

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g), FY 2010 Priority SIG II Year 3 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback for 2013-2014

School: Frederick Douglass High School

Principal: Dr. Antonio Hurt

LEA Central Support Team Lead: Dr. Maria Navarro

LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools

LEA Turnaround Director: TBD

Date of SIG Team's School Visit: May 1, 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 which included Maryland's SIG II schools as Priority Schools.**

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 SIG II Year 3 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit:

MSDE's Priority SIG II Year 2 Third Onsite Monitoring Visit will be different from the previous year 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 SIG II schools. MSDE's Priority SIG II Year 2 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 SIG II Year 3 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 SIG II Year 3 Third Onsite Visit consists of the following components:

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

Priority SIG II Year 3 Team's Members from MSDE:

- SIG II Year 3 Monitoring Team Members: Judy Kowarsky and Gary Einhorn

Priority SIG MSDE Leads:

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

Priority SIG II Year 3 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Organization of Feedback:

- **TABLE 1:** Using the information from the Priority SIG II Year 3 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tool, the SIG II Team tallied the information on MSDE's Priority SIG II Year 3 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 II 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 SIG II Year 3 budget. Information documented on this tool will be reviewed and used by the SIG Leads during subsequent onsite visits.

Table 1

Priority SIG II Year 3 Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tool Maryland State Department of Education
 Priority SIG II Year 3 Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tally Sheet for Frederick Douglass High School 2013-2014

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	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	M
2	x	0	1	0	1	x	0	1	1	1	5	62.50%	PM
3	1	1	0	0	1	x	0	1	1	1	6	66.67%	PM
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9	90.00%	M
5	1	1	1	1	1	x	1	1	1	1	9	100.00%	M
6	1	1	0	x	1	x	1	x	1	1	6	85.71%	M
7	x	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	88.89%	M
8	0	1	0	0	1	x	0	0	1	1	4	44.44%	NM
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9	90.00%	M
10	x	1	x	1	1	0	x	1	1	1	6	85.71%	M
11	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	80.00%	M
12	1	1	1	1	1	x	0	1	1	1	8	88.89%	M
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
14	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	90.00%	M
TOTAL	10	12	10	6	14	7	8	12	14	13	106	83.06%	M

*0-50%, Indicator is NOT MET for the school

Observation Team: Judy Kowarsky and Gary Einhorn

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

*70-100% Indicator is MET for the school

Adapted from Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*

Table 2

FREDERICK DOUGLASS HIGH SCHOOL
Priority Cohorts I, II, III Third Onsite Monitoring Visit
Classroom Observation Feedback 2013-2014

Team Members: Gary Einhorn and Judy Kowarsky

Date: May 1, 2014

Domain 1 : Instructional Planning

<p><u>Indicator 1:</u> <i>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.)</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All teachers had objectives posted. • Nearly all teachers had an objective is written in terms of what students will learn and be able to do. • Most objectives referenced curricular frameworks or standards.
<p><u>Indicator 2:</u> <i>The teacher aligns instructional and learning activities to the lesson objective.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 5 points out of 8 total observations 63% Partially Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most teachers planned learning activities that were matched to the instructional outcomes. • A few teachers implemented activities that provided opportunity for higher-level thinking. • Most learning activities were well structured with reasonable time allotments. • Many learning activities were only moderately challenging.

<p><u>Indicator 3:</u> <i>The teacher aligns assessment (ongoing, formative, and summative) to the lesson objective.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 6 points out of 9 total observations 67% Partially Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some teachers planned assessments (ongoing, formative, and/or summative) that matched the learning expectations. • Most teachers used rubrics that were aligned to learning objectives. • In some cases, formative assessments were not fully developed.
<p>Domain 2: Instruction Delivery- Strategies and Process</p>		
<p><u>Indicator 4:</u> <i>Teacher presents concepts, skills, and directions clearly using correct oral and written language.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most teachers made no content errors • All teachers used vocabulary suited to the lesson. • A few teachers invited students to explain content to their classmates. • A few teachers explained content clearly and imaginatively, using metaphors and analogies to bring the content to life.
<p><u>Indicator 5:</u> <i>Teacher provides a variety of feedback (oral and written) that advances student learning while checking for understanding.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 9 points out of 9 total observations 100% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most teachers elicited evidence of student understanding during the lesson. • Some teachers only requested rote memory responses as indications of student understanding • Most teachers' monitoring of student understanding is sophisticated and continuous: constantly "taking the pulse" of the class.

<p><u>Indicator 6:</u> <i>Teacher adapts plans as needed. (Differentiation of content, process, product; unexpected situation; teachable moment, etc.)</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 6 points out of 7 total observations 86% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many teachers incorporated students' interests and questions into the heart of the lesson. • Some teachers ignored indications of student boredom or lack of understanding
---	--	--

Domain 3: Teacher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies)

<p><u>Indicator 7:</u> <i>All students are actively engaged in meaningful tasks designed to challenge their thinking processes.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 8 points out of 9 total observations 89% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most students are attentive to the lesson and there is appropriate pacing of instruction. • In most classrooms materials and resources support the learning goals and require intellectual engagement. • In some classrooms students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding.
<p><u>Indicator 8:</u> <i>All students are engaged by the use of questioning and discussion strategies that encourage higher order thinking rather than emphasis on recall.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 4 points out of 9 total observations 44% Not Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a few classrooms the teacher conducted conversations that allowed students to initiate higher level thinking • There was minimal discussion between students in most classrooms. • A few classroom teachers used open-ended questions to encourage students to think and/or have multiple possible answers. • In many classrooms, students were asked for answers without a request to explain how they arrived at their answers.

