

## ***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:** Calverton Elementary/Middle School

**Principal:** Martia Cooper

**LEA Central Support Team Lead:** Dr. Maria Navarro

**LEA:** Baltimore City Public School System

**LEA Turnaround Director:** TBD

**Date of SIG Team's School Visit:** May 7, 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 Calverton Elementary/Middle School 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.

### **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 3 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 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 I Year 3 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 Members:**

- Martha Essenmacher and Deborah Nelson

### **Priority SIG I Year 4 MSDE Leads:**

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

### **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 (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.

**Table 1**

**Priority SIG I year 4 Third Onsite Visit Classroom Observation Tally Sheet for Calverton E/M 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	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	X	8	100.00%	M
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	X	X	7	100.00%	M
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
10	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0.00%	Not Observed
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	X	1	1	9	100.00%	M
<b>TOTAL</b>	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	12	11	114	100.00%	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: Martha Essenmacher, Deborah Nelson

**Table 2**

**Friendship Preparatory Academy at Calverton  
 Priority Cohorts I, II, and Non-SIG Third Onsite Monitoring Visit  
 Classroom Observation Feedback 2013-2014**

**Team Members: Martha E. Essenmacher, Deborah Nelson**

**April 25, 2014**

**Domain 1 : Instructional Planning**

<b>Domain 1 : Instructional Planning</b>		
<p><b><u>Indicator 1:</u></b>  <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><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 %                      MET</p>	<p align="center"><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All classrooms have a designated student greeter who is responsible for seating guests and sharing the lesson objectives in their own words.</li> <li>• Objectives represent high expectations and rigor.</li> <li>• Teacher and students connect objectives to previous learning.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 2:</u></b>  <i>The teacher aligns instructional and learning activities to the lesson objective.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 %                      MET</p>	<p align="center"><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning activities are matched to instructional outcomes.</li> <li>• Activities provide opportunity for higher-level thinking.</li> <li>• Lesson activities are well structured, with reasonable time allocations.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 3:</u></b>  <i>The teacher aligns assessment (ongoing, formative, and summative) to the lesson objective.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 %                      MET</p>	<p align="center"><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher includes the use of formative assessments during instruction.</li> <li>• Teacher makes adjustments based on formative assessment data.</li> <li>• Assessments are authentic with real-world application, as appropriate.</li> </ul>

**Domain 2: Instruction Delivery- Strategies and Process**

<b>Domain 2: Instruction Delivery- Strategies and Process</b>		
<p><b><u>Indicator 4:</u></b>   <i>Teacher presents concepts, skills, and directions clearly using correct oral and written language.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>   <b>10 points out of 10 total observations</b>   <b>100 % MET</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teacher’s explanation of content is clear, and invites student participation. Vocabulary and usage are correct and completely suited to the lesson.</b></li> <li>• <b>Teacher explains content clearly and imaginatively, using real-world examples.</b></li> <li>• <b>All students seem to understand the presentation.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 5:</u></b>   <i>Teacher provides a variety of feedback (oral and written) that advances student learning while checking for understanding.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>   <b>10 points out of 10 total observations</b>   <b>100 % MET</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teacher elicits evidence of student understanding.</b></li> <li>• <b>Teacher monitors student understanding continuously.</b></li> <li>• <b>Teacher makes frequent use of strategies to elicit information about individual student understanding.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 6:</u></b>   <i>Teacher adapts plans as needed. (Differentiation of content, process, product; unexpected situation; teachable moment, etc.)</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>   <b>10 points out of 10 total observations</b>   <b>100 % MET</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Teacher successfully makes modification to lesson.</b></li> <li>• <b>Teacher seizes on a teachable moment to enhance a lesson.</b></li> </ul>

