase the SAT scores of graduates by subgroup.

In sum, the data indicate that the Downcounty Consortium achieved progress on six of nine student performance goals listed above and progress on a related tenth measure (Grades 9-12 student eligibility). In particular, a majority of Downcounty campuses achieved gains in both Grade 9 to 10 and Grade 9 to graduation promotion rates, SAT participation and performance, and eligibility for extracurricular activities among Grades 9-12 that exceeded gains achieved by all MCPS high schools. The Downcounty Consortium also had gains in AP participation and performance that mirrored the gains achieved by MCPS high schools overall. On three measures, the Downcounty Consortium lost ground: decreasing freshmen course failure rates, increasing freshmen grade point averages, and increasing graduation rates.

Sources of Data and Methodology. MCPS' Offices of Curriculum and Instruction, and Shared Accountability provided all of the data reviewed in this section of the report. Appendix B (beginning at ©25) contains data tables for each of the goals tracked and more detailed analysis.

To discern whether each high school consortium achieved the student performance goals listed above, OLO reviewed the data to answer the following questions:

- During the time period examined, did a majority of consortium campuses make progress in the direction desired by MCPS?
- Was the rate of progress achieved by a majority of consortium campuses less than, equal to, or greater than the rate of progress made by all MCPS high schools?

The key observations in this chapter respond to these two questions for each performance measure reviewed. Appendix B includes more detailed analysis and a description of the achievement gaps evident on most measures by race, ethnicity, and income.

A. Northeast Consortium

Background on the student performance goals for the Northeast Consortium. MCPS was awarded a three-year \$2.9 million grant in 1998 by the U.S. Department of Education's Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) to implement the Northeast Consortium.⁴⁰

With MSAP funding, MCPS committed to:

- Reduce the degree of minority isolation within the consortium and in curricular and extracurricular activities in the three high school magnets;
- Implement systemic reforms that align the magnet programs with challenging state content standards and expectations for student performance;
- Establish school-wide magnet schools that feature innovative educational methods and practices to meet student needs and interests; and
- Assist Northeast Consortium high schools in the development of programs to strengthen students' knowledge of academic subjects and their marketable vocational skills.

This section describes the Northeast Consortium's progress on five student performance goals that track this consortium's progress in strengthening students' knowledge of academic subjects and their marketable vocational skills:

1. Increase the percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9;
2. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one AP exam;
3. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score;
4. Increase the percent of graduates who take the SAT; and
5. Increase the SAT scores of graduates.

OLO tracks and reports data for two time frames, at the start of the consortium and for recent years, to discern differences in this consortium's progress over the last 11 years. As a result, twelve opportunities for progress among the five measures are reviewed. Table 29 on the next page provides an overall summary of the trends demonstrated by the data reviewed; the text following the table provides more explanation for each goal. Appendix B contains data tables and a more detailed analysis of the student performance trends.

In sum, the data indicate that the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress. This consortium achieved progress on seven of twelve measures and lost ground on five measures. Among the seven measures where a majority of Northeast Consortium high schools achieved progress, on only one instance did this consortium's progress exceed that of all MCPS high schools – gains in SAT participation from FY98 to FY01. As a result, if this consortium accelerated student achievement, the data suggest that it did so near the start of this consortium with the consequent impacts diminishing in recent years.

⁴⁰Chapter II notes that in 2005, two of the NEC campuses (Blake and Paint Branch) were also awarded a five-year \$1.5 million grant from the USED's Small Learning Communities Program with specific performance goals. Since this grant is on-going, this project excludes an analysis of NEC's progress on these goals.

Table 29: Summary of Northeast Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase the percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9	FY99-03	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	No	Less progress
2. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one Advanced Placement (AP) exam	FY00-04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
3. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score	FY00-04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	Yes	Less progress
4. Increase the percent of graduates who take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	FY98-01	Yes	Greater progress
	FY01-05	No	Less progress
	FY06-08	No	Same progress
5. Increase the SAT scores of graduates	FY98-01	No	Same progress
	FY01-05	Yes	Same progress
	FY06-08	No	Same progress

1. Increase the percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9

From FY99 to FY03, two out of three Northeast Consortium campuses (Blake and Springbrook) made progress on this measure, but then lost ground on this measure between FY04 and FY07. As a result, the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed success in increasing Algebra I completion rates by the end of Grade 9 compared to all MCPS high schools, which showed an increase in Algebra I completion rates for every subgroup from FY99 to FY07. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©26.

2. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one AP exam.

From FY00 to FY07, each Northeast Consortium campus achieved progress on this measure overall and for every subgroup except among Latino students at Blake. In most cases, the consortium's progress by campus and subgroup paralleled MCPS' progress for all high schools. As a result, the Northeast Consortium achieved progress on this measure that was analogous to the progress achieved by all MCPS high schools. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©28.

3. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score.

From FY00 to FY07, each Northeast Consortium campus improved AP performance for every subgroup. From FY00 to FY04, the consortium's progress paralleled the progress of all MCPS high schools. From FY04 to FY07, the progress achieved at Blake exceeded the gains achieved by all MCPS high schools, but the progress achieved by Paint Branch and Springbrook lagged behind MCPS' gains among all high schools. As a result, the Northeast Consortium achieved progress on this goal from FY00 to FY07 at a rate that matched all MCPS high schools from FY00 to FY04, but lagged behind MCPS from FY04 to FY07. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©29.

4. Increase the percent of graduates who take the SAT.

From FY98 to FY01, Paint Branch and Springbrook increased the percent of graduates taking the SAT and achieved greater gains than all MCPS high schools. From FY01 to FY05, these two campuses, however, lost ground on this measure overall and relative to all MCPS high schools and to Blake which increased SAT participation during this time frame. From FY06 to FY08, Blake and Springbrook lost ground on this measure at levels similar to all MCPS high schools. As a result, the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress on this measure. For the data tables and detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©30.

5. Increase the SAT scores of graduates.

From FY98 to FY01, the Northeast Consortium campuses, like MCPS high schools overall, experienced declines in their average SAT scores among all students and among a majority of subgroups. From FY01 to FY05, the Northeast Consortium high schools, like their MCPS peers, increased their SAT scores overall and for a majority of subgroups. From FY06 to FY08, however, average SAT scores declined for at least four of five subgroups on every Northeast Consortium campus compared to three of five subgroups for all MCPS high schools. As a result, the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress on this measure as well. For the data tables and detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©33.

B. Downcounty Consortium

Background on the student performance goals for the Downcounty Consortium. MCPS was awarded another three-year, \$2.0 million grant in 2002 from the U.S. Department of Education to launch the Downcounty Consortium. As part of this grant, MCPS committed to achieving several goals for improved student performance.

Table 30 on the next page provides an overall summary of the trends demonstrated by the data reviewed; the text following the table provides more explanation for each performance goal. Appendix B, ©35 contains data tables and a more detailed analysis of the student performance trends.

In sum, the data indicate that the Downcounty Consortium achieved favorable progress on a majority of student performance measures, often at a better rate of progress than achieved by all MCPS high schools overall. More specifically, a majority of Downcounty Consortium high schools achieved gains on five measures – Grade 9 to 10 promotion, student eligibility for extracurricular activities, Grade 9 to graduation promotion, and SAT participation and performance – that exceeded the gains achieved by all MCPS high schools since FY04. On AP participation and performance, this consortium achieved gains that matched all MCPS high schools. However, the Downcounty Consortium lost ground on three measures overall and relative to all MCPS high schools: freshmen course failure rates, freshmen grade point averages, and graduation rates based on Maryland State Department of Education calculations.

Table 30: Summary of Downcounty Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase student promotion rate from Grade 9 to 10	FY05-08	Yes	Greater progress
2. Decrease freshmen course failure rate by subgroup	FY04-08	No	Less progress
3. Increase freshmen grade point average by subgroup	FY04-08	No	Less progress
4. Decrease student ineligibility by subgroup*	FY04-08	Yes	Greater progress
5. Increase student promotion rate from Gr. 9 to graduation	FY05-08	Yes	Greater progress
6. Increase graduation rate	FY04-07	No	Less progress
7. Increase AP participation among graduates by subgroup	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
8. Increase AP performance among graduates by subgroup	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
9. Increase SAT participation among graduate by subgroup	FY06-08	Yes	Greater progress
10. Increase SAT scores among graduates by subgroup	FY06-08	Yes	Greater progress

* Finding based on OLO analysis of all high school data rather than freshmen data.

1. Increase student promotion rate from Grade 9 to 10

From FY05 to FY08, the Downcounty Consortium increased the rate of Grade 9 students promoted to Grade 10 by 1 percentage point from 87% to 88%. This compared to all MCPS high schools increasing Grade 9 to 10 student promotion rates by a half a percentage point from 93.5% to 94.0% during this time frame. As a result, the Downcounty Consortium made progress on this measure, and at faster rate than all MCPS high schools. For the definition of Grade 9 to 10 promotion used by OLO, the data tables, and more detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©36.

2. Decrease the percent of freshmen who fail one or more classes by subgroup.

An analysis of first semester data on this measure demonstrates that the Downcounty Consortium did not achieve progress on this measure. Only one campus (Wheaton) reached this goal for every subgroup compared to the remaining four Downcounty campuses that increased their rates of freshman course failure for two or more of four subgroups from FY04 to FY08. Alternatively, MCPS decreased course failure among three of four subgroups among all high schools during this time frame. As a result, the Downcounty's progress on this measure lagged behind MCPS' progress for all high schools. For the data tables and detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©37.