<p><u>Indicator 9:</u></p> <p><i>Teacher reinforces skills, processes, and procedures introduced through modeling, shaping, and student practice.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score:</p> <p>9 points out of 10 total observations</p> <p>90%</p> <p>Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In nearly all classes the teacher states clearly what the students will be learning. • In many classrooms the students were engaged in activities and appeared to understand the lesson • Teachers' explanations in most classrooms were clear and used metaphors or analogies to help student learn and retain the material.
--	--	--

Domain 3: Teacher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies) - continued

<p><u>Indicator 10:</u></p> <p><i>All students effectively participate in a variety of groupings (whole group, small group, and independent) throughout the lesson.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score:</p> <p>6 points out of 7 total observations</p> <p>86%</p> <p>Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In most classrooms it appeared that students had seating arrangements that allowed them to concentrate on the lesson and work collaboratively, when appropriate. • Overall, accommodations were made for individuals. For instance, late-comers were brought up to speed and teachers checked-in with individual students to observe their progress and respond to unique questions.
--	---	--

Domain 4: Classroom Management (for Teaching and Learning)

<p><u>Indicator 11:</u></p> <p><i>Teacher organizes instructional learning time to maximize student time on task.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score:</p> <p>8 points out of 10 total observations</p> <p>80%</p> <p>Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In many classrooms the lesson was paced at a rate that provided enough time to engage students in the material. • In a few instances, students interacted with one another. • Students in some classrooms had an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding with each other and with the teacher.
--	--	---

<p><i>Indicator 12:</i> <i>Teacher establishes and manages classroom procedures and routines that promote learning.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 8 points out of 9 total observations 89% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across classrooms, student behavior was generally appropriate and there was virtually no evidence of student misbehavior. • In most classrooms, the teachers monitor student behaviors by moving about and through other effective means of engaging students or requesting more appropriate behaviors. • In most of the classrooms routines for distribution and collection of materials and supplies worked efficiently.
---	---	---

Domain 4: Classroom Management (for Teaching and Learning) - continued

<p><i>Indicator 13:</i> <i>Teacher uses space, equipment, and materials to support instruction including the use of technology to engage.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 10 points out of 10 total observations 100% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All classrooms and hallways appear safe, well maintained and welcoming. • Classrooms were arranged to support instructional goals. • Many teachers utilized technology and some were notably creative with the technology.
<p><i>Indicator 14:</i> <i>Teacher manages student behavior effectively which creates a learning environment of respect and rapport.</i></p>	<p>Indicator Score: 9 points out of 10 total observations 90% Met</p>	<p>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue between students and teachers and among students was uniformly respectful in each of the observed classrooms. • Teachers' responses to incorrect student responses were uniformly respectful of student's dignity. • Many of the teachers made connections with individual students and demonstrated that they cared about them. • Many teachers demonstrated their knowledge and enthusiasm for the subject matter discussed in class.

Table 3

SIG II Year 3 MSDE Grant # 144899 LEA: BCPSS Frederick Douglass School Budget FY 14			
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Kelly Coates		Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014	
Total SIG II Year 3 Allocation: \$ 1,279,584 School Budget Spent: \$ 815,853 Percent of School Budget Spent: 63% Spend Down Data as of: June 18, 2014			
Salaries & Wages	Contractual Services	Supplies & Materials	Other
Budgeted: \$ 855,803	Budgeted: \$ 380,000	Budgeted: \$ 43,781	Travel Budgeted: \$ 0
Encumbered: \$ 0	Encumbered: \$ 5,162	Encumbered: \$ 37,325	Travel Encumbered: \$ 0
Spent (amount): \$ 439,657 Spent (%): 51 %	Spent (amount): \$ 373,600 Spent (%): 98 %	Spent (amount): \$ 2,596 Spent (%): 5 %	Travel Spent(amount): \$ 0 Spent (%): 0 %
1. How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)? BCPSS provided documentation that showed Frederick Douglass has spent \$815,853. This amount is 63% of their approved SIG II Year 3 budget. The amount encumbered is \$42,487. Expended amount for fixed charges are included in the total spent.			
2. Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned? Yes, the school plans to expend all funds.			
3. What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget? The summer program which ends June 30, 2014 stipends have not been drawn down. Extended day will be journaled.			
4. Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school? No.			
5. How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors? (Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring) Monthly meetings are held with Deborah Oliver. SANE documentation will be submitted in all future monitoring visits.			
6. Did the school provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Explain: Reading books were purchased.			
7. Did the school 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: **Semi-annual certifications presented.**

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)*

Yes

No

Explain: **A random sample of invoices and purchase orders presented.**

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**