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

Domain 3: Teacher-Student Engagement (Techniques and Strategies)		
<p><b><u>Indicator 7:</u></b>  <i>All students are actively engaged in meaningful tasks designed to challenge their thinking processes.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b></p> <p>10 points out of 10 total observations</p> <p>100 % MET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson.</li> <li>• Materials/resources support the goals and rigor of the lesson.</li> <li>• Pacing provides students time to be intellectually engaged.</li> <li>• Students have opportunity for reflection and closure on lesson.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 8:</u></b>  <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><b>Indicator Score:</b></p> <p>10 points out of 10 total observations</p> <p>100 % MET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher effectively uses wait time; calls on most students.</li> <li>• Teacher builds on student responses to question effectively.</li> <li>• Teacher uses open-ended questions, inviting thinking and/or multiple answers.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 9:</u></b>  <i>Teacher reinforces skills, processes, and procedures introduced through modeling, shaping, and student practice.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b></p> <p>10 points out of 10 total observations</p> <p>100 % MET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The teacher states clearly what the students will be learning.</li> <li>• Teachers model the process to be followed; “I do, We do, You do”.</li> <li>• Students engage with task, indicating they understand.</li> <li>• Explanation of content is clear; invites participation, thinking.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 10:</u></b>  <i>All students effectively participate in a variety of groupings (whole group, small group, and independent) throughout the lesson.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b></p> <p>0 points out of 0 total observations</p> <p>Not Observed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not observed</li> </ul>

**Domain 4: Classroom Management (*for Teaching and Learning*)**

<b>Domain 4: Classroom Management (<i>for Teaching and Learning</i>)</b>		
<p><b><u>Indicator 11:</u></b>   <i>Teacher organizes instructional learning time to maximize student time on task.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 % MET</p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pacing of the lesson provides student the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</li> <li>• Students interact with one another; teachers use “turn and talk” to partner students</li> <li>• Students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding with each other and with the teacher</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator12:</u></b>   <i>Teacher establishes and manages classroom procedures and routines that promote learning.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 % MET</p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student behavior is entirely appropriate and teacher acknowledges good behavior.</li> <li>• Teacher frequently monitors student behavior; response to student misbehavior is effective.</li> <li>• Teacher monitors and responds to student behavior using proximity and other cues.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 13:</u></b>   <i>Teacher uses space, equipment, and materials to support instruction including the use of technology to engage.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 % MET</p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom is safe, all students are able to see and hear.</li> <li>• Classroom is arranged to support the instructional goals and learning activities.</li> <li>• Teachers make appropriate use of available technology.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Indicator 14:</u></b> <i>Teacher manages student behavior effectively which creates a learning environment of respect and rapport.</i></p>	<p><b>Indicator Score:</b>                       10 points out of 10 total observations                       100 % MET</p>	<p><b>Summary of Evidence to support the Indicator Score</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers and students consistently speak with respect to each other.</li> <li>• Teachers establish rapport with the class as well as individual students.</li> <li>• Teacher encourages respectful agreement, disagreement to student answers.</li> </ul>



**Table 3**

<b>Title I, Part A Priority School MSDE Grant # <u>134388</u> LEA: BCPSS Calverton School Budget FY 13</b>			
<b>MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer</b>		<b>Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014</b>	
<b>Total SIG _ Year _ / Title I, Part A Allocation: \$ 1,476,794</b> <b>School Budget Spent: \$ 1,062,746</b> <b>Percent of School Budget Spent: 71 %</b> <b>Spend Down Data as of: June 20, 2014</b>			
<b>Salaries &amp; Wages</b>	<b>Contractual Services</b>	<b>Supplies &amp; Materials</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Budgeted:</b> 454,210	<b>Budgeted:</b> \$16,915	<b>Budgeted:</b> \$858,826	<b>Travel/Equipment Budgeted:</b> \$146,843
<b>Encumbered:</b> \$0	<b>Encumbered:</b> \$ 16,915	<b>Encumbered:</b> \$ 42,600	<b>Travel/Equipment Encumbered:</b> \$139,143
<b>Spent (amount):</b> \$ 247,051 <b>Spent (%):</b> 54 %	<b>Spent (amount):</b> \$ 0 <b>Spent (%):</b> 0%	<b>Spent (amount):</b> \$ 807,995 <b>Spent (%):</b> 94%	<b>Travel/Equipment Spent(amount):</b> \$ 7,700 <b>Spent (%):</b> 5%
<p>1. <b>How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?</b>                  \$1,062,746/71%</p>			
<p>2. <b>Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?</b> 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.</p>			
<p>3. <b>What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?</b> Balances remain in salaries and wages and the respective FICA/fringe. They also have balances in contractual services and travel/equipment.</p>			
<p>4. <b>Has a budget amendment been submitted? Yes. If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?</b> FY 13 schools (external) extended until 9/30/14 – 3 months.</p>			
<p>5. <b>How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors? (Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring)</b> School expenditures are monitored by Title I coordinators, specialists, and supervisors on a daily basis via City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy).</p>			

