_____

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: Baltimore IT Academy   **LEA:** Baltimore City Public School System
Principal: Mrs. Laurie-Lynn Sutton   **LEA Turnaround Director:** TBD
LEA Central Support Team Lead: Dr. Maria Navarro   **Date of SIG Team's School Visit:** June 6, 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 and allowed Baltimore IT Academy to be 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 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.

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)   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: June 6, 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 3 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 First 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:
Dr. Gail Clark Dickson and Genevieve Barrow Gongar

Priority SIG I Year 4 MSDE Leads:

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

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch
Division of Student, Family, and School Support
Maryland State Department of Education   Page 2

_____

Priority SIG I Year 3 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 (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 of the spend down of the school's Title I, Part A Priority School budget (FY14). Information documented on this tool will be reviewed and used by the SIG Leads during subsequent onsite visits.

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

Table 1

Priority SIG I Year 3 Third Onsite Visit—Baltimore IT Academy, 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	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	8	80.00%	M
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
3	1	1	x	1	x	x	1	x	x	1	5	100.00%	M
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
6	X	1	1	x	1	x	x	x	x	1	4	100.00%	M
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
8	1	1	1	1	0	1	x	x	1	1	7	87.50%	M
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
10	1	1	1	x	1	1	x	x	x	x	5	100.00%	M
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	100.00%	M
TOTAL	13	14	13	12	11	12	11	10	10	13	119	97.68%	M

*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: Dr. Gail Clark Dickson and Genevieve Barrow Gongar

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

Page 4

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)   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: June 6, 2014
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Tier II School   Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

Table 2

Baltimore I T Academy		
Priority Cohorts I, II, and Non-SIG Third Onsite Monitoring Visit **Classroom Observation Feedback 2013 - 2014** **Team Members: Dr. Gail Clark Dickson and Genevieve Barrow Gongar**		**Date: June 6, 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 observations** **80.00%** **MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • **In many classrooms objectives were posted where they could be seen.** • **Objectives reflected moderate to rigorous learning in most classrooms.** • **In many classrooms the objective was clear, written in terms of what students will learn and be able to do.**
Indicator 2: *The teacher aligns instructional and learning activities to the lesson objective.*	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • **In most classrooms the activities supported the objectives.** • **Learning activities are matched to instructional outcomes.** • **In most classrooms materials and resources were appropriate.**
Indicator 3: *The teacher aligns assessment (ongoing, formative, and summative) to the lesson objective.*	**Indicator Score:** **5 points out of 5 observations** **100%** **MET**	Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score • **In a few classrooms there was evidence of peer to peer assessment.** • **In some classrooms assessment was verbal and on-going.** • **In many classrooms the assessment matched the learning expectations.**

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch
Division of Student, Family, and School Support
Maryland State Department of Education   Page 5

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 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:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms teachers' explanation of content is clear, and invites student participation and thinking.** • **In many classrooms teachers' use of vocabulary and usage are correct and suited for the lesson.** • **In most classrooms teachers presented concepts, skills, and directions clearly and used correct oral and written language.**
Indicator 5: *Teacher provides a variety of feedback (oral and written) that advances student learning while checking for understanding.*	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms teachers elicit evidence of student understanding during the lesson.** • **In most classrooms teachers provided specific and timely feedback by talking to students individually or to small groups and whole groups of students.** • **In some classrooms students are invited to assess their own work and make improvements.**
Indicator 6: *Teacher adapts plans as needed. (Differentiation of content, process, product; unexpected situation; teachable moment, etc.)*	**Indicator Score:** **4 points out of 4 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In many classrooms teachers incorporate students' interests and questions into the heart of the lesson.** • **In a few classrooms teachers adapted the instruction based on student needs.** • **In many classrooms teachers made sure that all students had a full understanding of the instruction.**

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 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:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms students were intellectually engaged in the lesson.** • **In most classrooms materials and resources supported the learning goals and required intellectual engagement, as appropriate.**
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:** **7 points out of 8 observations** **87.50%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In many classrooms discussions enable students to talk to one another, without ongoing mediation by the teacher.** • **In many classrooms teachers make effective use of wait time.** • **In some classrooms teachers build on and use students' responses to questions effectively.**
Indicator 9: _Teacher reinforces skills, processes, and procedures introduced through modeling, shaping, and student practice._	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classes teachers' explanation of content is clear, and invites student participation and thinking.** • **In some classes the teacher modeled the work for the students.** • **In most classes the teacher clearly stated what the students would be learning.**