3. Increase freshmen grade point average by subgroup.

An analysis of first semester data demonstrates that the Downcounty Consortium has not achieved this goal. From FY04 to FY08, every Downcounty campus diminished average GPAs for at least two of four subgroups, with a majority experiencing declining grade point averages for three subgroups. All MCPS high schools also lost ground among three of four subgroups on this measure, but the magnitude of the loss was less than for the Downcounty Consortium. As a result, the Downcounty's lagged behind MCPS' progress on this measure. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©38.

4. Decrease percent of freshmen ineligible for extracurricular activities by subgroup.

The declines in average freshmen GPAs and increases in freshmen course failure rates evident among Downcounty high schools for the prior two measures suggest that the Downcounty Consortium has not achieved progress in reducing ineligibility rates among high school freshmen. However, the ineligibility at the end of the school year data analyzed by OLO for *all high school students* suggests that the Downcounty Consortium had made progress in improving eligibility among this larger group of students from FY05 to FY08, and greater progress than MCPS. More specifically, the data demonstrate that four of the five Downcounty campuses achieved progress in reducing ineligibility rates for all high school students and among at least two of four subgroups. These campuses reduced ineligibility rates for all high school students by 0.4 to 4.8 percentage points compared to a decline of 0.1 points for all MCPS high schools. For the data tables and more detailed analysis, see Appendix B, ©40.

5. Increase the cumulative student promotion rate from Grade 9 to graduation.

An analysis of the data suggests that the Downcounty Consortium has made progress on this measure overall and relative to all MCPS high schools. The data suggest that this consortium increased its cumulative promotion rate by 5.2 percentage points from FY05 to FY08 from 65.0% to 70.0%, compared to a 0.4 percentage point increase of 81.6% to 82.0% for all MCPS high schools. Kennedy and Wheaton experienced the largest increases, with approximately three-quarters of their freshmen graduating within four years by FY08. For the definition of cumulative student promotion rate used by OLO, the data tables, and more detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©42.

6. Increase the graduation rate.

Unlike graduation rate measures based on the cumulative promotion index, Maryland State Department of Education calculations of graduation rates suggest that the Downcounty Consortium lost ground on this measure overall and relative to MCPS. In particular, the data suggest that from FY04 to FY07, each Downcounty campus's graduation rate diminished from 1.1 to 7.4 percentage points compared to a 1.0 percentage point drop for all MCPS high schools. For the data tables and analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©43.

7. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one AP exam.

An analysis of FY04 to FY07 data shows that every Downcounty campus made progress on this measure at a rate comparable to MCPS' level of progress for all high schools. More specifically, the data shows that the Downcounty campuses increased AP participation rates for every subgroup with a few exceptions, ranging from 1.3 to 21.4 percentage points. In comparison MCPS high schools overall increased AP participation among all students by 11.4 percentage points with gains for every subgroup. For the data tables and detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©43.

8. Increase percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score.

An analysis of FY04 to FY07 data also shows that each Downcounty campus achieved progress in increasing the percentage of graduates earning qualifying AP scores among a majority of subgroups. In particular, the data show increases in AP performance among every subgroup for two Downcounty campuses, and for three out of four subgroups for the remaining campuses. Overall, the Downcounty campuses increased the percent of graduates earning one or more qualifying AP scores by 3.6 to 10.5 percentage points. All MCPS high schools increased the percent of students with qualifying AP scores by 6.6 percentage points with gains for every subgroup. MCPS' aggregate progress among all high schools was comparable to the collective gains achieved by the Downcounty high schools. For the data tables and detailed analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©45.

9. Increase the percent of graduates who take the SAT by subgroup.

An analysis of FY06 to FY08 data demonstrates that the Downcounty campuses made progress in increasing participation on the SAT, and their progress exceeded MCPS' progress. In particular, the data show that three of four Downcounty campuses with data increased SAT participation rates for every subgroup, ranging from 1 to 24 percentage points; and that these campuses achieved gains at far higher levels than achieved by all MCPS high schools. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©45.

10. Increase the SAT scores of graduates by subgroup.

An analysis of the data demonstrates that the Downcounty campuses achieved progress in increasing student performance on the new SAT. In particular, the data demonstrate that two of the Downcounty campuses achieved increases in total SAT scores overall and for at least four of five subgroups compared to one campus that had falling scores for every subgroup, and another campus that had declines for three out of five subgroups. In comparison, MCPS high schools overall achieved gains among three of five subgroups but lost ground among students overall. This suggests that MCPS gains in SAT scores by subgroups were less than those achieved by the Downcounty Consortium. For the data tables and more analysis associated with progress on this goal, see Appendix B, ©47.