<p><b>6. Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No      <b>Explain</b> _____</p>
<p><b>7. Did the LEA provide evidence of time and effort for staff funded with SIG Grant (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No      <b>Explain</b> _____</p>
<p><b>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)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No      <b>Explain</b> _____ BCPSS did not provide any invoices for this school for 2013</p>
<p><b>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</b></p>
<p><b>10. Have progress reports been filed in a timely manner? (i.e. monthly fiscal reports, mid-year report, final report, final AFR, etc.)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No      <b>Explain</b> _____ N/A</p>
<p><b>11. Have indirect charges been calculated correctly and properly computed in the grant budget? (Review indirect charges posted against the grant to date)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No      <b>Explain</b> _____ N/A</p>

**Table 4**

<b>Title I, Part A Priority School MSDE Grant # <u>144489</u> LEA: BCPSS Calverton School Budget FY 14</b>			
<b>MSDE Fiscal Reviewer: Nola Cromer</b>		<b>Monitoring Date: June 20, 2014</b>	
<b>Total Title I, Part A Allocation: \$ 1,090,336</b> <b>School Budget Spent: \$329,792</b> <b>Percent of School Budget Spent: 30 %</b> <b>Spend Down Data as of: June 18, 2014</b>			
<b>Salaries &amp; Wages</b>	<b>Contractual Services</b>	<b>Supplies &amp; Materials</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Budgeted: 690,336</b>	<b>Budgeted: \$417,000</b>	<b>Budgeted: \$5,785</b>	<b>Travel Budgeted: \$0</b>
<b>Encumbered: \$0</b>	<b>Encumbered: \$400,000</b>	<b>Encumbered: \$0</b>	<b>Travel Encumbered: \$0</b>
<b>Spent (amount): \$ 329,792</b> <b>Spent (%): 49 %</b>	<b>Spent (amount): \$0</b> <b>Spent (%): 0%</b>	<b>Spent (amount): \$0</b> <b>Spent (%): 0%</b>	<b>Travel Spent(amount): \$0</b> <b>Spent (%): 0%</b>
<b>1. How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?</b> \$329,792 or 30 percent of the funds has been spent.			
<b>2. Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?</b> The school is spending behind the budget 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.			
<b>3. What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?</b> Balances remain in salaries, stipends, and contracts.			
<b>4. Has a budget amendment been submitted? No. If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?</b>			
<b>5. How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors? (Provide SANE documentation to support monitoring)</b> School expenditures are monitored by Title I coordinators, specialists, and supervisors on a daily basis via City Schools' procurement system (K12Buy).			
<b>6. Did the LEA provide evidence and documentation of the SIG Inventory?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes			

<input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Explain</b> _____
<p><b>7. Did the LEA provide evidence of time and effort for staff funded with SIG Grant (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.)</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <b>Explain</b> _____ BCPSS did not provide any time and effort docs for 2014 for this school _____
<p><b>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)</b></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Explain</b> _____
<p><b>9. Do you have money in your prior year's grant? Yes. If so, how much? \$414,048 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?</b></p>
<p><b>10. Have progress reports been filed in a timely manner? (i.e. monthly fiscal reports, mid-year report, final report, final AFR, etc.)</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Explain</b> _____ N/A
<p><b>11. Have indirect charges been calculated correctly and properly computed in the grant budget? (Review indirect charges posted against the grant to date)</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Explain</b> _____ N/A