### SIG Monitoring and Fiscal Team Third Onsite Visit Feedback Maryland State Department of Education—Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g)

LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools System (BCPSS) LEA Turnaround Lead: Dr. Maria Navarro MSDE SIG II Program Team Lead: Dr. Gail Clark Dickson MSDE SIG II Fiscal Team Lead: Kelly Coates LEA Turnaround Director: TBD Date Shared with BCPSS: June 27, 2014 Date of SIG Program Team Onsite Visit: June 20, 2014 Date of SIG Fiscal Team Onsite Visit: June 20, 2014

**Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG):** 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 (USDE) 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. **USDE approved Maryland's Flexibility Plan in May 2012 which included Maryland's SIG II schools as Priority Schools.** 

**Purpose of the SIG II Year 3 Monitoring and Fiscal Teams' Third Onsite Visit:** As approved by USDE, MSDE, through SIG Monitoring Teams, will conduct three onsite monitoring visits annually in each LEA that receives a school improvement grant to ensure that the LEA is implementing its intervention model fully and effectively in Maryland's Tier I and Tier II schools. As part of the SIG II Year 3 third onsite visit for school year 2013-2014, the SIG Team will interview members of the LEA Central Support Team which is the leadership body for planning, implementing, supporting, monitoring, and evaluating the LEA's approved SIG Plan. In addition to the interviews, the MSDE SIG Fiscal Team will monitor SIG II Year 3 budgets that include the LEA Budget, Consolidated Budget, and the individual SIG II schools' budgets.

Table Org	Table Organization of SIG II Year 3 Program and Fiscal Teams' Third Onsite Visit Feedback		
Table 1	BCPSS Central Support Team Interview Questions and Responses		
Table 2	Priority SIG II Year 3 Consolidated Budget		
Table 3	Priority SIG II Year 3 LEA Budget		

#### **Baltimore City Public Schools System (BCPSS)** Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

# Table 1

### LEA Commitments and Capacity

LEAs that accept 2010 Title I 1003(g) school improvement funds agree to establish a central support team to oversee the implementation of the selected models in Tier I and Tier II schools as well as the strategies that the LEA will implement in Tier III schools. The Title I office must be represented on the Central Support Team. The team will coordinate the support, as well as monitor, and assess the progress for each of the identified schools.

BCPSS Central Support	Team Interview	Questions and Responses
school year of SIG	Cherry Hill Elementary/Middle School	<ul> <li>SY 2013 - 2014 <ul> <li>The extended day program has improved</li> </ul> </li> <li>SY 2012 - 2013 <ul> <li>The district is using feedback from the MSDE's SIG feedback and the school district's walkthroughs to be more strategic in the feedback provided to the school.</li> <li>The school is using the Student Support Team (SST) identification protocol in order to provide student services earlier.</li> <li>The school is providing more differentiated support for teachers rather than provide school-wide professional development (PD) to the whole staff. The PD is targeted to meet the individual needs of teachers.</li> <li>There is a new data person at the school which has helped teachers to inform their instruction.</li> <li>MSDE's Breakthrough Center, specifically its instructional component, has been very helpful at the school.</li> <li>During this current school year, the school focused on first and second grade</li> <li>The placement of staff in Year 2 went more smoothly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	Benjamin Franklin High School @ Masonville Cove	<ul> <li>SY 2013 – 2014         <ul> <li>The afterschool program is available to all with focus on literacy, math and service learning; The extended day program was eliminated</li> </ul> </li> <li>SY 2012 - 2013         <ul> <li>MSDE's Breakthrough Center, specifically the instructional support, was very helpful. In</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

