



Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.  
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • MarylandPublicSchools.org

July 23, 2012

Dr. Andrés Alonso  
Chief Executive Officer  
Baltimore City Public School System  
200 East North Avenue  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Dr. Alonso:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) must make a decision if a school system's Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g), is renewed for the next school year. In order to make that determination, MSDE reviewed the following criteria for Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS) SIG II schools (Cherry Hill Elementary/Middle, Benjamin Franklin @ Masonville Cove High, and Frederick Douglass High):

- Level of Implementation Ratings for 12 Restart Components;
- Level of Implementation Ratings for 9 Turnaround Requirements;
- Fiscal Monitoring Spend Downs;
- LEA's Commitment and Capacity; and
- First, Second, Third, and Fourth Quarterly Reports.

Based on a point value for each criteria, MSDE determined the maximum score that BCPSS could receive is 102 points. In order to make a determination on grant renewal, MSDE developed the following Renewal Scoring Key:

- 83-102 points: SIG II Renewal Approval;
- 33-82 points: LEA Targeted Corrective Action Plan for SIG II Renewal; and
- 0-32 points: SIG II Renewal Not Approved.

The SIG II criteria rating scores for your school system is included with this letter. BCPSS received a score of 75 points which requires your system to develop and implement a SIG II Targeted Corrective Action Plan for Year 2 Renewal which must be approved by MSDE.

In its SIG II Targeted Corrective Action Plan, BCPSS must address the following section:

**Section II Fiscal Monitoring**

BCPSS received only 2 points out of 6 points for its SIG II Fiscal Spend Down and Monitoring.

For SIG II Targeted Corrective Action Plan BCPSS must submit the following table to MSDE on the 10<sup>th</sup> of every month beginning September 10, 2012 through June 10, 2013.

<b>Fiscal Monitoring of SIG II Schools: Monthly Spend Downs</b> <b>Baltimore City Public School System</b> <b>Date Submitted:</b>				
<b>Directions:</b> BCPSS must submit electronically to Geri Taylor Lawrence a completed table by the 10 <sup>th</sup> of each month beginning August 2012 through June 2013.				
SIG II Grant Year	SIG II Schools and/or BCPSS	Allocation	Amount Spent	Percentage Spent
SIG II Year 1	Cherry Hill Elementary/Middle School	\$1,141,506.20		
	Benjamin Franklin High School @Masonville Cove	\$1,174,711.46		
	Frederick Douglass High School	\$1,452,501.34		
	SIG II Consolidated School Spend Down			
	BCPSS LEA Budget	\$933,756		
SIG II Year 2	Cherry Hill Elementary/Middle School			
	Benjamin Franklin High School @ Masonville Cove			
	Frederick Douglass High School			
	SIG II Consolidated School Spend Down			
	BCPSS LEA Budget			

Dr. Andrés Alonso  
July 23, 2012  
Page 3

## **SIG II Year 2 Grant Funds**

The following steps must be completed to ensure BCPSS receives its SIG II Year 2 grant funds:

1. BCPSS must revise the SIG II school plans and schools' and LEA budget narratives to align with the SIG II year 2 allocation of **\$4,051,108.20**.
2. BCPSS must submit a signed C-1-25 budget form.
3. BCPSS staff should follow the same procedure used for Year 1 amendments to indicate program and/or fiscal changes in the plan using a different color font.
4. Please forward the budget forms and budget narrative to Geri Taylor Lawrence, Specialist, at 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201. The hard copy must have original signatures. BCPSS is also asked to submit the budget forms and narrative electronically to Mrs. Taylor Lawrence at [glawrence@msde.state.md.us](mailto:glawrence@msde.state.md.us) prior to hard copy submission.

Once MSDE receives and approves the C-1-25 and budget narrative, a notice of grant award will be sent to BCPSS and spending against the Year 2 grant may begin. If you have any questions regarding budget, please contact Geri Taylor Lawrence at 410-767-0642 or [glawrence@msde.state.ms.us](mailto:glawrence@msde.state.ms.us). If you have programmatic concerns, please contact Gail Clark Dickson or Felicia Lanham Tarason. Ms. Clark Dickson can be reached at [gdickson@msde.state.md.us](mailto:gdickson@msde.state.md.us) or 410-767-5153. Ms. Lanham Tarason can be reached at [fltarason@msde.state.md.us](mailto:fltarason@msde.state.md.us) or 410-767-0644. Ms. Lawrence, Ms. Tarason, and Ms. Dickson will be pleased to assist you.

