Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)   Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland   Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g), FY 2009
Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback for 2013-2014

School: Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School   **LEA:** Baltimore City Public School System
Principal: Tracy Hicks   **LEA Turnaround Director:** TBD
LEA Central Support Team Lead: Maria Navarro   **Date of SIG Team's School Visit:** April 9, 2014

Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 2009: 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 2009 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 I 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 I schools from 2010-2013. 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.

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)   Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland   Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Purpose of the Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit:

This Priority SIG I Year 4 third onsite monitor visit will focus on the impact of SIG on teaching and learning in the instructional classrooms of the LEA's SIG I schools. MSDE's Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Teams will visit classrooms throughout the day for 20 minute intervals. Classrooms with long term substitutes will be visited by SIG I Teams; however, classrooms with short term substitutes will not be visited.

Based on MSDE's Priority SIG I Year 4 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 I Year 4 Third Onsite Visit consists of the following 4 components:
- Pre-classroom Observations Principal Discussion Questions;
- Classroom Observations by SIG Observation Pairs;
- SIG I Team Tallying Observation Data; and 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 SIG I Year 4 MSDE Team's Members:
- SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team Members: Christy Rather and Janet Reed

Priority SIG I Year 4 MSDE Leads:
- Dr. Gail Clark Dickson
- Jim Newkirk
- Kelly Coates

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)   Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland   Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Organization of Feedback:

- **TABLE 1:**   Using the information from the Priority SIG I Year 4 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tool, the SIG I Team tallied the information on MSDE's Priority SIG I Year 4 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 I Team, through collaborative agreement, 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 of the spend down of the school's Title I, Part A Priority School budget. Information documented on this tool will be reviewed and used by the SIG Leads during subsequent onsite visits.

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Table 1

Priority SIG I year 4 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tally Sheet for Augusta Fells Savage IVS High School

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	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	80.00%	M
2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	50.00%	NM
3	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	6	60.00%	PM
4	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8	80.00%	M
5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	60.00%	PM
6	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	40.00%	NM
7	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	30.00%	NM
8	1	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	22.22%	NM
9	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	40.00%	NM
10	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	40.00%	NM
11	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	40.00%	NM
12	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	50.00%	NM
13	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	7	70.00%	M
14	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	60.00%	PM
TOTAL	14	1	6	12	11	5	5	2	2	14	72	51.59%	PM

*0-50%, Indicator is NOT MET for the school
*51-69% Indicator is PARTIALLY MET for the school
*70-100% Indicator is MET for the school

Observation Team: Christy Rather and Janet Reed

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

Page 4

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)   Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland   Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Table 2

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts Priority SIG Cohorts I, II, and Non-SIG Third Onsite Monitoring Visit Classroom Observation Feedback 2013-2014 Team Members: Christy Rather and Janet Reed DATE: April 9, 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:** **8 points out of 10 total observations** **80% MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • In most classrooms, the objective is written in terms of what students will be able to do. • In most classrooms, the objective was written in terms of what students would learn and would be able to do. • In a few classrooms, teacher and students connect objective to previous learning.
Indicator 2: *The teacher aligns instructional and learning activities to the lesson objective.*	**Indicator Score:** **5 points out of 10 total observations** **50% NOT MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • In some classrooms, learning activities were moderately challenging. • In most classrooms, learning resources were suitable, but there was limited variety. • In some classrooms, the lesson activities were well structured, with reasonable time allocations. • In some classrooms, learning activities were matched to instructional outcomes.
Indicator 3: *The teacher aligns assessment (ongoing, formative, and summative) to the lesson objective.*	**Indicator Score:** **6 points out of 10 total observations** **60% PARTIALLY MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • In some classrooms, assessment types match learning expectations. • In some classrooms, the teacher included the use of formative assessments during instruction. • In some classrooms, formative assessments are not fully developed.

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Domain 2: Instruction Delivery- Strategies and Process		
Indicator 4: _Teacher presents concepts, skills, and directions clearly using correct oral and written language._	**Indicator Score:** **8 points out of 10 total observations** **80% MET %**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • In most classrooms, the teacher makes no content errors. • In most classrooms, vocabulary and usage were correct and completely suited to the lesson. • In some classrooms, the teacher's explanation of the content was clear, and invited student participation and thinking. • In some classrooms, vocabulary was appropriate to the students' ages and levels of development.
Indicator 5: _Teacher provides a variety of feedback (oral and written) that advances student learning while checking for understanding._	**Indicator Score:** **6 points out of 10 total observations** **60% PARTIALLY MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • In most classrooms, the teacher monitored understanding through a single method, or without eliciting evidence of understanding from all students. • In some classrooms, the teacher requested global indications of students understanding. • In a few classrooms, the teacher made adjustments to the lesson to enhance understanding by groups of students. • In a few classrooms, the teacher elicits evidence of students understanding during the lesson.
Indicator 6: _Teacher adapts plans as needed. (Differentiation of content, process, product; unexpected situation; teachable moment, etc.)_	**Indicator Score:** **4 points out of 10 total observations** **40% NOTMET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • In most classrooms, the teacher's efforts to modify the lesson were only partially successful. • In some classrooms, the teacher made perfunctory attempts to incorporate student questions and interests into the lesson. • In a few classrooms, the teacher ignored indications of student boredom or lack of understanding.