CHAPTER VII: Summary of Findings

The MCPS Board of Education developed the two high school consortiums to address overcrowding, enhance integration, improve student achievement, and narrow the achievement gap in the eastern portion of the County. The Northeast Consortium became operational in 1998 with the combining of the Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook high school clusters into one consortium. The Downcounty Consortium became operational in 2004 with the combining of the Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton high school clusters into the second consortium.

The purpose of this Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) report is to improve the Council's understanding of the costs and results associated with MCPS' two high school consortiums. This chapter summarizes OLO's findings on the two high school consortiums into four general topics:

- Costs and funding of the consortiums;
- Consortia goals and strategies;
- Trends in school choice and enrollment; and
- Trends in student demographics and performance.

Costs and Funding of the Consortiums

Finding #1: The FY09 budget includes \$3.2 million for the high school consortiums.

MCPS' FY09 operating budget allocates \$3.2 million for the high school consortiums as follows:

- \$963,000 is budgeted to the Northeast Consortium;
- \$891,000 is budgeted to the Downcounty Consortium;
- \$856,000 is included in the Department of Transportation budget; and
- \$532,000 is budgeted to the Division of Consortia Choice and Application Program Services (Division of Consortia).

Non-personnel costs (contractual services, supplies and materials, travel, and equipment) and transportation costs account for 43% of the high school consortia budgets. Personnel costs (wages, salaries, and benefits) account for 57% of the high school consortia budgets; the specific positions/hours funded are:

- 6.1 teachers for the Northeast Consortium;
- 5.6 teachers for the Downcounty Consortium;
- 3.6 positions for the central office Division of Consortia; and
- 14,776 hours of bus operator services for the Department of Transportation.

Finding #2: The cumulative cost of the high school consortiums (FY98-09) has been \$27.4 million; 77% of this amount was funded by the County.

Of the \$27.4 million budgeted over 11 years (FY98-09) to the two high school consortiums:

- \$11.6 million was budgeted for the Northeast Consortium;
- \$7.0 million was budgeted for the Downcounty Consortium;
- \$4.8 million was budgeted to support additional transportation services; and
- \$4.0 million was budgeted for the Division of Consortia and its precursors.

Since FY98, MCPS has budgeted \$21.2 million in local dollars to support the high school consortiums; this represents approximately 77% of the total 11-year consortia costs. Three federal grants awarded to MCPS since FY98 make up the remaining 23% of total high school consortia funding. For FY09, local dollars make up 90% of the high school consortia's overall funding.

Finding #3: MCPS has been awarded \$6.4 million in federal grants to launch and expand programming for both high school consortiums.

MCPS started planning the high school consortiums in 1991. MCPS' records indicate the consortium concept was developed in response to a County Council request to address secondary school overcrowding in the eastern part of the County. As the planning evolved, MCPS staff identified, applied for, and received federal grants that aligned with MCPS' school improvement and integration goals:

- In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education's Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) awarded MCPS a three-year, \$2.9 million grant for the Northeast Consortium.
- In 2002, MCPS was awarded a three-year, \$2.0 million grant from the Department's Small Learning Communities (SLC) Program for the Downcounty Consortium; and
- In 2005, MCPS was awarded another federal SLC grant of \$1.5 million for five years to support two of the three Northeast Consortium campuses: Blake and Paint Branch.

Consortia Goals and Strategies

Finding #4: Gains in student performance and narrowing of the achievement gap serve as the goals of each high school consortium.

Board of Education meeting minutes and MCPS grant applications indicate that the primary goal for each high school consortium is "improving student performance." As summarized in the chart below, common objectives articulated by MCPS in the three federal grant applications were to: improve students' academic knowledge and vocational skills; and narrow the achievement gap by race, ethnicity, and income.

Chart 1: Student Performance Goals by Federal Grant for High School Consortia

Student Performance Goals	FY99-01 MSAP Grant	FY03-06 SLC Grant	FY05-10 SLC Grant
1. Reduce minority isolation	√		
2. Strengthen students knowledge of academic subjects and vocational skills	√	√	√
3. Improve freshmen performance by subgroup		√	√
4. Improve student engagement by subgroup			√

Sources: MCPS grant applications

Finding #5: MCPS uses three strategies to implement the high school consortiums—signature programs, freshmen academies, and student choice.

Signature Programs: MCPS currently offers signature and academy programs in 23 of its 24 comprehensive high schools. The chart below lists the specific signature and academy programs found in each of the consortium high schools.

