Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g), FY 2010 Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback for 2013-2014

School: Steuart Hill Academic Academy	LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
Principal: Dr. Tanyaneka Lipscomb	LEA Turnaround Director: TBD
LEA Central Support Team Lead: Maria Navarro	Date of SIG Team's School Visit: May 7, 2014

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 2010: The School Improvement Grant (SIG) Program, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, provides funding through State educational agencies (SEAs) to local educational agencies (LEAs) with the lowest-achieving schools that have the greatest need for the funds and demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds to raise significantly the achievement of students. The United States Department of Education (USED) views the large infusion of Federal funds into the SIG program through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) as a historic opportunity to address one of the most intractable challenges for America's education system: turning around or closing down our Nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools. Maryland's approved application reflects Secretary Duncan's determination to ensure that SIG FY 2010 funds are used to implement one of four rigorous school intervention models—turnaround, restart, transformation, and school closure. Through a rigorous technical review process, MSDE approved Prince George's County Public Schools' application (PGCPS) on July 1, 2010 and Baltimore City Public School System's application (BCPSS) on August 27, 2010. Both school systems were granted approval to charge to their grants beginning July 1, 2010. **USDE approved Maryland's Flexibility Plan in May 2012 resulting in the SIG schools with five additional Tier I and Tier II schools becoming Priority Schools, including Steuart Hill Academic Academy funded with Title I, Part A funds.**

Maryland State Department of Education's (MSDE) Monitoring of LEA Approved SIG Application: As approved by USED, MSDE will monitor each LEA that receives a school improvement grant to ensure that it is implementing its intervention model fully and effectively in Maryland's Tier I and Tier II schools. Both PGCPS and BCPSS must submit to MSDE a quarterly summary report of the LEA monitoring/oversight that has been completed and the progress the Tier I or Tier II schools have made towards achieving their goals. In addition, MSDE will perform onsite visits to these same SIG schools from 2011-2014. The primary function of the onsite visits is to review and analyze all facets of a school's implementation of the identified approved intervention model and collaborate with leadership, staff, and other stakeholders pertinent to goal attainment. MSDE's School Improvement Grant Monitoring Teams (SIG Teams) will conduct three onsite monitoring visits annually (*Beginning-of -the-Year One Day Visit; Interim Midyear Two Day Visit; and End- of -Year One Day Visit*) with the school leadership team and district level team composed of staff responsible for the technical assistance, administrative support, and monitoring.

Purpose of the Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit:

MSDE's Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Monitoring Visit will be different from the previous years of SIG. This third onsite monitor visit will focus on the impact of SIG on teaching and learning in the instructional classrooms of the LEA's Priority Non-SIG schools. MSDE's Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Teams will visit classrooms throughout the day for 20 minute intervals. Classrooms with long term substitutes will be visited by SIG Teams; however, classrooms with short term substitutes will not be visited.

Based on MSDE's Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Tool, the SIG Team, in pairs, will monitor the following 4 teaching and learning domains, including fourteen indicators aligned to each domain:

- Domain 1: Instructional Planning (3 indicators);
- Domain 2: Instructional Delivery (Strategies and Process) (3 indicators);
- Domain 3: Teacher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies) (4 indicators); and
- Domain 4: Classroom Management (4 indicators).

The protocol for the Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Visit consists of the following components:

- Classroom Observations by SIG Observation Pairs
- SIG Team Tallying Observation Data; Collaborative Agreement of Classroom Evidence
- **Special Note:** In addition and on a different day, a MSDE Fiscal Team will monitor the school's budget.

Priority Non-SIG Year 1 MSDE Team Members:

• Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Team: Richard Scott and Michelle Daley

Priority SIG MSDE Leads:

- Dr. Gail Clark Dickson
- Jim Newkirk
- Kelly Coates

Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Organization of Feedback:

- **TABLE 1:** Using the information from the Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tool, the SIG Team tallied the information on MSDE's Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Visit Tally Sheet that uses an Excel Spreadsheet. Table 1 reflects the Tally Sheet that addresses the 4 Domains and its accompanying 14 indicators.
- **TABLE 2:** Using the data information and point value from the Tally Sheet, the SIG Team provided evidence to support the score of each of the 14 indicators. Table 2 reflects that evidence.
- **TABLE 3:** Table 3 represents SIG Leads monitoring the spend-down of the school's Title I, Part A budget (FY13). Information documented on this tool will be reviewed and used by the SIG Leads during subsequent onsite visits.
- **TABLE 4**: Table 4 represents SIG Leads monitoring the spend-down of the school's Title I, Part A budget (FY14). Information documented on this tool will be reviewed and used by the SIG Leads during subsequent onsite visits.

Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tool Maryland State Department of Education

Priority Non-SIG Year 1 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tally Sheet for Steuart Hill Academic Academy Table 1

Classroom Observation Indicators	Classroom 1	Classroom 2	Classroom 3	Classroom 4	Classroom 5	Classroom 6	Classroom 7	Classroom 8	Classroom 9	Classroom 10	Total Proficient or Above Observations	*Total % Proficient or Above Observations	*Indicator MET (M), Partially MET (PM), NOT MET (NM)
1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	М
2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	М
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	М
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	М
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	М
6	х	1	х	х	1	1	1	1	0	1	6	85.71%	М
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	9	90.00%	М
8	0	1	1	1	1	х	1	1	Х	1	7	87.50%	М
9	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	М
10	1	х	1	Х	1	1	1	х	Х	Х	5	100.00%	М
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	8	80.00%	М
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	М
13	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	М
14	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	8	80.00%	М
TOTAL	9	13	13	10	14	13	14	13	8	12	119	91.66%	М
*0-50%, Ind	*0-50%, Indicator is NOT MET for the school Observation Team: Walt Sallee and Nancy Fitzgerald												

*51-69% Indicator is Partially-MET for the school

*70-100% Indicator is MET for the school

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch Division of Student, Family, and School Support Maryland State Department of Education

Adapted from Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Table 2

Steuart Hill Academic Academy Priority Cohorts I, II, and Non-SIG Third Onsite Monitoring Visit Classroom Observation Feedback 2013-2014 Team Members: Walt Sallee & Nancy Fitzgerald Date: May 7, 2014					
Domain 1 : Instructional Planning					
Indicator 1: The teacher states the lesson objective (written and orally) in student learning outcomes which demonstrate high expectations. (identifies what students should know and be able to do at the end of the lesson.)	Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms, the objective represented high expectations and rigor. In most classrooms, the objective was written in terms of what students will learn and be able to do. In most classrooms, the objective was related to big ideas of the discipline. 			
Indicator 2: The teacher aligns instructional and learning activities to the lesson objective.	Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms, learning activities were matched to instructional outcomes. In most classrooms, the lesson activities were well-structured with reasonable time allocation. 			

<u>Indicator 3</u> : The teacher aligns assessment (ongoing, formative, and summative) to the lesson objective.	Indicator Score: 10 points out of 10 total observations 100.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms the teacher included the use of formative assessments during instruction and learning outcomes had a method for assessment. Assessment types matched learning expectations.
	Doma	in 2: Instruction Delivery- Strategies and Process
<u>Indicator 4:</u> Teacher presents concepts, skills, and directions clearly using correct oral and written language.	Indicator Score: 10 points out of 10 total observations 100.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms the teacher made no content errors. Vocabulary was appropriate to the students' ages and levels of development and usage was correct and completely suited to the lesson.
<u>Indicator 5:</u> Teacher provides a variety of feedback (oral and written) that advances student learning while checking for understanding.	Indicator Score: 10 points out of 10 total observations 100.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms the teacher elicited evidence of student understanding during the lesson. In most classrooms feedback included specific and timely guidance.

Indicator 6: Teacher adapts plans as needed. (Differentiation of content, process, product; unexpected situation; teachable moment, etc.)	Indicator Score: 6points out of 7 total observations 85.71% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms the teacher incorporates students' interests into the heart of the lesson. Teachers successfully made minor modifications to the lesson where appropriate.
I	Domain 3: Te	acher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies)
<u>Indicator 7:</u> All students are actively engaged in meaningful tasks designed to challenge their thinking processes.	Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms students were intellectually engaged in the lesson. Materials and resources supported the learning goals and required intellectual engagement as appropriate.
<u>Indicator 8</u> : All students are engaged by the use of questioning and discussion strategies that encourage higher order thinking rather than emphasis on recall.	Indicator Score: 7 points out of 8 total observations 87.50% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score Discussions enabled students to talk to one another without ongoing mediation by the teacher. Teacher built on and used student responses to questions effectively.

