Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG), section 1003(g)
MSDE Onsite Monitoring Dates: February-March 2011

MSDE SIG Monitoring Teams' Second Onsite Visit Feedback for:

I.   **Local Educational Agency (LEA):**
   - **Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS).**
II. **Turnaround Intervention Model SIG Schools:**
   - **Augusta Fells Savage institute of Visual Arts High School; and**
   - **Booker T. Washington Middle Schools**
III. **Restart Intervention Model SIG Schools:**
   - **Calverton Elementary/Middle School;**
   - **Commodore John Rodgers Elementary/Middle School;**
   - **Baltimore IT Academy (formerly Chinquapin Middle);**
   - **William C. March Middle School; and**
   - **Garrison Middle School.**

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 Monitoring Teams' Second 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. The purpose of the SIG Teams second onsite visit is to review documentation that substantiates the LEA's implementation, both programmatic and fiscal, of its SIG Grant, as approved by MSDE. Once all documentation provided by the LEA has been reviewed, SIG Monitoring Teams will determine a level of implementation for each section/component/strategy/action that consists of being MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. For areas that are MET in this feedback, MSDE will continue to monitor sustainability of the level of implementation. Based on the SIG Teams' Onsite Visit Feedback, **MSDE expects the LEA to review and analyze the feedback and make adjustments to its approved SIG application through the system's internal controls and submission of programmatic and fiscal amendments to MSDE.**

Table Organization of SIG Teams' Second Onsite Visit Feedback

Table 1	Section 4: LEA Commitments and Capacity
Table 2	Levels of Implementation At -a -Glance for SIG Turnaround Schools
Table 3	Section 2: Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School
Table 4	Section 2: Booker T. Washington Middle School
Table 5	Levels of Implementation At -a -Glance for SIG Restart Schools
Table 6	Section 2: Calverton Elementary/Middle School
Table 7	Section 2: Commodore John Rodgers Elementary/Middle School
Table 8	Section 2: William C. March Middle School
Table 9	Section 2: Baltimore IT Academy *(formerly Chinquapin Middle)*
Table 10	Section 2: Garrison Middle School
Table 11	Section 5: SIG Consolidated Budget
Table 12	Section 5: SIG LEA Budget
Table 13	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Augusta Fells Institute of Visual Arts High School
Table 14	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Booker T. Washington Middle School
Table 15	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Calverton Elementary/Middle School
Table 16	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Commodore John Rodgers Elementary/Middle School
Table 17	Section 5: SIG School Budget for William C. March Middle School
Table 18	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Baltimore IT Academy *(formerly Chinquapin Middle)*
Table 19	Section 5: SIG School Budget for Garrison Middle School

TABLE 1: Section 4—LEA Commitments and Capacity by Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team Members: Jim Newkirk and Geri Taylor Lawrence   **Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011

Table 4.A: BCPSS Central Support Team	**Level of Implementation for Table 4.A: MET**

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- Provided documentation the identified members of BCPSS' 1003(g) Central Support Team, as amended in the system's approved SIG application, are active members.
- Provided documentation each member's responsibilities is being addressed as identified in Table 4.A.
- In terms of the estimate time each member will devote to supporting the system's identified Tier I and/or Tier II school, BCPSS communicated the time is aligned with each member's responsibilities for implementing the SIG grant is fairly accurate. BCPSS provided documentation the amount of time each office/department spends in the 7 SIG Schools.

a. **How often will the LEA 1003(g) central support team meet?**	**Level of Implementation: MET**

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- Central Support Team has been renamed Turnaround School Project Management Team. Team Member names are the individuals listed in Table 4.A.
- Provided documentation of monthly meetings from September 2010 through February 2011. Representation from all identified departments/offices attended these monthly meetings.
- Provided documentation to substantiate the team will "reflect on plans and processes" by sharing specific agenda items from the monthly meetings that identified the following:
    - ✓ Follow-up from Last Week
    - ✓ School Updates for Turnarounds
    - ✓ Closing and Next Steps
    - ✓ Turnaround School Updates by Individual Departments (Office of Family Community Engagement, Human Capital, Network Support Teams which is part of the Chief Academic Office, Student Support Services, Special Education, and Office of Teaching and Learning)
- Provided documentation on a Turnaround School Retreat that was held on December 20, 2010 for the purpose of reflecting on what has been implemented to date and make modifications to the Turnaround Infrastructure in order to assist and support schools on teaching and learning,

b. **How often will they report on their work and the work on Tier I, II and III schools to the Superintendent?**	**Level of Implementation: MET**

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- BCPSS communicated that a formal report was provided to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and CEO's cabinet every month.
- The CEO receives a quarterly report. BCPSS provided evidence the CEO received formal reports in August 2010; November 2010; and January 2011. In terms of the CEO's cabinet, there is representation from that office at the monthly Turnaround Project Management Team meetings.

c. **How often will they report on their work and the work on Tier I, II and III schools**   **Level of Implementation: MET**
    to the Board of Education?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- BCPSS provided documentation that the School Board received quarterly reports for August 2010, November 2010, and January 2011.
- In addition, BCPSS provided documentation these quarterly reports were shared with the local School Board in its Executive Sessions.

d. **Has the LEA 1003(g) central support team met prior to the submission of the grant**   **Level of Implementation: MET**
    application to review the individual school descriptions and to discuss how it will
    coordinate and manage the support, monitoring and assessment outlined in those plans?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- BCPSS provided documentation that a working group met weekly beginning May 2010 in July of 2010. These meetings were held bi-weekly to ensure that all schools were ready for the effective implementation of the grant at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.
- BCPSS provided documentation that the FTE was assigned to the role of project management.

e. **What role has or will the LEA 1003(g) central support team play in the creation of annual**   **Level of Implementation: MET**
    goals for student achievement and annual review/assessment of progress based on these
    goals described in sections 2 and 3 of this proposal?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- BCPSS provided documentation that the identified Turnaround School Project Management Team works collaboratively as a cross functional team to review and assess the progress of the 7 SIG schools toward their set goals.
- Documentation was not provided for the system's "school quality review" due to the fact that this process has not been developed because this is an end-of-year activity.
- BCPSS communicated that a process will be implemented at the end of year 2 to give formal feedback to the school leadership teams as well as the school-based operators, and community support organization.
- MSDE communicated that this revision needs to be included in a programmatic amendment to Section 4.

f. **What steps will the LEA take to ensure that the school improvement**   **Level of Implementation: PARTIALLY MET**
    funds are utilized (1) in a timely way and (2) effectively and efficiently to support
    the required components of the selected intervention? Specifically, what assurances
    will the LEA make that schools and LEA support teams have access to these funds,
    even during annual rollover processes? How will the LEA support principals'
    timely and effective use of these funds?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- BCPSS provided documentation the school system hired an individual to assure SIG funds are utilized to implement the selected interventions. A Turnaround Budget Manager was hired on December 2010.