Chart 2: Signature Programs by Consortia High School

Consortium	High School	Signature and Academy Programs
Northeast Consortium	Blake	Humanities and Public Service, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, Business and Consumer Services
	Paint Branch	Science and Media, Finance, Engineering Technology, Child Development and Education, NJROTC, and Restaurant Management
	Springbrook	International studies, Technology
Downcounty Consortium	Montgomery Blair	Human Services, Entrepreneurship, Media Literacy, Science, Math and Technology and International Studies
	Einstein	Finance, International Studies, and Visual and Performing Arts
	Kennedy	International Studies, Multimedia and Telecommunications, Sports Medicine and Management, and NJROTC
	Northwood	Environmental Sciences, Political Science and Public Advocacy, Humanities and Film, and Musical Theater
	Wheaton	Information Technology, Engineering, and Biosciences and Medicine, and Global and Cultural Studies

Source : MCPS website

Freshmen Academies: All five Downcounty Consortium high schools and two of the Northeast Consortium campuses (Blake and Paint Branch) also house freshmen academies aimed at improving the transition and performance of Grade 9 students.⁴¹ Common features of the freshmen academies include:

- Smaller learning communities with dedicated faculty;
- Accelerated, double period literacy and mathematics courses for students two or more grades behind in literacy and/or math; and
- Connections, a freshman seminar that introduces students to career and higher education options.

Student Choice: The consortiums also offer student choice, with MCPS bus services provided to students who attend high schools outside of their base areas. The choice application process encourages students to rank their order of preference for high schools based on their interest in the schools' signature programs. MCPS guarantees students assignment to their base school (determined by where the student lives) if it is their first choice or it is their second choice and their first choice is not available. MCPS assigns students to schools based on students' ranking of school choices, the number of students selecting their base school, the capacities of consortia high schools, and the socioeconomic status and gender of students.

Trends in School Choice and Enrollment

Finding #6: Since FY05, approximately 14,000 students have been enrolled each year in one of the consortia high schools.

Between FY05 and FY09, approximately 14,000 students (representing almost one-third of all high school students in MCPS) were enrolled in either the Northeast or Downcounty consortium. The table below summarizes high school enrollment by each consortium compared to MCPS' overall high school enrollment.

Table 31: High School Enrollment for MCPS and by Consortium, FY05-09

<u>High School Enrollment</u>	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09*	Change 05-09
Northeast Consortium	5,741	5,776	5,571	5,486	5,519	-222
Downcounty Consortium	8,378	8,337	8,502	8,387	8,499	121
High School Consortia Total	14,119	14,113	14,073	13,873	14,018	-101
MCPS	44,084	44,677	44,515	44,201	44,245	161
High School Consortia Enrollment as % of MCPS High School Enrollment	32.0%	31.6%	31.6%	31.4%	31.6%	-0.4%

*MCPS FY09 data for all high schools based on preliminary September 30, 2008 enrollment.
Source: MCPS

⁴¹ Two additional MCPS high schools also have freshmen academies, Seneca Valley and Gaithersburg.

Finding #7: In FY08, 90% of students in both consortiums received their first choice school; about half selected their home school as their top choice.

The data in Table 32 describing trends in school choice show that from FY04 to FY08:

- The percent of students receiving their first school choice remained close to 90% for the Northeast Consortium, but declined from 97% to 90% for the Downcounty Consortium;
- The percent of students selecting their base school as their first choice declined from 60% to 56% in the Northeast Consortium, and from 56% to 50% in the Downcounty Consortium.

Table 32: Round 1 Student Choice Trends by High School Consortium, FY04-08

Percent of	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change 04-08
Northeast Consortium						
Grade 8 eligible students who applied	89%	94%	95%	95%	100%	11%
Applicants that received 1 st choice	91%	93%	85%	94%	89%	-2%
Applicants that selected base as 1 st choice	60%	56%	54%	56%	56%	-4%
Downcounty Consortium						
Grade 8 eligible students who applied	90%	95%	95%	96%	95%	5%
Applicants that received 1 st choice	97%	86%	83%	86%	90%	-7%
Applicants that selected base as 1 st choice	54%	51%	53%	56%	50%	-4%

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Finding #8: About a third of the high school consortia students in FY09 (5,044 students) enrolled in schools outside of their base area.

The data in Table 33 show that in FY09, 36% of the students enrolled in a consortium high school have selected to attend a consortium high school outside of their base area. The number of students who chose to attend a non-base high school within their consortium increased by 555 students from 4,514 students in FY05 to 5,044 students in FY09.