BCP	SS Central Support	Team Interview Questions and Responses	
		<ul> <li>its walkthroughs, the district is seeing positive movement in instruction by staff.</li> <li>MSDE's Breakthrough Center, specifically the SST support by Lynne Muller, has been very helpful in terms of student attendance.</li> <li>The school is utilizing its commitment to the co-teaching model as a special education instructional focus.</li> <li>The school has an effective partnership with University of Maryland in its social work program. This partnership has helped significantly the school's culture and climate.</li> </ul>	
		Frederick SY 2013 – 2014	
		Douglass High     There was a smooth transition in the change of principal leadership     School	
		SY 2012 - 2013	
		<ul> <li>The school's family engagement area has grown dramatically to develop leadership among parents. The community presented at the district's Board of School Commissioners' meeting in March 2013.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The community support coming into the building has grown significantly.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The school's climate and culture has improved significantly.</li> </ul>	
		The school's attendance is still in the low eighty percents.	
		<ul> <li>The school hired a literacy interventionist this school year which has helped the overall literacy instruction in the building.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The school implemented its Operation Graduation Program. The school was invited to present this program at 2 national conferences this school year.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The district believes the Edworks Partnership has helped the school.</li> </ul>	
2	How have you	The following have contributed to building internal capacity at the District level:	
Ζ.	•	$\circ$ Cycles of Professional Learning	
	continued to build the	<ul> <li>Cycles of Professional Learning</li> <li>Learning Walks</li> </ul>	
	internal capacity at the	<ul> <li>The presence of the Network Staff allows for deeper &amp; richer conversations with school staff</li> </ul>	
	district level during SIG	<ul> <li>Collaboration with various departments</li> </ul>	
	II Year 3 implementation	<ul> <li>Monthly meetings</li> </ul>	
	to sustain the reforms	• Attendance at conferences i.e. Family Community Engagement Conference, the Principal Leadership	
	introduced this year?	Academy, and the National Institute of School Leaders	
3.	What were your	Successes at the District Level:	
	greatest implementation	<ul> <li>Special Education Department's creation of School Status Reports via collaboration with various</li> </ul>	
	successes as a district	departments	
		<ul> <li>Examination of data with focus on student support services</li> <li>Collaboration with Academic Content Licinger (ACLe)</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Collaboration with Academic Content Liaisons (ACLs)</li> </ul>	

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch

Division of Student, Family, and School Support

Maryland State Department of Education

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

BCP	SS Central Support	t Team Interview Questions and Responses
	team?	<ul> <li>Partnership with Special Education staff in creation of actions plans</li> <li>Weekly meetings with Executive Directors</li> <li>Collaboration with the Office of Academic Accountability (OAA)</li> <li>Cycles of Professional Learning Data</li> <li>Breakthrough Center alignment with the District initiatives</li> <li>Implementing best practices for engaging parents</li> <li>Growth in teaching practices</li> <li>Implementing the School Effectiveness Reviews (SER) for all schools</li> <li>Alignment to Maryland's College and Career Ready Standards</li> </ul>
4.	What were the implementation challenges across the district?	Challenges at the District Level: <ul> <li>Transition and understanding of Title I Funding</li> <li>The absence of a Turnaround Director</li> <li>The transition of SIG to Priority</li> <li>Community changes resulting in school climate changes</li> <li>The understanding from staff of the "sense of urgency"</li> </ul>
5.	Discuss the lessons learned. What advice would you give to other districts?	Advice to other Districts: <ul> <li>Consistency of District leadership</li> <li>Collaboration among District leadership</li> <li>Developing meeting schedules</li> <li>Monthly meetings/collaboration with Maryland State Department of Education Staff</li> <li>Learning walks</li> <li>Planning for SIG implementation</li> </ul>
6.	What are your key priorities for SIG II Year 3? What's next?	Key Priorities for 2014 – 2015:         One on One coaching of staff         Use of videos for best leadership practices         Conducting Triads District visits         Community School Partnerships         Enriched technology training for staff         Implementing Restorative Practices         Use of Quarterly Assessments         Cycles of Professional Learning

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

### **BCPSS Central Support Team Interview Questions and Responses**

7. What would you like to tell us that we have not	N/A
asked?	

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

# Table 2

Section 5: SIG II Year 3 Consolidated Budget Grant # 144	899 LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Kelly Coates	Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014
	SIG II 1003(g)
Total Allocation Amount Spent Percent Spent Amount Encumbered	\$ 3,096,469 \$ 2,258,544 72% \$259,091
Spend Down Data as of :	As of June 18, 2014

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) II, section 1003(g), FY 2010

SIG Monitoring and Fiscal Teams' Third Onsite Visit Feedback for SY 2013-2014 Date Feedback shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

