***SIG II Year 1 Monitoring and Fiscal Teams’ Third Onsite Visit Feedback***

**Maryland State Department of Education—Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g)**

|  |
| --- |
| **LEA:** Prince George’s County Public Schools (PGCPS) **LEA Turnaround Director:** Ed Ryans  **Date of SIG Team’s LEA Visit**: June 15, 2012  **Date of SIG Fiscal Team’s Visit:** June 15, 2012  **SIG Team Members:**  Gail Clark Dickson & Felicia Lanham Tarason **SIG Fiscal Team Member:** Geri Taylor Lawrence |

**Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG):** 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 (USDE) 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.

**Purpose of the SIG II Year 1 Monitoring and Fiscal Teams’ Third Onsite Visit:** As approved by USDE, MSDE, through SIG Monitoring Teams, will conduct three onsite monitoring visits annually in each LEA that receives a school improvement grant to ensure that the LEA is implementing its intervention model fully and effectively in Maryland’s Tier I and Tier II schools. As part of the third onsite visit, a SIG Monitoring Team will interview members of the LEA Central Support Team which is the leadership body for planning, implementing, supporting, monitoring, and evaluating the LEA’s approved SIG Plan. In addition and on a different day, a MSDE SIG Fiscal Team will monitor the LEA’s SIG budgets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table Organization of SIG II Year 1 Monitoring and Fiscal Teams’ Third Onsite Visit Feedback** | |
| Table 1 | PGCPS Central Support Team Interview Questions and Responses |
| Table 2 | School Budget for Oxon Hill Middle School |
| Table 3 | School Budget for Thomas Johnson Middle School |
| Table 4 | LEA Budget (Part of Consolidated Budget) |
| Table 5 | Consolidated Budget |
| Table 6 | LEA Budget |

| **TABLE 1 PGCPS Turnaround Executive Team Interview Questions and Responses** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. *Compare your previous school year to SIG II Year 1 Implementation in your system’s SIG II schools.* | **Thomas Johnson Middle School**  **Oxon Hill Middle School** | * The support of the Reading and Mathematics has been substantive with the hiring of Instructional Specialists in content areas * Enhanced training with Harvard University (School Turnaround Leaders), *Classroom Focused Improvement Process* and *Understanding by Design* authors have impacted the knowledge and subsequent plans * Our SIG partners have worked more closely with the Turnaround Director; the partnership with MSDE’s Breakthrough Center, in terms of instructional assistance, has been helpful; and the Mid-Atlantic Equity System has been a valuable resource in promoting parental and community engagement * The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) was supported and collaborative in working with the Turnaround staff * The district’s Turnaround Office provided enhanced on-ground support in both SIG II schools * PGCPS has focused on leadership development in both schools; Research for Better Teaching (RBT), provided instructional coaching; and contracted with Grant Wiggins to focus on his “Authentic Education” design * The Turnaround Director works directly with CAO and Human Resources to support both schools * Turnaround staff and the District’s Executive Team participated in a Turnaround Retreat for the purpose of strategic planning |
| 1. *How have you continued to build the internal capacity at the district level during SIG II Year 1Implementation to sustain the reforms introduced this year?* | * PGCPS has attracted stronger leadership candidates * PGCPS received a Wallace Grant that focuses on leadership * PGCPS is participating in MSDE’s Aspiring Leaders Program | |
| 1. *What were your greatest SIG II Year 1 implementation successes as a district team?* | * The Collective Bargaining Unit and the Human Capital Office collaborated with the Turnaround Office to address staffing * PBIS is being implemented | |
| 1. *What were the SIG II Year 1 implementation challenges across the district?* | * Extended day and extended Year continue to be a challenge * There continues to be pervasive issues with human resource management and recruitment * Building a partnership with Mosaica * Recruiting the best personnel to the school created challenges | |
| 1. *Which SIG II Year 1 challenges did you overcome and how?* | * The instructional specialists established relationships and developed a work-stream to support the school level instructional programs along with the partners * The leadership team was able to maintain a safe and orderly environment that allowed for greater access to instructional focus through collaborative planning, data conversations, and student interviews to inform instructional practice and strategic planning for the shift to the common core | |
| 1. *Discuss the lessons learned. What advice would you give to the other districts?* | * Use of data driven systems to enrich instructional practices * Build capacity of teachers and leaders * Value the importance of relationships * Involve all stakeholder and understand the political climate | |
| 1. *What are your key priorities for SIG II Year 2? What’s next?* | * Transition to the common core curriculum * Focus on parent engagement vs. parent involvement * Mosaica will create professional development modules based on *Framework For Teaching* | |
| 1. *What would you like to tell us that we have not asked?* | * The OID (observe, interview, and develop a plan) process engages teachers in conversation and with shared goals to build capacity | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 2** | | | |
| **SIG II Year 1 School Budget for Oxon Hill Middle School , Tier II** | | | |
| **MSDE Fiscal Reviewer:** Geri Taylor Lawrence **Monitoring Date:** June 15, 2012 | | | |
| **Total SIG II Year 1 Allocation:**  $ 1,222,535 | **School Budget Spent:**  $ 428,832 | **Percent of School Budget Spent:**  35% | **Spend Down Data as of:**  June 14, 2012 |
| **Salaries & Wages** | **Contractual Services** | **Supplies & Materials** | **Other** |
| **\*Budgeted:** $ 887,441 | **\*Budgeted:** $ 31,551 | **Budgeted:** $ 10,254 | **Budgeted:**  Travel: $15,640 Registration Fees: $5,360 |
| **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered& Spent**  Travel Encumbered: $ 0 (Spent: $0 )  Registration Fees Encumbered: $ 0 ( Spent: $ 0 ) |
| **Spent (amount):** $ 314,349  **Spent (%):**  35 % | **Spent (amount):** $ 23,031  **Spent (%):**  73 % | **Spent (amount):** $ 4,910  **Spent (%):**  48 % | **Travel Spent : ( 0**  % **)**  **Registration Fees Spent: (**  0 %**)** |
| 1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA’s approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**   PGCPS provided documentation that showed Oxon Hill has spent $ 428,832. This amount is 35% of their approved SIGII Year 1 budget. No additional funds have been encumbered. Expended amounts for fixed charges are included in the total spent. | | | |
| 1. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**   PGCPS explained that spending is a little slow but an amendment has been submitted. | | | |
| 1. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**   PGCPS explained that the Avid Conference and much of the professional development have not taken place. Most of the positions funded through SIG (math and reading coach, parent engagement specialist, etc.) were filled late, thus the spending is low. | | | |
| 1. **Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**   PGCPS indicated that an amendment was submitted to MSDE on June 14, 2012. This amendment will realign the funds for the AVID teacher because the district provided an AVID teacher for all schools implementing the program. Funds for this position are proposed to cover the cost of STEM project. Also, funds ($20,000) will be decreased from teacher stipends. | | | |
| 1. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**   PGCPS provided documentation that showed that monitoring for Oxon Hill was conducted on May 2, 22 and June 12, 2012**.** PGCPS explained that the Compliance Specialist/Program Coordinator works directly with schools to encourage timely spending of funds. The Compliance Specialist sends to schools a Quarterly Budget Blast. This document outlines the funds that are allocated and spent in the budget categories directly under the schools control. Schools are requested to concentrate on immediately spending in the categories that have a large unspent balance. Additionally, school teams meet monthly with staff from the Turnaround Office to discuss challenges to spending and recommendations for amendments. | | | |