Table 33: Base and Non-Base Area and Outside Student Enrollment by Consortium, FY05-09

<u>Enrollment</u>	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Change (05-09)
Number of base, non-base, and outside of consortium students						
(a) Base within consortium	8,954	8,616	8,621	8,424	8,406	-548
(b) Non-base within consortium	4,514	4,815	4,781	4,793	5,044	530
(c) Outside consortium	651	682	671	656	676	25
Base, non-base, and outside of consortium students as % consortia enrollment						
(a) Base within consortium	63.4%	61.1%	61.3%	60.7%	59.5%	-3.9%
(b) Non-base within consortium	32.0%	34.1%	34.0%	34.5%	35.7%	3.7%
(c) Outside consortium	4.6%	4.8%	4.8%	4.7%	4.8%	0.2%

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Trends in Student Demographics and Performance

Finding #9: The high school consortiums did not improve racial or economic integration.

Table 34 describes the distribution of White students among total school enrollment for all MCPS high schools and Northeast Consortium high schools from FY98 to FY08. During this time frame, none of the Northeast campuses were able to reverse minority isolation, and two of the high schools (Paint Branch and Springbrook) had declines in their White student enrollment that were higher than the declines evidenced among by all MCPS high schools.

Table 34: White Enrollment for MCPS and Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08

<u>High School</u>	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
MCPS*	52.9%	52.2%	51.9%	51.1%	50.1%	49.2%
Blake	**	43.2%	47.0%	47.2%	47.8%	47.4%
Paint Branch	41.5%	40.2%	39.8%	38.6%	35.9%	33.7%
Springbrook	28.7%	27.5%	27.2%	25.7%	23.8%	22.6%
<u>High School</u>	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change* FY98-08
MCPS*	47.4%	46.2%	45.0%	43.5%	42.1%	-10.8%
Blake	45.5%	45.8%	45.6%	42.3%	37.3%	-5.9%
Paint Branch	31.2%	29.7%	25.7%	24.1%	22.5%	-19.0%
Springbrook	19.9%	17.2%	16.1%	16.2%	14.5%	-14.1%

* MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools ** Change for Blake FY99-FY08.

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 35 describes the percent of students ever receiving FARMS for the Northeast Consortium and all MCPS high schools from FY98 to FY08. The data show that since the start of this consortium, two of the Northeast high schools (Paint Branch and Springbrook) experienced greater growth in their ever FARMS population than MCPS high schools overall.

Table 35: Ever FARMS Enrollment for MCPS and Northeast Consortium High Schools, FY98-08

<u>High School</u>	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
MCPS*	32.7%	32.5%	32.7%	33.2%	33.5%	34.3%
Blake	**	32.9%	28.5%	27.3%	25.8%	27.3%
Paint Branch	28.4%	28.1%	29.0%	30.4%	31.5%	34.9%
Springbrook	43.1%	43.1%	44.3%	45.3%	47.8%	48.2%
<u>High School</u>	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change* FY98-08
MCPS*	35.4%	36.4%	37.5%	37.8%	38.9%	6.2%
Blake	29.3%	29.8%	29.7%	33.8%	36.5%	3.6%
Paint Branch	37.9%	39.4%	42.1%	43.3%	43.7%	15.3%
Springbrook	50.4%	53.6%	56.1%	55.4%	56.2%	13.1%

* MCPS refers to all MCPS high schools ** Change for Blake FY99-FY08.

Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Table 36 contains student demographic data for the Downcounty Consortium and all MCPS high schools from FY04 to FY08. The data show that declines in White student enrollment for the Downcounty campuses mirrored the declines for all MCPS high schools. However, four Downcounty high schools had greater growth in their “ever” FARMS enrollment than MCPS.

Table 36: Demographics of MCPS and Downcounty Consortium High Schools, FY04-08

	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Change
% White						
MCPS**	47.4%	46.2%	45.0%	43.5%	42.1%	-5.3%
Montgomery Blair	28.1%	27.2%	27.0%	26.1%	25.4%	-2.7%
Einstein	26.7%	26.2%	23.9%	24.0%	22.6%	-4.1%
Kennedy	18.8%	17.4%	15.8%	15.2%	12.4%	-6.4%
Northwood		30.1%	28.2%	25.5%	25.4%	-4.7%
Wheaton	17.8%	15.3%	12.7%	11.0%	10.7%	-7.1
% Ever FARMS						
MCPS	35.4%	36.4%	37.5%	37.8%	38.9%	3.5%
Montgomery Blair	52.4%	52.7%	52.0%	52.6%	53.1%	0.7%
Einstein	59.2%	60.2%	62.7%	62.8%	65.6%	6.4%
Kennedy	60.9%	63.3%	64.5%	63.8%	67.8%	6.9%
Northwood		49.7%	53.2%	55.4%	56.0%	6.3%
Wheaton	77.2%	78.3%	79.1%	80.7%	81.4%	4.2%

* Change for Northwood based on FY05 – 08 data. ** MCPS refers to all high schools
 Source: OLO analysis of MCPS data

Finding #10: The Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress at strengthening students’ knowledge of academic subjects.