- BCPSS provided documentation of monthly Turnaround Operators meetings that included agenda items addressing SIG schools' spending plans.
- BCPSS provided documentation of Turnaround Budget Manager's phone logs and meeting notes to ensure all SIG budgets of the LEA and SIG schools adhere to the approved budgets. Also, the Turnaround Budget Manager monitors the expenditure requests by the LEA and SIG schools to ensure reasonable and necessary and allowable and allocable.
- In Tables 11-19 of this feedback, MSDE monitored BCPSS' Level of Implementation of all SIG budgets as NOT MET due to SIG funds not being used in a timely way.

g. **Within this proposal, the LEA identified actions taken or in the planning to support**   **Level of Implementation:**   **MET**
individual Tier I and Tier II schools' implementation of the selected interventions.
Looking across the commitments made for the schools, and considering as well the strategies selected by the LEA for identified Tier III schools, what additional actions will the LEA take to ensure that the selected interventions are implemented as designed and to make the 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?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- **REALIGNMENT:**
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools were given a per pupil allocation for spending
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools had the ability to align their resources targeted interventions
  - ✓ Provided documentation Restart Schools with external operators were able to realign their SIG funding resources to have more flexibility to meet the needs of their targeted interventions within the parameters of the federal fiscal regulations
- **REMOVAL OF BARRIERS**:
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools submitted plans that outline how each school will reach given benchmarks. BCPSS developed and implemented High Priority Plan for each SIG school that sets specific targets for teaching and learning.
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools made adjustments to the traditional school calendar. In order to implement one of the nine requirements of the Turnaround Intervention Model, Augusta Fells Savage and Booker T. Washington implemented and extended learning opportunity for all students which modified the system's traditional school calendar.
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools had autonomy in budget, staffing, and programming through the approved SIG budget process as well as the programmatic and fiscal amendment protocol.
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools were supported to make best use of collaborative planning time and embedded professional development within the school day. Each SIG school was provided support and technical assistance through the system's Network Support Teams through the Chief Academic Office.
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG schools had the flexibility to use its staff, time and money to ensure each school dramatically improves student achievement. SIG Teams' monitoring of SIG schools did not always substantiate this LEA documentation.
- **MODIFICATIONS TO POLICIES:**
  - ✓ Provided documentation SIG the Turnaround School Project Management Team met regularly with SIG schools to rethink policies that may impact the expedited turnaround of schools.
  - ✓ Provided documentation the Office of Human Capital modified communication and recruiting practices for the identified SIG schools.

✓ COMMUNICATION:
  ➢ Provided documentation the Office of Human Capital, in partnership with other central office leaders, visited each of the impacted schools' existing staff to discuss the respective model, the direction of the initiative and lay out the case for change.
  ➢ Provided documentation the voluntary transfer process was relaxed in its requirements which encourage our effective teachers to consider restart or turnaround schools.
  ➢ Provided documentation external Restart Operators were invited to attend and discuss staffing at their respective schools
✓ TEACHER RECRUITING:
  ➢ Provided documentation BCPSS developed and implemented a process for Restart/Turnaround SIG schools to have first access to the strongest candidates. Even though BCPSS relaxed its voluntary transfer option and recruitment of first year teachers to meet the staffing needs of all SIG schools, MSDE, through its SIG Team first and second onsite monitoring visits, determined their continues to be staffing challenges in some of the SIG schools.
  ➢ Provided documentation a rigorous interview process was developed that included face-to-face interviews, a review of student data, sample lessons, instructional observations, and evaluation feedback from existing leadership. MSDE determined this process used considerable more data points than ever before to recruit and retain staff.

- **ENAGING IN COLLABORATION:**
  ✓ Provided documentation the Turnaround Director provided long-range planning with Restart School Operators and Turnaround principals. This long-range planning process is ongoing.

---

h. **What are the major challenges to full and effective implementation of all components**   **Level of Implementation: MET**
of the SIG grant that the LEA 1003 (g) central support team has identified and how
will the team address these challenges in the early phases of the work?

BCPSS Presented Evidence:
- In its approved application to the MSDE, BCPSS identified the following challenges and solutions to implementing its SIG grant:

Challenge	Solutions
Identifying highly effective staff for every position within Turnaround schools	City Schools implemented an informal observation protocol to identify staff members who demonstrated turnaround potential. Implementation targeted
Identification of highly effective school leaders	Create a job description and a posting specifically for a "turnaround principal." A pool of qualified applicants will be created through a rigorous selection process. Put incentives in place for additional compensation, vacation cash, out and performance bonuses. Develop turnaround leader training to support principals
Ensuring that all elements of the school model and state requirements can be adequately funded	Team approach to the roll out of funds to ensure that every school receives that funds required for school model implementation

- BCPSS communicated the identified three challenges were accurate.
- In addition to the identified challenges in its approved SIG Application, BCPSS identified additional challenges that included processing budget invoices with Restart school operators in a timely manner.