## Table 3

SIG II Year 3	MSDE Grant # 144899	LEA: BCPSS	FY 14
/ISDE Fiscal Reviewer:	Kelly Coates	Monit	oring Date: June 20, 2014
	Total SIG II Year	r <b>3 Allocation:</b> \$ 89,210.86	
	LEA Budg	get Spent: \$89,211	
	Percent of L	EA Budget Spent: 100%	
	Spend Down I	Data as of: June 18, 2014	
Salaries & Wage	s Contractual Services	Supplies & Materials	Other
Budgeted: \$ 81,425	<b>Budgeted:</b> \$ 0	Budgeted: \$ 5,293.36	Budgeted: \$ 2,493
			Technology: \$ 0
Encumbered: \$ 0	Encumbered: \$ 0	Encumbered: \$ 69	Encumbered:
			Technology: \$ 0
Spent (amount): \$82,		Spent (amount): \$ 5,216	<b>Technology (amt.)</b> \$ 2,348
Spent (%): 100%	<b>Spent (%)</b> : \$0	Spent (%): 98 %	94%
BCPSS provided budget. Expend	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent.	expended to date (amount and %)? It is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3
BCPSS provided budget. Expend 2. Is LEA spending	documentation that showed the LEA	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent.	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3
BCPSS provided budget. Expend 2. Is LEA spending Yes, total amou	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned?
BCPSS provided budget. Expend 2. Is LEA spending Yes, total amou 3. What action ste None.	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended.	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken en place that would impact the	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget?
BCPSS provided budget. Expend 2. Is LEA spending Yes, total amou 3. What action ste None. 4. Has a budget ar No.	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended. ps or planned activities have not tak nendment been submitted? If yes, w	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken en place that would impact the what budget changes were reque	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget?
BCPSS provided         budget. Expend         2. Is LEA spending         Yes, total amout         3. What action stern         None.         4. Has a budget ar         No.         5. How often are I	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended. ps or planned activities have not tak nendment been submitted? If yes, w .EA expenditures monitored by the L	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken en place that would impact the what budget changes were reque EA? Who monitors? ( <i>Provide SA</i>	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget? ested for this school?
BCPSS provided         budget. Expend         2. Is LEA spending         Yes, total amout         3. What action stern         None.         4. Has a budget ar         No.         5. How often are In         Monthly meeting	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended. ps or planned activities have not tak nendment been submitted? If yes, w .EA expenditures monitored by the L	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken en place that would impact the what budget changes were reque EA? Who monitors? ( <i>Provide SA</i>	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget? ested for this school? <i>NE documentation to support monitoring</i> ,
BCPSS provided         budget. Expend         2. Is LEA spending         Yes, total amout         3. What action stern         None.         4. Has a budget ar         No.         5. How often are In         Monthly meeting         submitted in all         6. Did the LEA pro         Yes	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended. ps or planned activities have not tak nendment been submitted? If yes, w EA expenditures monitored by the L ngs are held with Renee Calvi, Debora future monitoring visits. vide evidence and documentation of	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken ten place that would impact the what budget changes were reque EA? Who monitors? ( <i>Provide SA</i> ah Oliver, Cheryl Bird and Ray An the SIG Inventory?	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget? ested for this school? <i>NE documentation to support monitoring</i> ,
BCPSS provided         budget. Expend         2. Is LEA spending         Yes, total amout         3. What action stern         None.         4. Has a budget ar         No.         5. How often are In         Monthly meeting         submitted in all         6. Did the LEA pro         Yes         No	documentation that showed the LEA ed amount for fixed charges are inclu consistent with budget timeline? If r nt allocated has been expended. eps or planned activities have not tak nendment been submitted? If yes, w EA expenditures monitored by the L ngs are held with Renee Calvi, Debora future monitoring visits. vide evidence and documentation of Explain: No equipment was purchase	A has spent \$ <u>89,211</u> . This amour uded in the total spent. not, what steps are being taken en place that would impact the what budget changes were reque EA? Who monitors? ( <i>Provide SA</i> ah Oliver, Cheryl Bird and Ray An the SIG Inventory? ed using SIG funds.	nt is <u>100%</u> of their approved SIG II Year 3 to expend the funds as planned? budget? ested for this school? <i>NE documentation to support monitoring</i> ,

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch

Division of Student, Family, and School Support

Maryland State Department of Education

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: Semi-annual certifications presented.
<ul> <li>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? (<i>Provide a sample of expenditures for review</i>)</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>Explain: A random sample of invoices and purchase orders presented.</li> </ul>
9. Do you have money in your prior year's grant? If so, how much? NO 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?
10. Have progress reports been filed in a timely manner? (i.e. monthly fiscal reports, mid-year report, final report, final AFR, etc.)
Yes
No Explain: Will send the June monthly report immediately.
11. Have indirect charges been calculated correctly and properly computed in the grant budget? (Review indirect charges posted
against the grant to date)
🔀 Yes
No Explain: N/A