Sincerely,



Maria E. Lamb, Director  
Program Improvement and Family Support Branch

MEL/GCD:tp

Attachment

c: Sonja Brookins Santelises  
Victor Delapaz  
Kim Ferguson  
Pauline Edwards  
Ann Chafin  
Gail Clark Dickson  
Felicia Lanham Tarason  
Geri Taylor Lawrence

SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013		Date(s)		Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (2 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
MSDE Monitoring Data Sources (Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)		Ratings					
Section IA. SIG II Restart Schools: Evidence Provided in the First and Second Monitoring Feedback Reports Based on Restart Components (possible 24 pts)		SIG II Schools		Date(s) Shared with LEA			
Student Profile	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Staff Profile	Cherry Hill ES/MS	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
Student Achievement	Cherry Hill ES/MS	NOT MET	4/3/2012			0	0
Rigorous Curriculum	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Instructional Program	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Assessments	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
School Climate & Culture	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Student, Family, Community Support	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Professional Development	Cherry Hill ES/MS	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
Organizational Structure and Resources	Cherry Hill ES/MS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
Comprehensive and Effective Planning	Cherry Hill ES/MS	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
Effective Leadership	Cherry Hill ES/MS	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
<b>Total Points for Section IA</b>				<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>

SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013 MSDE Monitoring Data Sources (Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)	Section 18: SIG II Turnaround Schools: Evidence Provided in the First and Second Monitoring Feedback Reports Based on Turnaround Requirements (possible 18 pts)	SIG II Schools	Ratings	Date(s)	Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (2 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
	1. Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012	2	1		1
		Frederick Douglass HS	MET	4/3/2012				
	2. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and (B) Select new staff.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012		1		1
		Frederick Douglass HS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012				
	3. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
		Frederick Douglass HS	MET	4/3/2012				
	4. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	MET	4/3/2012		1		1
		Frederick Douglass HS	PARTIALLY MET	4/3/2012				
	5. Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
		Frederick Douglass HS	MET	4/3/2012				
	6. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	MET	4/3/2012	2			2
		Frederick Douglass HS	MET	4/3/2012				

SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013

MSDE Monitoring Data Sources  
(Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)

	Date(s)	Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (3 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
7. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	PARTIALLY MET	1		1
	Frederick Douglass HS	PARTIALLY MET			
8. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	PARTIALLY MET	1		1
	Frederick Douglass HS	PARTIALLY MET			
9. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	PARTIALLY MET	1		1
	Frederick Douglass HS	PARTIALLY MET			
<b>Total Point for Section IB</b>			6	0	12



SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013 MSDE Monitoring Data Sources (Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)		Date(s)		Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (3 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
<b>Section II. Fiscal Monitoring of SIG II Schools: Evidence Provided Based on Third Fiscal Monitoring Visit (possible 6 pts).</b>		<b>SIG II Schools</b>		<b>% and Rating</b>	<b>Date(s) Monitored</b>		
<b>SIG II Year 1 School Spend Down:</b> Met (M): 75% and above spent Partially Met (PM): 50%-74% spent Not Met(NM): 49% or less spent		Cherry Hill ES/MS	23% - NOT MET	6/8/2012	1		1
		Benjamin Franklin High School@ Masonville Cove	55% - PARTIALLY MET	6/8/2012			
		Frederick Douglass HS	91% - MET	6/8/2012			
		SIG II Consolidated School Spend Down	53% - PARTIALLY MET	6/8/2012			
<b>SIG II Year 1 LEA Spend Down:</b> Met(M): 75% and above spent Partially Met (PM): 50%-74% spent Not Met (NM): 49% and less spent		Baltimore City Public Schools	11% - NOT MET	6/8/2012	1	0	0
<b>The Average Number of LEA Monitoring SIG II Year 1 Visits of School Budgets:</b> Not Met (NM): Less than or equal to 2 Partially Met (PM): 3 to 4 Met (M) 5 or more		Baltimore City Public Schools	4 MONITORING VISITS PARTIALLY MET	6/8/2012	1		1
<b>Total Points for Section II</b>				0	2	0	2

**SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013**

MSDE Monitoring Data Sources  
(Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)