Table 37 on the next page summarizes the Northeast Consortium’s progress at strengthening students’ knowledge of academic subjects based on five measures of student performance. In sum, the data reviewed show that the Northeast Consortium achieved mixed progress at improving student performance. To the extent that this consortium accelerated student performance, it did so in the early years of the consortium with the impacts declining in more recent years.

Table 37: Summary of Northeast Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase the percent of students who complete Algebra I by the end of Grade 9	FY99-03	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	No	Less progress
2. Increase the percent of graduates who take at least one Advanced Placement (AP) exam	FY00-04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
3. Increase the percent of graduates who earn at least one qualifying AP score	FY00-04	Yes	Same progress
	FY04-07	Yes	Less progress
4. Increase the percent of graduates who take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)	FY98-01	Yes	Greater progress
	FY01-05	No	Less progress
	FY06-08	No	Same progress
5. Increase the SAT scores of graduates	FY98-01	No	Same progress
	FY01-05	Yes	Same progress
	FY06-08	No	Same progress

Finding #12: The Downcounty Consortium achieved progress on seven of ten student performance goals.

Table 38 summarizes the Downcounty Consortium’s progress at achieving progress on ten measures of student performance. In sum, the data reviewed show that the Downcounty Consortium achieved greater progress than MCPS high schools overall on five measures of student performance and equal progress to MCPS high schools on another two measures of performance. For the remaining three performance goals, the Downcounty Consortium lost ground on these measures overall and relative to all MCPS high schools.

Table 38: Summary of Downcounty Consortium Progress on Student Performance Goals

Student Performance Goals	Time Frame	Overall Progress?	Progress Relative to all MCPS high schools?
1. Increase student promotion rate from Grade 9 to 10	FY05-08	Yes	Greater progress
2. Decrease freshmen course failure rate by subgroup	FY04-08	No	Less progress
3. Increase freshmen grade point average by subgroup	FY04-08	No	Less progress
4. Decrease student ineligibility by subgroup*	FY04-08	Yes	Greater progress
5. Increase student promotion rate from Gr. 9 to graduation	FY05-08	Yes	Greater progress
6. Increase graduation rate	FY04-07	No	Less progress
7. Increase AP participation among graduates by subgroup	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
8. Increase AP performance among graduates by subgroup	FY04-07	Yes	Same progress
9. Increase SAT participation among graduate by subgroup	FY06-08	Yes	Greater progress
10. Increase SAT scores among graduates by subgroup	FY06-08	Yes	Greater progress

* Finding based on OLO analysis of all high school data , not just freshmen data.

CHAPTER VIII: Recommended Discussion Issues

The purpose of this Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) project is to improve the Council's understanding of the costs and results associated with the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)' two high school consortiums. Based on the information and analysis compiled about the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums, this chapter outlines issues for the Council to discuss with Montgomery County Board of Education and MCPS representatives. The chapter also identifies a related issue for the Council to discuss concerning OLO's upcoming study on MCPS' workforce readiness programs.

Recommended Discussion Issues

Issue #1: Assessing the investment in MCPS' high school consortiums.

The Northeast Consortium became operational in 1998 by combining the Blake, Paint Branch, and Springbrook high school clusters into one consortium. The Downcounty Consortium became operational in 2005 by combining the Montgomery Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, and Wheaton high school clusters into the other high school consortium.

In sum, the estimated current year (FY09) cost of operating the two consortiums is \$3.2 million; 90% of the cost is County-funded. The estimated cumulative cost of the two consortiums from FY98-09 has been \$27.6 million; during this 11-year period, federal grant funds provided 23% of the total funding and the County funded the balance.

As outlined in previous chapters of the report:

- A third of all MCPS high school students is currently enrolled in a consortia high school;
- 90% of the students receive their first choice school and about a third of participating students attend a school outside of their base area;
- The Downcounty Consortium has achieved progress on seven of ten student performance goals, while the Northeast Consortium has achieved more mixed progress on improving student achievement; and
- The consortiums have had no impact on reversing "minority isolation" or improving economic integration in the eastern part of the County.

OLO recommends the Council discuss the following questions with Board of Education and MCPS representatives:

- Has the investment in the two high consortiums been "worth it"? Why and why not?
- What plans (if any) does MCPS have to change the approach to operating one or both of the consortiums?

Issue #2: The high school consortiums as a strategy for meeting the extra-learning needs of students in the red-zone.

