

**Department of Legislative Services**  
Maryland General Assembly  
2002 Session

**FISCAL NOTE**

Senate Bill 336  
Finance

(Senator Collins)

---

**Education - Baltimore County - Public School Employees**

---

This bill extends collective bargaining in the Baltimore County Public School System to professional and administrative employees, including certificated and noncertificated employees, and supervisory employees. These employees would constitute a separate bargaining unit.

The bill applies retroactively to actions of the Baltimore County Board of Education on or after January 1, 1994.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** None.

**Local Effect:** None. The bill clarifies existing practice in Baltimore County between the school board and these employees.

**Small Business Effect:** None.

---

**Analysis**

**Current Law:** These employees have their own bargaining unit.

**Background:** This bargaining unit was formed in 1994. The unit elected an exclusive representative and opted for “meet and confer” negotiations (rather than formal collective bargaining) with their employer. The unit includes supervisory, professional, and administrative employees. Some of these positions require certification, while others do

not. The State law governing collective bargaining of public school employees differentiates between positions requiring certification and positions that do not require certification.

**Local Expenditures:** The Department of Legislative Services generally estimates costs associated with collective bargaining in two categories: first, the administrative costs of implementing collective bargaining; and second, the additional personnel costs that result from collective bargaining. Because the school board already bargains with this unit, it is assumed that there would be no additional administrative costs for the school board.

Similarly, personnel expenses for the 722 employees (with a payroll of \$53 million not including fringe benefits) are assumed to remain as they would under existing law. There could be increased costs if the unit chose formal collective bargaining rather than “meet and confer;” however, the employees could make that election under its existing agreement with the school board without any statutory change. The bill’s retroactive component would not have a fiscal impact.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** A similar bill was introduced at the 2001 session as SB 253. The bill was withdrawn.

**Cross File:** HB 544 (Delegate Minnick) – Ways and Means.

**Information Source(s):** Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore County Public School Board, Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 21, 2002  
ncs/jr

---

Analysis by: Mark W. Collins

Direct Inquiries to:  
John Rixey, Coordinating Analyst  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510