TABLE 2: **Levels of Implementation At-a-Glance on the Requirements for the Turnaround Intervention Model in BCPSS' SIG Schools**	**Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Arts High School** **Tier II** **Requirement Level of Implementation** **M-Met** **PM-Partially Met** **NM-Not Met**	**Booker T. Washington Middle School** **Tier I** **Requirement Level of Implementation** **M-Met** **PM-Partially Met** **NM-Not Met**
1 Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**
2 Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and select new staff	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**
3 Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth	**Met**	**Met**
4 Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**
5 Adopt a new governance structure	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**
6 Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned"	**Partially Met**	**Met**
7 Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction	**Partially Met**	**Met**
8 Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**
9 Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students	**Met**	**Met**

TABLE 3: Augusta Fells Institute of Visual Arts High School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools	
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Valerie Ashton-Thomas, Walt Sallee, Vanessa Diggs, Annette Harris, and Gary Hedges			Monitoring Dates: Feb. 28 and Mar. 1, 2011	
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met				
Require-ment	Description	Requirement Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item	
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	Partially Met	1.b-c. A job description for the turnaround principal position and the listing ad for the position were not provided. No evidence was provided that the OHC And CAO assisted the principal in developing a staffing model and budget process in accordance with the established guidelines.	
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	Partially Met	2.c. No written plan from the Harvard Institute.	
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	Met		
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	Partially Met	4.c. No evidence of written plan from Harvard Institute (see 2.c)	
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	Partially Met	5.a.i. Missing evidence that Director of Turnaround is supporting periodic <u>curriculum review</u> and <u>modification</u>.	

TABLE 3: Augusta Fells Institute of Visual Arts High School		LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Valerie Ashton-Thomas, Walt Sallee, Vanessa Diggs, Annette Harris, and Gary Hedges		**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 28 and Mar. 1, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met		
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	**Partially Met**	6.b. Smart boards have not yet been purchased; training has not taken place.
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	**Partially Met**	7.b. Insufficient evidence was provided. No sign-in sheets, agenda, or notes were provided that BCPSS Network is meeting with school based leadership staff to provide support to teachers to analyze student data and suggest strategies for teachers to use to meet the identified needs of students.
8	Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time	**Partially Met**	8.a-v. No evidence to support the existence of an extended day model, specifically attendance records.
9	Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students	**Met**	

TABLE 4: Booker T. Washington Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Valerie Ashton-Thomas, Walt Sallee, Vanessa Diggs, Annette Harris, and Gary Hedges			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 24-25, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Require-ment	**Description**	**Requirement Level of Implementation**	**Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item**
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	**Partially Met**	1.b-c. A job description for the turnaround principal position and the listing ad for the position were not provided. The only evidence presented for the Turnaround principal selection process was a copy of 5-slide powerpoint presentation that also included the traditional and charter school principal selection process. 1.f – No evidence of weekly school-based support. There was evidence of quarterly meetings with mentor/Teacher Support Coordinator however sign in sheets were not available for all meetings.
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	**Partially Met**	2.b -No written plan for teacher monitoring and improvement from Harvard Leadership Institute. 2.c. - Staffing process located with OHC. List of candidates and interview schedule was provided. An e-mail from staffing specialist indicates that (central office) led the interviews for special education position. Some resumes for candidates provided. Selection process did not yield qualified individuals to fill vacancies. Principal's feedback on how she wanted OHC to proceed or status of fulfilling vacancies is not provided. There were discrepancies among the list of candidates and credentials provided.
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	**Met**	
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	**Partially Met**	4.a. The plan that was to be developed at the end of the Harvard Institute was missing. NLNS development of leadership team appears to be missing (diagnostic report; ongoing support). School-based professional development occurred on January 6 and 13. Evidence of preparation for the opening of school is provided.
5	Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school	**Partially Met**	5.c. Evidence provided (look-for's – teacher effectiveness, staffing) did not address ensuring the curriculum is being implemented with

TABLE 4: Booker T. Washington Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools	
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Valerie Ashton-Thomas, Walt Sallee, Vanessa Diggs, Annette Harris, and Gary Hedges			Monitoring Dates: Feb. 24-25, 2011	
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met				
Require-ment	Description	Requirement Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item	
	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		fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective. Evidence did not include observation of classroom objectives and clear connections to the State Curriculum.	
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	Met		
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	Partially Met	7.c. A statement was provided indicating that continued support has been provided from the Office of Teaching and Learning and Student Support Networks in monitoring the progress of students in reading and math. However, there is no evidence to support this implementation (Sign in sheets, agendas, etc). 7.d. A statement was provided to indicate that the school is currently in Phase 1.	
8	Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time	Partially Met	8.c. Four teachers were hired; two of them resigned. 8.g. A written statement was provided indicating that the KIPP model was attempted at the beginning of the school year. Despite best efforts, the program was deemed unsuccessful. Evidence provided, including daily schedule, indicates that the KIPP model was infused into the instructional program at various times during the school day. There is no SANE evidence that meetings occur that would reflect student needs were assessed and /or samples of completed data matrices. 8.i. A statement was provided indicating that this component of the plan has not been implemented because of changes in the enrichment block.	
9	Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students	Met		

TABLE 5: Levels of Implementation At-a-Glance on the Requirements for the Restart Intervention Model in BCPSS' SIG Schools		Calverton Elem/Middle Tier I Requirement Level of Implementation M-Met PM-Partially Met NM-Not Met	Commodore John Rodgers Elem/Middle Tier II Requirement Level of Implementation M-Met PM-Partially Met NM-Not Met	William C. March Middle Tier I Requirement Level of Implementation M-Met, PM-Partially Met NM-Not Met	Baltimore IT Academy Tier I Requirement Level of Implementation M-Met PM-Partially Met NM-Not Met	Garrison Middle Tier I Requirement Level of Implementation M-Met, PM-Partially Met NM-Not Met
1	Student Profile	Not Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Partially Met
2	Staff Profile	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
3	Student Achievement	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
4	Rigorous Curriculum	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
5	Instructional Program	Partially Met	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
6	Assessments	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
7	School Climate & Culture	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
8	Student, Family, Community Support	Partially Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Not Met	Partially Met
9	Professional Development	Partially Met	Partially Met	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Not Met
12	Effective Leadership	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met

Title I School Improvement (SIG) Grant 1003(g)
SIG 2ⁿᵈ Onsite Monitoring Visit in Baltimore City Public School System (BCPSS)
Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