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

Page 6

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Domain 3: Teacher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies)		
Indicator 7: *All students are actively engaged in meaningful tasks designed to challenge their thinking processes.*	**Indicator Score:** **3 points out of 10 total observations** **30%** **NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, some students were intellectually engaged in the lesson but the student engagement with the content was largely passive, learning primarily facts or procedures.** • **In most classrooms, students had no choice in how they complete tasks.** • **In most classrooms, the materials and resources were partially aligned to the lesson objectives, only some of them demanding student thinking.**
Indicator 8: *All students are engaged by the use of questioning and discussion strategies that encourage higher order thinking rather than emphasis on recall.*	**Indicator Score:** **2 points out of 2 total observations** **22.2%** **NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, the teacher framed some questions designed to promote student thinking, but only a few students were involved.** • **In most classrooms, the teacher invited students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students responded.** • **In most classrooms, the teacher called on many students, but only a small number actually participated in the discussion.**
Indicator 9: *Teacher reinforces skills, processes, and procedures introduced through modeling, shaping, and student practice.*	**Indicator Score:** **4 points out of 10 total observations** **40%** **NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, the teacher had to clarify the learning task so students could complete it.** • **In most classrooms, the teacher's explanation of the content consisted of a monologue or was purely procedural with minimal participation by students.** • **In most classrooms, the teacher modeled without student participation.**

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Indicator 10: *All students effectively participate in a variety of groupings (whole group, small group, and independent) throughout the lesson.*	**Indicator Score:** **4 points out of 10 total observations** **40% NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, instructional groups were random or only partially supported the outcome.** • **In a most classrooms, the teacher employed only the total class presentation for the entire lesson.** • **In most classrooms, the classroom was not organized for a variety of student groups for learning.**
Domain 4: Classroom Management (*for Teaching and Learning*)		
Indicator 11: *Teacher organizes instructional learning time to maximize student time on task.*	**Indicator Score:** **4 points out of 10 total observations** **40% NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, the pacing of the lesson was uneven.** • **In most classrooms, some instructional time appeared to be lost and student engagement negatively impacted.** • **In a most classrooms, the instructional pacing was unsuitable to the lesson and/or the students. The lesson dragged or was rushed.**
Indicator12: *Teacher establishes and manages classroom procedures and routines that promote learning.*	**Indicator Score:** **5 points out of 10 total observations** **50% NOT MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In some classrooms, student behavior was generally appropriate and the teacher acknowledged good behavior.** • **In some classrooms, classroom routines functioned smoothly.** • **In some classrooms, the teacher attempted to keep track of student behavior, but with no apparent system.** • **In some classrooms, the teacher's response to student misbehavior is inconsistent.**

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround) Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Indicator 13: *Teacher uses space, equipment, and materials to support instruction including the use of technology to engage.*	**Indicator Score:** **7 points out of 10 total observations** **70% MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **All classrooms were safe, and all students were able to see and hear.** • **Most classrooms were arranged to support the instructional goals and learning activities.** • **In most classrooms, the teacher made use of appropriate use of available technology.**
Indicator 14: Teacher manages student behavior effectively which creates a learning environment of respect and rapport.	**Indicator Score:** **6 points out of 10 total observations** **60% PARTIALLY MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms, the talk between the teacher and students and the talk among students was uniformly respectful.** • **In some classrooms, the teacher made superficial connections with individual students.** • **In a few classrooms, the teacher attempted to respond to disrespectful behavior among students, with uneven results.**

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)   Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland   Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

Table 3

Title I, Part A Priority School MSDE Grant # 144489 LEA: BCPSS Augusta Fells School Budget FY 14			
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer			**Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014**
Total Title I, Part A Allocation: $ 997,081 **School Budget Spent:** $435,887 **Percent of School Budget Spent:** 43 % **Spend Down Data as of:** June 18, 2014			
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $821,081	**Budgeted:** $155,000	**Budgeted:** $0	**Travel Budgeted:** $21,000
Encumbered: $0	**Encumbered:** $35,860	**Encumbered:** $0	**Travel Encumbered:** $0
Spent (amount): $414,551 **Spent (%):** 50 %	**Spent (amount):** $21,336 **Spent (%):** 13%	**Spent (amount):** $0 **Spent (%):** 0%	**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 %)?** The school has spent $435,887, or 43 percent of its funds.

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 slightly 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. They also have large balances in supplies and materials, contracts, and out of town travel

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?**   No. **If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?** *(Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring)* School expenditures are monitored by Title I coordinators, specialists, and supervisors on a daily basis via the City's procurement system (K12Buy).

6. **Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory?**
   ☒ **Yes**

Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School (Turnaround)
Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS), Maryland
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School

Priority SIG I Year 4 Monitoring Team's Third Onsite Visit Feedback
Date of SIG Team's Third Onsite Visit: April 9, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

_____

☐ **No**   **Explain** _____
7. **Did the LEA provide evidence of time and effort for staff funded with SIG Grant (2nd and 3rd 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 for 2014</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)*   ☒ **Yes**   ☐ **No**   **Explain** _____
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?** NA
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** _____ 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)*   ☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**   **Explain** _____ N/A

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch
Division of Student, Family, and School Support
Maryland State Department of Education   Page 11