\*Amounts changed to reflect an amendment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 3** | | | |
| **SIG II Year 1 School Budget for Thomas Johnson Middle School , Tier II** | | | |
| **MSDE Fiscal Reviewer:** Geri Taylor Lawrence **Monitoring Date:** June 15, 2012 | | | |
| **Total SIG II Year 1 Allocation:**  $ 1,101,956 | **School Budget Spent:**  $ 442,000 | **Percent of School Budget Spent:** 40% | **Spend Down Data as of:**  June 14, 2012 |
| **Salaries & Wages** | **Contractual Services** | **Supplies & Materials** | **Other** |
| **\*Budgeted:** $ 740,462 | **\*Budgeted:** $ 113,113 | **Budgeted:** $ 10,254 | **Budgeted:**  Travel: $ 15,640 Registration Fees: $ 5,360 |
| **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered & Spent:**  Encumbered Travel: $ 0 ( Spent - $ 0 )  Encumbered Registration Fees: $ 0 ( Spent - $ 0) |
| **Spent (amount):** $ 334,639  **Spent (%):**  45 % | **Spent (amount):** $ 21,891  **Spent (%):** 19 % | **Spent (amount):** $ 2,297  **Spent (%):**  22 % | **Travel Spent: (**0 **%)**  **Registration Fees Spent: (**0 %**)** |
| 1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA’s approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**   PGCPS provided documentation that showed Thomas Johnson has spent $ 442,000. This amount is 40% of their approved SIGII Year 1 budget. No additional fundshave been encumbered**.** Expended amounts for fixed charges are included in the total spent. | | | |
| 1. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**   PGCPS explained that the spending for Thomas Johnson is slightly off target but an amendment has been submitted. | | | |
| 1. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**   PGCPS indicated that the funds allocated for the Avid vacant position were not used and professional development for culture & climate and teaching and learning has not all occurred. | | | |
| 1. **Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**   PGCPS indicated that an amendment was submitted to MSDE on June 14, 2012. This amendment will realign the funds for the AVID teacher because the district provided an AVID teacher for all schools implementing the program. Funds for this position are proposed to cover the cost of STEM project. | | | |
| 1. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**   PGCPS provided documentation that showed that monitoring was for Thomas Johnson was conducted onMay 2, 24, and June 12, 2012.PGCPS explained that the Compliance Specialist/Program Coordinator works directly with schools to encourage timely spending of funds. The Compliance Specialist sends to schools a Quarterly Budget Blast. This document outlines the funds that are allocated and spent in the budget categories directly under the schools control. Schools are requested to concentrate on immediately spending in the categories that have a large unspent balance. Additionally, school teams meet monthly with staff from the Turnaround Office to discuss challenges to spending and recommendations for amendments. | | | |