TABLE 6: Calverton Elementary/Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Hilda Ortiz, Donna Olszewski, Mary Cross, Catherine Amsel			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 15-16, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	**Description**	**Level of Implementation**	**Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item**
1	Student Profile	**Not Met**	**1.a.** Evidence of at-risk factors for students, developed by the LEA, is presented. However school states that it was not received when needed during the summer but instead only very recently from the LEA. No intervention plans were evident and some data were missing. Also, missing evidence of parent notification for students and there are no dates on certified post office receipts of letters sent to parents. **1.c.** No intervention plans for at risk students were presented. One strategy noted for a student but no monitoring follow-up is presented. No staff was identified to do the follow-up. For one student there is evidence of a growing attendance problem but no plan for attendance is presented. Plans relevant to attendance are not in the binder presented. School Performance Plan was presented but does not focus on intervention.
2	Staff Profile	**Partially Met**	**2.c .** 2010-2011instructional staff roster was provided but it is not possible to determine if the 33% goal was met. **2.d.** Schedule was not provided for demonstration lessons. Schedule of coaching for subject area supervisors was not provided. No evidence of feedback provided to teachers based on learning walk conversations. No schedule of demonstration lessons and lesson plans were provided.
3	Student Achievement	**Met**	
4	Rigorous Curriculum	**Partially Met**	**4.b** Numerous lesson plans provided as evidence. Several lesson plans referenced standards that were not aligned to Maryland's State Curriculum. Plan states that books being used contain intervention and enrichment sources. Reviewer requested evidence/samples of those interventions. None were provided.
5	Instructional Program	**Partially Met**	**5.**a. The approaches that were not fully addressed were the Readers and Writers Workshop across the curriculum and the use of learning centers in the elementary grades.
6	Assessments	**Partially Met**	**6.h.** Evidence provided for data night was for parent training only. No documentation on school leadership training. **6.j.** Due to the late receipt of technology hardware staff training will not take place until March 2011.
7	School Climate & Culture	**Partially Met**	**7.a**. PowerPoint of a discipline plan was provided –the principal explained that this was their culture plan. PBIS strategies were addressed in the plan however there were no connections with SST.

TABLE 6: Calverton Elementary/Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Hilda Ortiz, Donna Olszewski, Mary Cross, Catherine Amsel			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 15-16, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	**Description**	**Level of Implementation**	**Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item**
			7.b. A scope of service for a community school's model was provided. However, the plan was not fully implemented. An agreement with the University of Maryland identified support for mental health. **7.c**. Several documents pertinent to Student Support Team process were provided. No documentation however was provided for the monitoring of services for students with IEP's. A list of IEP meetings was provided however there is no indication of monitoring for service delivery.
8	Student, Family, Community Support	**Partially Met**	**8.c** Agendas and sign-in sheets were presented. However, the goal of 200 students/parents/guardians attending monthly parent nights was not met. **8.d**. One individual behavior plan was found. However, no evidence that the SST monitored the plan. **8.e**. No plans or documentation were in evidence for the Student Support Team monitoring individual behavior plans for quality and fidelity of implementation.
9	Professional Development	**Partially Met**	**9.a** Provided agenda for summer teacher PD sessions. Summaries of overall teacher evaluations were presented but there were no individual evaluations for multiple sessions. No sign-in notes or evaluations of specific training sessions were presented except for the PowerPoint for STEM and notes. **9.b** Agendas for administrator training were on file. No sign in, notes, or evaluation of administrators' trainings were presented. Additional documentations (sign-in, notes, evaluations) was requested but not provided.
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	**Partially Met**	**10.a.** A budget provided but does not reflect items mentioned in this indicator. Principal provided budget information for after school enrichment program only. This program is not literacy focused. Principal also provided PowerPoint with data focus. There is no budget documentation provided for other items. **10.b.** Provided sign in sheets for 3 vertical math meetings, provided teacher common planning schedules, one early child- hood vertical meeting agenda and minutes, lesson planning was not reflected in the minutes, not evident that early childhood special education teachers attended meeting. There is no evidence that collaborative planning focused on instruction is occurring. Vertical meetings are held but the focus is not on enhancing the instructional program. **10.c.** No evidence that the scripted model is being followed. **10.d.** No clear alignment between data review and student skill development in the day to day instruction of students. A PowerPoint on the data cycle was provided. **10.e.** No clear documentation that increased learning time for literacy occurs during the school day. **10.f.** Very little documentation provided to show use of Writers' Workshop. PowerPoint provided and limited student work. **10.h.** Budget information provided. No clear indication as to which programs were being funded and

Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
TABLE 6: Calverton Elementary/Middle School			**LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools**
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Hilda Ortiz, Donna Olszewski, Mary Cross, Catherine Amsel			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 15-16, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
			from what source. No indication as to which staff or if additional staff has been secured.
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	**Met**	
12	Effective Leadership	**Partially Met**	**12.a.** One certificate of participation was evidenced. It is difficult to see how the skills learned during the training drove the revisions in the School Performance Plan. Some documentation is needed. **12.d.** No documentation was found to demonstrate that the operator used benchmark assessments to design PD sessions **12.f.** This section of the binder only contained teacher rosters. There was no evidence that the summer PD focused on curricula mapping, unit planning development, developing common assessments, school wide behavior management plan implementation, creating a college going culture beginning in Pre-K, and differentiation of instruction. **12.h.** Promethean Boards were delivered late and training will occur at a later date.

TABLE 7: Commodore John Rodgers Elementary/Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Ann Glazer, Donna Olszewski, Mary Cross, Catherine Amsel			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 17-18, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
1	Student Profile	**Partially Met**	1.d-e. No documentation for the summer workshops to share attendance policy with families (sign-in, agenda, evaluations) -No info provided for use of Parent Portal by school and parents which became operational on 1.27.11 or for the summer workshop referred to in this section. -No communication logs addressing absenteeism. -No copies of invitations to events, mailing lists, flyers, places where flyers were distributed to document parent outreach regarding behavioral programs 1.h. The information included is not the Super Star Referral certificates for excellent student behavior noted in the evidence section. Instead this section includes sign-in, blank evaluation forms, PowerPoint's, etc.
2	Staff Profile	**Partially Met**	2.b. Could not determine which of the teachers with less than 5 years experience were mentored by the dean of students. 2.c. Results of all surveys were not compiled and it is unclear how surveys were used to drive PD. Samples of PD surveys were included.
3	Student Achievement	**Partially Met**	3.e. No evidence that strategy board has been created
4	Rigorous Curriculum	**Partially Met**	4.a. No sample of the "structured design process". Note: Staff noted that this is not in place at this time.
5	Instructional Program	**Met**	
6	Assessments	**Partially Met**	6.b. No description/documentation of how students' needs were accommodated (using Universal Design principles). 6.c. No sign in sheets, evaluations, notes were provided for the PD sessions for teachers on accessing and analyzing bench mark data (agenda found in section 9j)
7	School Climate & Culture	**Partially Met**	7.a . School staff explained that the climate surveys are currently in progress -Not clear how the information shared at back to school night was analyzed and used. How was parent feedback used? -Documentation (sign in/logs) was not provided for morning advisory meetings or what happens when students are late or absent for these meetings. -Documentation on PBIS training was limited (photographs). - No explanation of Advisory Challenge-not clear 7.b. On-Line Data results and tracking documentation were not available to document the *Leaders Go Places* program. 7.d. Parent signatures to document home visits were not provided.

Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
			7.g. Not clear if community involvement team was meeting with community associations such as Butchers Hill and Johns Hopkins. 7.k. No sign-in sheets, agendas, notes, were available to document service learning meetings.
8	Student, Family, Community Support	**Partially Met**	8.c. Staff will address parent involvement activities (Parent Involvement Council) at a later date. 8.d. No evidence that family involvement outreach will include community organizations. No evidence of newsletters sent to community. No evidence of recruiting volunteers.
9	Professional Development	**Partially Met**	9.a.ii. PD plan needs to be amended to target the 2011-2012 school year for developing an electronic format. 9.b.i PD action research project to be addressed in the spring of 2011. 9.b.iii No documentation to describe how the school determines the effectiveness of PD. 9.i. No documentation was provided that described how information from teachers' self assessments was used to inform professional development experiences. 9.l. No documentation was provided to show that Living Classrooms provided PD on the use of benchmarks.
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	**Partially Met**	10. a.-f. Documentation was insufficient for this section. Only photos of the Teacher Collaboration Center were provided. 10.g. Documentation of teachers' use of Share Point was not provided. 10.h. CFIP process to be implemented next year.
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	**Partially Met**	11.a. No evidence that Dean of Instruction is coaching and mentoring 30% of total teaching staff through the NBCT process on site. 11.c. No evidence that Teacher Leaders are supporting teachers and interventions on site 11.e. No evidence of individual plans that were designed as a result of diagnostic testing.
12	Effective Leadership	**Partially Met**	12.c. No documentation to indicate that leadership analyzes the data from the Collaboration Center to inform their learning walks. 12.f. No documentation provided to indicate that LCF is working with other funding partners to provide extended learning hours throughout the year. 12.g. No documentation provided to indicate that LCF is exploring Saturday and Summer learning opportunities. 12.h. No evidence provided that monthly meetings are held between the principal and LCF to review financial records and assess financial status.

TABLE 7:   Commodore John Rodgers Elementary/Middle School   LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Ann Glazer, Donna Olszewski, Mary Cross, Catherine Amsel   **Monitoring Dates: Feb. 17-18, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met

TABLE 8: William C. March Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Barbara Scherr, Portia Bates, John McGinnis, Pete Singleton			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 15-16, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
1	Student Profile	**Partially Met**	1.b. Documentation reviewed included attendance/data records, but did not see communication by inter-disciplinary team on strategies and incentives addressing attendance. 1.c. Missing evidence included: teacher ratings of student behaviors SANE for July 20 & 30 PD (this was reflected on the Master schedule)
2	Staff Profile	**Partially Met**	2.a. Documentation missing included a complete list of teachers with less than 5 years experience.
3	Student Achievement	**Partially Met**	3b. Missing evidence included: • Class schedule showing use of Math and Reading Labs • *Documentation of homework assistance and extended day program. (*A note was provided stating: The extended day program began this semester, therefore this documentation is not available.)*
4	Rigorous Curriculum	**Partially Met**	4.d. It was noted in the documentation binder that the Savvy Readers' Lab instructor was not available for summer training. The Math Acceleration Lab instructor received initial training during the professional development activities from July 28 – August 6. A separate sign-in sheet was not kept for the math lab instructor.
5	Instructional Program	**Partially Met**	5a. Evidence of PD in understanding and responding appropriately to the developmental needs of early adolescents was reflected on the Master Schedule and a copy of the PowerPoint was provided but no SANE documentation. In addition, there was no evidence of a January shadow study, but one was provided for February. 5b. The following documentation was missing: • SANE from PD around predictors of course failure • Logs from Early Warning Indicator Meetings • Noted in binder: During the 1st semester, Early Warning Indicator (EWI) data was shared with the multidisciplinary teams for the use during their common planning time. More formal meetings will be held by a committee that includes administrators, a JHU representative, team leaders, and related service professionals during the second semester. • Noted in the binder: No student schedules have been adjusted as a part of the EWI process. Multidisciplinary teams use the data to focus attention and resources on those students who exhibit chronic absenteeism, behavior problems, or who fall in math or reading/English language arts. 5d. Neither afterschool program schedules nor were descriptions of activities provided.
6	Assessments	**Partially Met**	6a. No documentation of extensive training for teaching staff in the use of formative assessments to inform classroom instruction was provided. It was noted in the binder: PD on formative assessments will be offered later this semester, so no SANE is available. 6d. In the suggested documentation, it indicated "re-teaching and differentiation based upon assessment data should be evident to classroom visitors – school observation forms; LEA SIG Monitoring observation forms with re-teaching as a 'look-for'. There was evidence of a checklist by Talent Development but not evidence of "re-teaching" as a 'look for'.

TABLE 8: William C. March Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Barbara Scherr, Portia Bates, John McGinnis, Pete Singleton			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 15-16, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
7	School Climate & Culture	**Partially Met**	7a. None of the suggested documentation was provided: • School safety measures as tracked by Safety Stat • Data from SWIS • Student Survey data • Annual climate survey of students, staff, and parents • Reduction of students with misbehavior (Early Warning Indicator) by 25% 7c. No logs indicating parents were contacted were provided. It was noted in the binder that records of contacts with parents regarding absenteeism have not been kept consistently at March. The School Leadership Team is addressing these issues.
8	Student, Family, Community Support	**Not Met**	No documentation was provided for the component. It appears that activities will take place after February SIG visit. Noted in binder: 1. Per the BCPS Turnaround Director, the parent climate survey is administered by BCPSS, which maintains all data generated by the survey. Apparently, BCPSS has not yet administered this year's survey. 2. The first Action Team meeting and training session is scheduled to take place on February 26, so no SANE has been generated. 3. No PD development activities regarding NNPS have occurred; therefore no SANE has been generated.
9	Professional Development	**MET**	
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	**Partially Met**	10a. Missing documentation included: • Evidence of meetings of reflective practices by reviewing student work. • No SANE for PD showing resource teachers are being deployed to co-teach with general education teachers.
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	**Partially Met**	Documentation was provide for leadership meetings and a copy of the School Performance Plan was provided, but missing documentation included: • The Turnaround Director has not submitted a data analysis report to the principal. • No SANE for School Performance Plan meetings
12	Effective Leadership	**Partially Met**	12b No evidence that the Leadership Team includes the Turnaround Director. It was noted in the documentation binder: During the first semester, the Turnaround Director was a member of the School Leadership Team. However, this practice was discontinued with the arrival of a new administration. We are working to develop a collaborative leader's model that will accommodate all stakeholders. 12.c. No evidence of the family community involvement action team. The National Network of Partnership Schools (NNRS) has scheduled their first meeting for February 2011.

Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
			TABLE 9: Baltimore IT Academy *(formerly Chinquapin Middle)* **LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools**
			MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Cvieta Jovanovich, Brian Tureck, Marcie Frye **Monitoring Dates: Feb. 17-18, 2011**
			Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met
1	Student Profile	**Not Met**	1.a. Data showed enrollment decrease from Sept to February by 31 students. The goal to increase enrollment was not met. The low enrollment was a concern in September. No data supporting the implementation of a rigorous math and technology program. IT Academy has not been able to access funds to purchase tech equipment that as of this visit were on purchase orders and expected in two to three weeks. 1.b. Information provided showed that informative sessions planned for the community regarding the school's mission and vision in the spring have not yet been scheduled or planned.
2	Staff Profile	**Partially Met**	2.a. Schedules, staff roster, staff list were provided but we could not cross-walk the information accurately. Some teachers were listed but had no schedules; some appeared on one list but not on others. 2.b. HQ status was not identified and it appears that some of the teachers hired are not certified. 2.e. Unclear that staff hired had technology background. From the sample of resumes it appears that one teacher had computer education background with some software development. 2.c. Administrators as a whole did not have the strong background in math and information technology. 2.g. Technology training is not apparent in the Teacher PD plans. 2.f,i-j.No records of staff professional development prior to January. Earlier references to PD lacked documentation (dated agendas, sign in sheets, focus of training and evaluation). Most were either administrative staff meetings or general faculty meetings with typical administrative announcements (often 10-12 items rather than a focused training topic with evidence and follow-up.) 2.k. No evidence of mentoring for new teachers. 2.l-o No evidence for these strategies: development of the school culture; additional days for professional development; building partners with the community; and meetings with Towson University to discuss offering classes at the school site.
3	Student Achievement	**Partially Met**	3 a-c. Data was available for the Special Education students related to analysis and strategies to meet the identifying student needs but was lacking for the regular population. 3.e . Benchmark data was not available for general population. There were difficulties with programming. The Director indicated data was not valid and could not be compared at this time.
4	Rigorous Curriculum	**Partially Met**	4. a-d. Baltimore IT Academy has not been able to access funds to purchase tech equipment that as of this visit was on purchase orders and expected in two to three weeks. (Smart Boards, computers to complete all the labs) 4.e-g. No evidence available to see how technology is integrated across the curriculum
5	Instructional Program	**Partially Met**	5.a. No evidence available to see how technology is integrated across the curriculum 5.c. No evidence tutoring sessions after school and on weekends incorporate the use of technology. 5.d. August professional development did not occur. Staff was not hired before the training dates.

TABLE 9: Baltimore IT Academy *(formerly Chinquapin Middle)*			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Cvieta Jovanovich, Brian Tureck, Marcie Frye			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 17-18, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
6	Assessments	**Partially Met**	6.a. No evidence of PD for teachers on how to assess for learning with formative, interim, and summative assessments. 6.b. Data link training was provided but documentation to support the when, how, and who was trained was not provided. 6.c. No evidence of student assessments at the beginning of the year. 6.d. Benchmark data was not available for the general population due to difficulties with programming. The Director indicated data was not valid and could not be compared at this time.
7	School Climate & Culture	**Partially M**	7.ai. No documentation on student recruitment. 7.aii. No documentation on the first two conference of the school year. 7.b. No documentation how discipline plan or code was taught to staff and students (PBIS). No evidence of what "bit bucks" offers students. 7.e. No evidence that schoolwide & classroom rules were formed by teachers.
8	Student, Family, Community Support	**Not Met**	8.a-f. The PTO has not yet been established.
9	Professional Development	**Partially Met**	9.a. No records of staff professional development prior to January. Earlier references to PD lacked documentation (dated agendas, sign in sheets, focus of training and evaluation) most were either administrative staff meetings or general faculty meetings with typical administrative announcements (often 10-12 items rather than a focused training topic with evidence and follow-up 9.b. Professional growth plan development for each staff member started in February however plans were not available for all staff. 9.c-g. No evidence to support the following strategies: PD that reflect the needs of teachers and foster student growth; ten PD days scheduled during the school year; five PD days scheduled before the beginning of the school year; teacher attendance at seminars and workshops; PD planned through the partnership between school and Towson University
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	**Partially Met**	10.b-c. Board has not added additional members. Three meetings were held only one set of minutes was available. 10.e. Job descriptions were not provided. 10.f. No evidence that classroom observation occurred prior to January.
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	**Not Met**	Documentation stated "School Improvement Plan will be developed with all stakeholders after Parent Organization is formed." Parent organization is only in the process of being formed.
12	Effective Leadership	**Partially Met**	12.c. No evidence of assessment data reviewed during Leadership team meetings. 12.d. Assessment Data was collected but there is no evidence that the data was disseminated to staff. 12.e. No evidence of observations prior to January. Minimal evidence of instructional leadership in other areas listed in this strategy.