**Section III. Evidence Provided for MSDE's Feedback: LEA's Commitment and Capacity (possible 14 pts)**

	Date(s)	Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (3 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
<b>Rating based on 2nd Monitoring Visit</b>	Shared with LEA				
Creation and Duties of LEA Central Support Team (CST)	04/03/2012		1		1
LEA CST Meetings	4/3/2012		1		1
LEA CST Reports to Superintendent	4/3/2012	2			2
LEA CST Reports to Board of Education	4/3/2012	2			2
The LEA CST conducted an annual review/assessment of progress based on goals described in sections 2 and 3 of the proposal. Based on an analysis of its annual review, the LEA CST developed a strategic plan to support and address identified needs in its SIG II schools.	4/3/2012		1		1
The LEA CST ensured that the school improvement funds were utilized (1) in a timely way and (2) effectively and efficiently to support the required components of the selected intervention. The LEA CST ensured that schools and LEA support teams have access to these funds, even during annual rollover processes. The LEA CST supported principals' timely and effective use of these funds.	4/3/2012		1		1
The LEA CST took additional supported actions to ensure that the selected interventions were implemented as designed and to make other changes such as: (1) realignment of other resources; (2) removal of expectations that might run counter to the approach outlined in the selected intervention; (3) timely modification of practices and policies (those anticipated ahead of time and those that will emerge during implementation); and (4) engaging in reflective and sustained, collaborative conversation and planning to ensure that improvement efforts can be sustained once this funding ends. Also, the LEA CST coordinated and managed the Network Team to support the schools.	04/03/2012	2			2
<b>Total Points for Section III</b>		6	4	0	10



**SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013**

*MSDE Monitoring Data Sources  
(Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the  
MSDE website.)*

Date(s)		Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (2 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
<b>Section IV. LEA First Quarterly Report (possible 10 pts)</b>					
<b>Rating</b>					
Date(s) Submitted					
• Monitoring Processes Defined and Carried Out	MET	2			2
• Assessment Data/Student Improvement Provided and Analyzed	MET	2			2
• Attendance Data Provided and Analyzed	MET	2			2
• Suspension Data Provided and Analyzed	MET	2			2
• LEA Submitted Quarterly Reports in a Timely Manner. SIG First Quarter Report Due to MSDE 45 Days After End of Marking Period	NOT MET			0	0
<b>Total Points for Section IV</b>					
<b>Rating</b>					
Date(s) Submitted					
3/12/2012		2			2
3/12/2012		2			2
3/12/2012		2			2
3/12/2012		2			2
3/12/2012				0	0
<b>Total Points for Section V</b>					
<b>Rating</b>					
Date(s) Submitted					
4/24/2012		2			2
4/24/2012		2			2
4/24/2012		2			2
4/24/2012		2			2
4/24/2012		2			2
<b>Total Points for Section VI</b>					
<b>Rating</b>					
Date(s) Submitted					
4/24/2012		10	0	0	10

**SIG Renewal for School Year 2012-2013**

MSDE Monitoring Data Sources  
(Documentation to support this renewal process is posted on the MSDE website.)

**Section VII. LEA Fourth Quarterly Report (possible 10+ A127 pts)**



- Monitoring Processes Defined and Carried Out
- Assessment Data/Student Improvement Provided and Analyzed
- Attendance Data Provided and Analyzed
- Suspension Data Provided and Analyzed
- LEA Submitted Quarterly Reports in a Timely Manner. SIG Fourth Quarter Report Due to MSDE 45 Days After End of Marking Period

**Total Points for Section VII**

**GRAND TOTAL**

Date(s)	Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation) (2 Points)	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 Points)	Total Points
Submitted				
7/2/2012	2			2
7/2/2012	2			2
7/2/2012	2			2
7/2/2012	2			2
7/2/2012	2			2
	10	0	0	10
	56	19	0	75

# Baltimore City Public School System SIG II Year 1 Renewal Ratings At-A-Glance

Section (Maximum Points)	Indicator Met (Achieved expected level of Implementation (2 points))	Indicator Partially Met (Making Progress toward Implementation) (1 Point)	Indicator Not Met (Below expected level of Implementation) (0 points)	Total Points
Section IA (24 pts.)	8	7	0	15
Section IB (18 pts.)	6	6	0	12
Section II (6 pts.)	0	2	0	2
Section III (14 pts.)	6	4	0	10
Section IV (10 pts.)	8	0	0	8
Section V (10 pts.)	8	0	0	8
Section VI (10 pts.)	10	0	0	10
Section VII (10 pts.)	10	0	0	10
<b>GRAND TOTAL (102 pts.)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Renewal Scoring Key</b>	<b>Total Points*</b>	<b>MSDE Renewal Decision</b>		
83-102 Points Renewal Approved	<b>75</b>	<b>Corrective Action Plan Required for Renewal</b>		
33-82 Points Renewal with Corrective Action Plan Required				
0-32 Points Renewal Not Approved				
				
<b>Approval Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>		

Evaluation of LEA's Progress by School

- Each school within a LEA received a rating of *met*, *partially met*, or *not met* for the indicators in the rubric above (where applicable).
- Individual school's progress was used to create a composite rating of overall LEA performance on each indicator. The composite rating is based on an average of the ratings across schools.
- LEAs also received a zero (0) rating for indicators in the rubric for which required reports have not been submitted to MSDE.