The Council is familiar with the Board of Education's practice of targeting local, state, and federal funds to address the extra-learning needs of elementary students in the red-zone. In FY07, for example, MCPS expended, on average, an additional \$2,000 per elementary student in a red-zone focus school compared to a non-focus school (i.e., \$10,765 per student for school-based services in the red-zone compared to \$8,798 per student in the green-zone).⁴²

In FY09, MCPS will spend approximately \$643 more on every student who exercises his or her choice to attend a non-base consortia high school. To improve the Council's understanding of how MCPS targets additional resources to meet the extra-learning needs of secondary students at-risk, OLO recommends the following discussion questions:

- To what extent does MCPS consider the high school consortiums a strategy for meeting the extra-learning needs of secondary students in the red-zone?
- What other MCPS initiatives target secondary students in the red zone and what impacts have these strategies had?

Issue #3: MCPS' practices with respect to grant-funded positions.

By FY10, MCPS will have effectively used \$6.4 million in federal funding to jump start each consortium and to add Grade 9 academies and another signature program to two Northeast Consortium high schools. Over the years, MCPS used local funds to continue ten positions initially funded with federal grants (4.4 FTEs in Northeast Consortium high schools and 5.6 FTEs in Downcounty Consortium high schools). In comparison, MCPS staff has indicated in conversations with OLO staff that the 1.7 new positions included in the current small learning communities grant for Blake will not be continued once federal funding ends.

To improve the Council's understanding of how MCPS budgets for the continuation of programs that began with grant funding, OLO recommends the Council discuss the following questions with MCPS representatives:

- What are MCPS' policies and practices for determining whether County-funding should replace grant-funding when a grant ends?
- What is MCPS' record over the past five years in terms of eliminating grant-funded positions at the end of the grant period?

⁴² See Appendix C for OLO memorandum to the Education Committee, May 7, 2008

Issue #4: The potential fiscal, enrollment, and performance impact of discontinuing the high school consortiums.

MCPS' FY09 Program Budget shows the annual costs of the high school consortiums as approximately \$4.9 million. However, as discussed earlier, this calculation includes a number of staff positions, particularly for the Downcounty high schools, that would likely continue if the consortiums ended (e.g., the signature program coordinator and class size reduction positions).

The table below itemizes OLO's calculations of the marginal FY09 costs of operating the high school consortiums. These data suggest that MCPS could reduce expenses by approximately \$3.2 million annually if both the Northeast and Downcounty Consortiums were discontinued.

Table 39: Estimated Marginal Costs of High School Consortia, FY09

<u>Item</u>	<u>Staffing and Estimated Costs</u>
Positions (FTE's)	15.3
Salaries, Wages & Benefits	\$1,863,607
Non-personnel costs	\$500,620
Transportation costs	\$856,397
Total Costs	\$3,220,624

Source: OLO calculations of MCPS data

OLO recommends the Council discuss the following questions with the Board of Education and MCPS representatives in order to clarify the potential cost savings and changes in student enrollment and performance that could result from discontinuing the high school consortiums:

- In addition to the \$3.2 million in savings identified by OLO, does MCPS see the potential for additional savings if the two high school consortiums were to be discontinued?
- How and in what ways does MCPS anticipate student performance would be affected if the consortiums were to be discontinued?
- Would ending the consortiums necessitate formal boundary studies for each campus? If so, what would be the associated cost, timing, and process?

Issue #5: OLO's upcoming study on MCPS workforce readiness programs.

OLO's FY09 Work Program includes an assignment to study MCPS' workforce readiness programs. This project will involve compiling fiscal and other information on the workforce readiness opportunities that MCPS provides to the one in five high school seniors that intend to join the workforce upon graduation. As part of this project, OLO staff will obtain feedback about MCPS' workforce readiness programs through interviews with a sample of students, teachers, principals, and guidance counselors; and summarize what the published literature contains about structuring successful career preparation programs.

As reviewed earlier in this report, there is a connection between the two high school consortiums and MCPS' workforce readiness programs. Specifically, there are signature programs offered at each consortia high school that are designed to improve both college and workforce readiness of students. OLO staff is just now beginning to compile data on MCPS' delivery of career and technical education programs. As the Council discusses the connection between the high school consortiums and workforce readiness, OLO staff would benefit from the Council's guidance on whether the scope of OLO's upcoming study on workforce readiness should be expanded to include any additional issues.

CHAPTER IX: Agency Comments

The written comments received from the Chief Operating Officer of Montgomery County Public Schools on the final draft of this Office of Legislative Oversight report are attached (pages 65-67). As always, OLO greatly appreciates the time taken by staff to review our draft report and to provide feedback.

This final OLO report incorporates technical corrections and comments provided by MCPS staff. This includes updated fiscal information that indicates a \$27.4 million cumulative 11-year cost of the high school consortiums rather than the \$29.1 million figure referenced in the attached and draft report reviewed by MCPS staff.