<u>Indicator 9</u> : Teacher reinforces skills, processes, and procedures introduced through modeling, shaping, and student practice.	Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90.00% MET		Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms students engaged with the learning task, indicating they understand what they are to do. In most classrooms the teacher stated clearly what the students would be learning and modeled the process to be followed in the task.
Indicator 10: All students effectively participate in a variety of groupings (whole group, small group, and independent) throughout the lesson.	5 total observations	•	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms instructional student groups are organized thoughtfully to maximize learning to build on student strengths.
	Domain 4:	Cla	assroom Management (for Teaching and Learning)
<u>Indicator 11</u> : Teacher organizes instructional learning time to maximize student time on task.	Indicator Score: 8 points out of 10 total observations 80.00% MET	•	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms students interacted with one another and the pacing of the lesson provided the students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.

<u>Indicator12</u> : Teacher establishes and manages classroom procedures and routines that promote learning.	Indicator Score: 10 points out of 10 total observations 100.00%	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms student behavior was generally appropriate and the teacher acknowledged good behavior. Classroom routines functioned smoothly and the teacher frequently monitored student behavior.
Indicator 13: Teacher uses space, equipment, and materials to support instruction including the use of technology to engage.	MET Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90.00% MET	 Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score All observed classrooms were safe and all students were able to see and hear. In most classrooms the teacher made appropriate use of available technology. Most classrooms were arranged to support the instructional goals and learning activities.
<u>Indicator 14</u> : Teacher manages student behavior effectively which creates a learning environment of respect and rapport.	Indicator Score: 8 points out of 10 total observations 80.00% MET	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score In most classrooms talk between teacher and among students was uniformly respectful.

Table 3

Title I, Part A Priority	Title I, Part A Priority School MSDE Grant # <u>134388</u> LEA: BCPSS Steuart Hill School Budget FY 13					
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014						
Total SIG _ Year _ / Title I, Part A Allocation: \$ 1,000,000						
School Budget Spent: \$623,674						
Percent of School Budget Spent: 62%						
Spend Down Data as of: June 18, 2014 Solarias & Wasser Contraction for the structure of the structur						
<u> </u>	Salaries & Wages Contractual Services Supplies & Materials Other					
Budgeted: 317,626	Budgeted: \$335,502	Budgeted: \$320,672	Travel Budgeted: \$26,200			
Encumbered: \$0	Encumbered: \$ 90,405	Encumbered: \$74,218	Travel Encumbered: \$ 0			
Spent (amount): \$ 319,638	Spent (amount): \$	Spent (amount): \$179,423	Travel Spent(amount): \$ 0			
Spent (%): 100 %	124,613	Spent (%): 55%	Spent (%): 0%			
	Spent (%): 37 %					
 \$623,674 or 62% of the funds have been spent. 2. Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned? The school is spending behind the spending timeline. The Title I Office requests quarterly updates to nudge the school to benchmark spending as well as identify the barriers to spending. The Title I Office elicits the support of network staff such as data specialists and facilitators to assist the schools in completing the spending updates and submitting expenditures. The Office of Title I and the Turnaround Office staff will continue to work with the school to expend the funds. 						
 What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget? Balances remain in contracts, instructional supplies, professional development supplies, and out-of-town travel. 						
4. Has a budget amendment been submitted? No. If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?						
 How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors? (<i>Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring</i>) School expenditures are monitored by Title I coordinators, specialists, and supervisors on a daily basis via City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy). 						
Program Improvement and Family Support Branch						

6. Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory?
⊠ Yes
No Explain
7. Did the LEA provide evidence of time and effort for staff funded with SIG Grant (2 nd and 3 rd monitoring visit only) in
compliance with Federal A-133 payroll documentation requirements? (If salaries are charged to more than one funding source
and employees are working in multiple activities, determine that the time sheets or other documentation is maintained to support
the actual time charged to the grant. If salaries are federally funded 100% and related to one cost objective; determine that semi-
annual certifications are prepared and available for review.)
Yes
No Explain <u>BCPSS did not provide any time and effort docs for this school</u>
8. Are expenditures allowable in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, A-21, A-122, or "Cost Principles for State Funded
Grants", per the Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools? (Provide a sample of expenditures for review)
No Explain <u>BCPSS did not provide any invoices for 2013 for this school</u>
9. Do you have money in your prior year's grant? If so, how much? Have you taken steps to charge current year
expenditures to prior year's grant, where applicable? If not, what is your plan to spend your prior year's funds? N/A
10. Have progress reports been filed in a timely manner? (i.e. monthly fiscal reports, mid-year report, final report, final AFR, etc.)
No Explain N/A
11. Have indirect charges been calculated correctly and properly computed in the grant budget? (Review indirect charges posted
against the grant to date)
No Explain N/A

Table 4

Budgeted: 500,774	Total Title I School Percent o Spend Do ontractual Services	I, Part A Allocation: \$ 924,739 Budget Spent: \$ 201,078 f School Budget Spent: 21% own Data as of: June 18, 2014	Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014					
Budgeted: 500,774	School Percent o Spend Do ontractual Services	Budget Spent: \$ 201,078 f School Budget Spent: 21% own Data as of: June 18, 2014						
Budgeted: 500,774								
		Salaries & WagesContractual ServicesSupplies & MaterialsOther						
Encumbered: \$0 En	Budgeted: \$337,651							
	ncumbered: \$219,091	Encumbered: \$0	Travel Encumbered: \$0					
Spent (amount): \$ 134,227	Spent (amount): \$0	Spent (amount): \$66,851	Travel Spent(amount): \$0					
Spent (%): 26 %	Spent (%): 0%	Spent (%): 77%	Spent (%): 0%					
 school is spending behind the spending timeline. The Title I Office requests quarterly updates to nudge the school to benchmark spending as well as identify the barriers to spending. The Office of Title I and the Turnaround Office staff will continue to work with the school to expend the funds. 3. What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget? Balances remain in salaries and respective FICA/fringe, stipends and temp salaries, contracts, laptops, instructional supplies, and Pd supplies. 								
4. Has a budget amendment been submitted? No. If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?								
 How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors? (<i>Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring</i>). School expenditures are monitored by Title I coordinators, specialists, and supervisors on a daily basis via City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy). 								
 6. Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory? ☐ Yes ☐ No Explain 								
7. Did the LEA provide evidence of time and effort for staff funded with SIG Grant (2 nd and 3 rd monitoring visit only) in compliance with Federal A-133 payroll documentation requirements? (<i>If salaries are charged to more than one funding source</i>								

the actual time	s are working in multiple activities, determine that the time sheets or other documentation is maintained to support e charged to the grant. If salaries are federally funded 100% and related to one cost objective; determine that semi- cations are prepared and available for review.)				
Yes	anons are preparea and avallable jor review.)				
No	Explain				
8. Are expenditu	res allowable in accordance with OMB Circular A-87, A-21, A-122, or "Cost Principles for State Funded				
Grants", per tl	the Financial Reporting Manual for Maryland Public Schools? (Provide a sample of expenditures for review)				
Yes					
No I	Explain <u>BCPSS did not provide any invoices for 2014 for this school</u>				
9. Do you have m	9. Do you have money in your prior year's grant? Yes. If so, how much? <u>\$376,326</u> Have you taken steps to charge current year				
expenditures to	to prior year's grant, where applicable? If not, what is your plan to spend your prior year's funds?				
10. Have progress	s reports been filed in a timely manner? (i.e. monthly fiscal reports, mid-year report, final report, final AFR, etc.)				
Yes					
No E	Explain N/A				
11. Have indirect	charges been calculated correctly and properly computed in the grant budget? (Review indirect charges posted				
against the gra	ant to date)				
Yes					
No E	Explain N/A				