\*Amounts changed to reflect an amendment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 4** | | |
| **Section 5: SIG II Year 1 LEA Budget (Part of Consolidated Budget) LEA:** Prince George’s County Public Schools | | |
| **MSDE Fiscal Reviewer:** Geri Taylor Lawrence **Monitoring Date:** June 15, 2012 | | |
| **SIG II Year 1 LEA Allocation:**  $ 320,451 | **LEA Budget Spent:**  Amount- $ 153,258  Percentage - 48 % | **Spend Down Data as of:**  June 14, 2012 |
| **Salaries & Wages** | **Fixed Charges** | **Other** |
| **Budgeted:** $ 125,796 | **Budgeted:** $ 47,212 | **Budgeted:** Indirect Cost $ 147,443 |
| **Encumbered:** $ 0 | **Encumbered:** $ 0 |  |
| **Spent (amount):** $ 120,948  **Spent (%):** 96 % | **Spent (amount):** $ 32,310  **Spent (%):** 68 % |  |
|  | | |
| 1. **How much of the LEA SIG II 1003(g) Title I Part A, budget has been expended to date (amount and %)?**   PGCPS provided documentation that indicated that the LEA has spent $ 153,253. This amount is 48% of the LEA budget. | | |
| 1. **Is the LEA spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**   PGCPS indicated that spending is consistent with the timeline in all categories. | | |
| 1. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the LEA budget?**   PGCPS explained that all planned activities are occurring. PGCPS explained that indirect cost recovery will be posted in June 30, 2012 which is the end of the fiscal year. | | |
| 1. **Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for the LEA?**   PGCPS indicated that no amendment has been done that will impact the budget LEA portion of the grant. | | |
| 1. **How often are LEA expenditures monitored? Who monitors?**   PGCPS indicated that monitoring for the LEA budget was conducted inJanuary 2012 and next meeting is scheduled for July 2012.PGCPSexplained that quarterly spend down meetings are held to discuss the activities and spending of the LEA budget. Stakeholders in attendance at these meetings are Turnaround Director, Turnaround Budget Specialist, Director of School Leadership and staff from Budget Management Services. Additionally, the Budget Management team participates in quarterly Enterprise Program Management Office grant Core Team meetings and provides implementation updates on SIG spending, current activities, and future initiatives. | | |

\*Amounts changed to reflect an amendment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 5** | |
| **Section 5: SIG II Year 1 Consolidated Budget LEA:** Prince George’s Public Schools | |
| **MSDE Fiscal Reviewer:** Geri Taylor Lawrence **Monitoring Date:** June 15, 2012 | |
| **SIG II 1003(g) Title I, Part A** | |
| Total Allocation  Amount Spent  Percent Spent  Amount Encumbered  Spend Down Data as of : | $ 2,644,942 |
| $ 1,027,739 |
| 39% |
| $ 0 |
| June 14, 2012 |

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 6** |
| **Section 5: SIG II Year 1 LEA Budget LEA:** Prince George’s County Public Schools |
| **MSDE Fiscal Reviewer:** Geri Taylor Lawrence **Monitoring Date:** June 15, 2012 |
| **SIG II Year 1 LEA Allocation:**  $ 933,755 |
| **Spend down as of:** |
| **\* Contracted Services -Budgeted:** $ 933,755 |
| **Encumbered:** $ 0 |
| **Spent (amount):** $ 814,500  **Spent (%):**  87 % |
| 1. **How much of the LEA SIG II budget has been expended to date (amount and %)?**   PGCPS provided documentation that indicated that the LEA has spent $814,500. This amount is 87 % of the LEA budget. No additional fundshave been encumbered. |
| 1. **Is the LEA spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**   PGCPS indicated that spending is on target with the payments to Mosaica (EMO) for services to the two SIG II schools. |
| 1. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the LEA budget?**   PGCPS explained that all planned activities have taken place. |
| 1. **Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for the LEA?**   PGCPS indicated that no budget amendment is needed for this grant. |
| 1. **How often are LEA expenditures monitored? Who monitors?**   PGCPS provided documentation that showed that monitoring for the LEA budget was conducted inJanuary 2012 and next meeting is scheduled for July 2012.PGCPS indicated that quarterly spend down meetings are held to discuss the activities and spending of the LEA budget. Stakeholders in attendance at these meetings are Turnaround Director, Turnaround Budget Specialist, Director of School Leadership and staff from Budget Management Services. Additionally, the Budget Management team participates in quarterly Enterprise Program Management Office grant Core Team meetings and provides implementation updates on SIG spending, current activities, and future initiatives. |