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 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:** **5 points out of 5 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In many classrooms students participated in whole group activities** • **In some grouped classes teachers maximized learning and built on students' interests and strengths.**
**Domain 4: Classroom Management (*for Teaching and Learning*)**	
Indicator 11: *Teacher organizes instructional learning time to maximize student time on task.*	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms the pacing of the lesson provided students time needed to be intellectually engaged.** • **In most classrooms there were strong classroom management processes in which student time was maximized.** • **In most classrooms students interacted with each other.**
Indicator12: *Teacher establishes and manages classroom procedures and routines that promote learning.*	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms student behavior was generally appropriate.** • **In most classrooms teachers monitored student behavior and responded effectively.** • **In most classrooms routines function smoothly.**

_____

Indicator 13: *Teacher uses space, equipment, and materials to support instruction including the use of technology to engage.*	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms teachers used space effectively and the classrooms were safe with all students able to see and hear the teacher and each other.** • **In many classrooms there was limited used of technology.**
Indicator 14: Teacher manages student behavior effectively which creates a learning environment of respect and rapport.	**Indicator Score:** **10 points out of 10 observations** **100%** **MET**	**Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score** • **In most classrooms talk between teacher and students and among students was respectful.** • **In many classrooms there was limited physical evidence of PBIS implementation. (Display cases and bulletin boards were not utilized)**

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)   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: June 6, 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 # **134388** LEA: BCPSS Baltimore IT Academy School Budget FY 13			
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer		Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014	
Total Title I, Part A Allocation: $ 1,258,538 **School Budget Spent:** $728,465 **Percent of School Budget Spent:** 57% **Spend Down Data as of:** June 18, 2014			
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $166,688	**Budgeted:** $494,006	**Budgeted:** $404,134	**Travel/Equipment Budgeted:** $193,650
Encumbered: $0	**Encumbered:** $35,942	**Encumbered:** $43,980	**Travel/Equipment Encumbered:** $16,407
Spent (amount): $ 72,246 **Spent (%):** 43 %	**Spent (amount):** $423,027 **Spent (%):** 85%	**Spent (amount):** $106,532 **Spent (%):** 26%	**Travel/Equipment Spent(amount):** $126,660 **Spent (%):** 66%

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   $728,465 or 57 percent of funds has 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 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 Title I Office elicits the support of network staff such as 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.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?** Balances remain in salaries and wages and respective FICA/fringe. They also have large balances in supplies and materials.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?** Yes. **If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?** FY13 schools (external) extended until 9/30/14 – 3 months.

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 City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy).

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

Program Improvement and Family Support Branch
Division of Student, Family, and School Support
Maryland State Department of Education   Page 10

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

☒ **Yes**	
☐ **No**	**Explain** ____BCPSS provided the 2014 inventory. Nothing was listed for 2013____

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** __BCPSS did not provide any time and effort docs for this school for 2013___

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** ____BCPSS did not provide any invoices for this school for 2013.

9. Do you have money in your prior year's grant? Yes. If so, how much? __$530,073. **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** _____ 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

_____

Table 4

Title I, Part A Priority School MSDE Grant # __144489__ LEA: BCPSS Baltimore IT Academy School Budget FY 14			
MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer		**Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014**	
Total Title I, Part A Allocation: $ 1,078,861 **School Budget Spent:** $306,109 **Percent of School Budget Spent:** 28% **Spend Down Data as of:** June 18, 2014			
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $777,361	**Budgeted:** $153,000	**Budgeted:** $278,067	**Travel Budgeted:** $0
Encumbered: $0	**Encumbered:** $52,000	**Encumbered:** $0	**Travel Encumbered:** $0
Spent (amount): $ 306,109 **Spent (%):** 28 %	**Spent (amount):** $0 **Spent (%):** 0%	**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 %)?** $306,109 or 28 percent of funds has 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 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 contracts, laptops, and instructional supplies.			
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 City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy).			
6. **Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory?** ☒ **Yes** ☐ **No** **Explain** _____			

Baltimore IT Academy (Turnaround Principles)
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: June 6, 2014
Date Shared with BCPSS: July 17, 2014

---

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** BCPSS provided no time and effort docs for this school for 2014

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?** Yes. **If so, how much?** __$530,073. **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** _____ 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 13