TABLE 10: Garrison Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Barbara Scherr, Portia Bates, John McGinnis, Pete Singleton			Monitoring Dates: Feb. 22-23, 2011
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
1	Student Profile	**Partially Met**	1.a. Documentation showed that enrollment has increased at GMS, however, missing documentation was the information sent out by BCPSS to include a letter to parents for recruitment fairs. (There were no copies in the binder.) 1.c. Missing documentation included: • Evidence/log of parent contacts, principal/parent interviews. • Communication to parents regarding who to contact with questions and/or concerns.
2	Staff Profile	**Partially Met**	2.a. Documentation included evaluation schedules for November and December and mid-year formal evaluations but did not see additional observations beyond October.
3	Student Achievement	**Partially Met**	3.b. No evidence to show the school day has been increased. It was explained that due to transportation, the day could not be extended for students but planning for next school year is in the works. 3c. No documentation of special education scores was available.
4	Rigorous Curriculum	**Partially Met**	4.b. While we reviewed the schedule of extended day meetings for teachers, there was no evidence gauging the impact. 4d. A list of afterschool programs was provided and a sign-in sheet from one afterschool program, but there was no documentation of student progress or SANE for other afterschool programs. 4.i. There is no SES program at the school.
5	Instructional Program	**Partially Met**	5.a. No SANE documentation was provided for Summer training on teacher competencies. 5.c. No SANE on PD in explicit instruction and writing usage, and no explanation of how teachers use benchmarks to address deficiencies and how teachers disseminated benchmark score to students. 5.e. No samples of CORE fidelity assessments were provided. 5.f. Evidence of the rapid response units were provided but no evidence of a pacing guide for that intervention. 5.g. No SANE PD to support PD calendar. 5.j. No evidence of computer lab schedule. 5.k. Wireless carts were not provided because it was decided to purchase a computer lab instead. There were no programmatic amendments for this change. 5.l. No evidence was provided that Global Partnerships was researching e-learning software for accelerated learning for overage students. 5.m. Documentation on training teachers and monitoring data analysis was provided but the following were missing: • No SANE from common planning periods. • No samples of monitoring • No samples of lesson plans that reflect data analysis.

TABLE 10: Garrison Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Barbara Scherr, Portia Bates, John McGinnis, Pete Singleton			Monitoring Dates: Feb. 22-23, 2011
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
6	Assessments	**Partially Met**	6.b. No evidence of revised schedule that shows flexible grouping for across grade level teams. 6.e. BCPSS Data Links System was addressed but no evidence of GPS Performance Dashboards and Benchmark Data. 6.g. No SANE from achievement summits. No accountability matrix

7	School Climate & Culture	**Partially Met**	7.a. BCPSS is developing for district so there was no evidence of climate survey or student satisfaction survey.
			 7.c-d. No evidence of follow-up or intervention information for students identified by SST.
			 7.f. No SANE from cultural transformation PD
			     No examples of student support protocols
			     No SANE from parent and student meetings around Code of Conduct
			     No SANE from community meetings

8	Student, Family, Community Support	**Partially Met**	8.a. No SANE from December 12th meeting on family engagement.
			 8.e. School does not have a PTA
			     No evidence from parents (parent input) on communication
			     strategies for parents (collaboration with parents)
			 *8.h. No evidence for the Board of Friends or PTA
			 (It was explained that the school does not have a PTO and was unaware of Board of Friends)
			 8.i. No evidence of training materials for students participating in Roland Park and Boys Latin Partnership.
			 8.j. No evidence of GPS assisting with identifying community advocates to help spread the word about changes at Garrison other than from spring 2010.

9	Professional Development	**Partially Met**	9.b. Missing evidence included: • No SANE on PD in explicit instruction and writing usage • SANE from grade level meetings • Explanations of how teachers use benchmarks to address deficiencies and how teachers disseminated benchmark scores to students. 9.c. No samples of fidelity assessments were provided No rapid response units or pacing guides 9.d. No SANE documents of PD provided by GPS staff or Garrison staff developer. 9.f. No SANE from SIP review
10	Organizational Structure and Resources	**Partially Met**	Missing evidence includes: • No documentation of improved behavior and academic results for 6th graders.
11	Comprehensive and Effective Planning	**Not Met**	Missing evidence includes: • No SANE for SIT meetings • No minutes from quarterly review meetings

TABLE 10: Garrison Middle School			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE SIG Monitoring Team: Barbara Scherr, Portia Bates, John McGinnis, Pete Singleton			**Monitoring Dates: Feb. 22-23, 2011**
Overall Level of Implementation: Partially Met			
Comp. #	Description	Level of Implementation	Insufficient Evidence by Component and Action Item
			• Not clear how operator will measure effectiveness of their efforts.
12	Effective Leadership	**Partially Met**	• There was no evidence of continuous monitoring of progress against the standards.

TABLE 11: Section 5: SIG Consolidated Budget			LEA: Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
SIG 1003(g) ARRA		**SIG 1003(g) Title I, Part A**	
Total Allocation	$7,650,111	Total Allocation	$1,999,343
Amount Spent	$1,828,995	Amount Spent	$164,309
Percent Spent	24%	Percent Spent	8%
Amount Encumbered	$1,588,498	Amount Encumbered	$755,635
Spend Down Data as of :	February 28, 2011	Spend Down Data as of :	February 28, 2011

TABLE 12: Section 5: SIG LEA Budget			**LEA:** Baltimore City Public Schools
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG LEA Allocation: $1,999,343	**LEA Budget Spent:** $ 164,309	**Percent of LEA Budget Spent:** 8%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28, 2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $230,000	**Budgeted:** $ 1,227,460	**Budgeted:** $ 59,470.91	**Budgeted:** Travel: $ 6,525
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $ 754,760	**Encumbered:** $ 875	**Encumbered:** Travel: 0
Spent (amount): $ 65,154 **Spent (%):** 28%	**Spent (amount):** $ 30,166 **Spent (%):** 1%	**Spent (amount):** $ 5,071 **Spent (%):** 1%	**Spent (amount):** $72.49 **Spent (%):** 0

1. **How much of the LEA SIG 1003(g) ARRA budget, based on your system's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and percent)?**
   The LEA does not have funds allocated in the ARRA budget.

2. **How much of the LEA SIG 1003(g) Title I Part A, budget has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that indicated that the LEA has spent $164,309. This amount is 8% of the LEA SIG budget. An additional amount of $755,635 has been encumbered.

3. **Is the LEA spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that the LEA spending is mostly consistent the budget timeline even though the percentage of spending is low. An increase in the spending percentage will be evident with the payout of encumbered funds and additional purchases from the amendment.

4. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the LEA budget?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that indicated that salary of one of their funded positions started late and was disrupted with a personnel change. One vendor providing contractual services started late.

5. **Has a budget amendment been submitted? If yes, what budget changes were requested for the LEA?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment was completed in March 2011. This amendment created two new positions a business manager and Turnaround Specialist. Funds were also realigned to purchase equipment for turnaround staff.

6. **How often are LEA expenditures monitored? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. The reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, and Title I Coordinator. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If recipients have questions or concerns they contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office.

TABLE 13:   Section 5:   SIG School Budget for Augusta Fells Savage High School, Tier II

MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk   **Monitoring Date: March 18, 2011**

Level of Implementation: NOT MET

Total SIG Allocation: $ 1,288,481	School Budget Spent: $ 297,529	Percent of School Budget Spent: 23%	Spend Down Data as of: February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 784,576	**Budgeted:** $ 160,000	**Budgeted:** $ 179,342	**Budgeted:** N/A
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $ 71,124	**Encumbered:** $ 145,427	**Encumbered:** N/A
Spent (amount): $ 211,377 **Spent (%):** 27%	**Spent (amount):** $ 14,191 **Spent (%):** 12%	**Spent (amount):** $ 17,714 **Spent (%):** 13%	**Spent (amount):** N/A **Spent (%):** N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Augusta Fells Savage has spent $ 297,529. This amount is 23% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $ 216,551 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that school spending is consistent with the plan but is slow. Contractual services and materials have substantial funds encumbered which should evidentially increase the amount spent.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that at Augusta Fells Savage the extended day started on time but teacher payment did not occur until December. Purchase of art supplies for the school was delayed.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in January and March 2011. Budget changes for Augusta Fells Savage included removing funds from several categories into materials to purchase Smart Boards.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 14:	Section 5:	SIG School Budget for Booker T. Washington Middle School, Tier I	
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $ 928,355	**School Budget Spent:** $ 198,958	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 21%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 603,243	Budgeted: $ 129,000	Budgeted: $ 156,318	Budgeted: N/A
Encumbered: 0	Encumbered: 0	Encumbered: $ 33,566	Encumbered: N/A
Spent (amount): $ 129,453 Spent (%): 32%	Spent (amount): $ 45,000 Spent (%): 14%	Spent (amount): $ 5,350 Spent (%): 3%	Spent (amount): N/A Spent (%): N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Booker T. Washington has spent $ 198,958. This amount is 21% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $33,566 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that school spending is consistent with the plan but is slow. Booker T. Washington has a new principal from out of state and the principal had difficulty navigating the system to make purchases. The Turnaround Office is providing support to assist the principal with the spending.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that the leadership position (assistant principal) at Booker T. Washington could not be filled so it was removed from the plan. There was a problem with staffing extended day and contracted employees were used to provide this service to students. The extended day activities started on time but teacher payment did not start until December.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in January and March 2011. Budget changes for Booker T. Washington included moving funds for the community support position from salaries to contracted services. Booker T. Washington allocated additional funds to the materials category to increase technology purchases.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 15: Section 5: SIG School Budget for Calverton Elem/Middle School, Tier I			
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk		**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011	
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $1,777,590	**School Budget Spent:** $452,342	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 25%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 388,064	**Budgeted:** $ 1,000,000	**Budgeted:** $ 300,000	**Budgeted:** N/A
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $161,979	**Encumbered:** $ 203,980	**Encumbered:** N/A
Spent (amount): $ 213,242 **Spent (%):** 55%	**Spent (amount):** $ 194,700 **Spent (%):** 18%	**Spent (amount):** $ 3,502 **Spent (%):** 1%	**Spent (amount):** N/A **Spent (%):** N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Calverton has spent $452,342. This amount is 25% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $365,959 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that school spending is consistent with the budget timeline with the exception of the EMO contract.. The Turnaround Director sends out a "Monthly Blast". Since January, a note has been included reminding EMOs to submit invoices monthly. During EMO meetings with the Turnaround Director this has been a major issue of discussion. Substantial expenditures for supplies and materials have been encumbered but the amount spent is low.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that the EMO at Calverton has been very slow in submitting invoices. To date, no invoices have been submitted therefore the percentage spent in contractual services is very low.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in March 2011. Budget changes for Calverton included moving $75,000 from salaries to supplies and materials to purchase additional classroom computers.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 16: Section 5: SIG School Budget for Commodore John Rodgers Elem/Middle School, Tier II			
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $1,027,065	**School Budget Spent:** $305,954	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 30%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 217,507	Budgeted: $ 550,000	Budgeted: $ 123,000	Budgeted: N/A
Encumbered: 0	Encumbered: $104,116	Encumbered: $ 30,000	Encumbered: N/A
Spent (amount): $ 137,209 Spent (%): 63%	Spent (amount): $ 61,254 Spent (%): 19%	Spent (amount): $ 84,600 Spent (%): 68%	Spent (amount): N/A Spent (%): N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Commodore John Rodgers has spent $305,954. This amount is 30% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $134,116 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that all school spending is consistent with the budget timeline with the exception of the Education Management Organization (EMO) contract. The Turnaround Office has been working with the EMO to get invoices submitted correctly and in a timely manner.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that planned activities are on target but invoices submitted by the EMO have regularly been returned for revisions and more specifics. This action has delayed payment and is reflected in the low percentage spent in this category.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in January 2011. Budget changes for Commodore John Rodgers included $250,000 taken from contractual services and moved to salaries/ stipends   for teachers.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 17: Section 5: SIG School Budget for William C. March Middle School, Tier I			
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk		**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011	
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $ 956,457	**School Budget Spent:** $ 254,881	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 27%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 220,657	**Budgeted:** $ 580,000	**Budgeted:** $ 109,000	**Budgeted:** N/A
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $ 240,190	**Encumbered:** $ 71,017	**Encumbered:** N/A
Spent (amount): $ 164,919 **Spent (%):** 53%	**Spent (amount):** $ 19,250 **Spent (%):** 4%	**Spent (amount):** $ 17,870 **Spent (%):** 16%	**Spent (amount):** N/A **Spent (%):** N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed William C. March has spent $ 254,881. This amount is 27% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $311,207 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that the grant activities including spending were affected when the principal had to be changed. New leadership and assistance from the Turnaround Office should assist the school to get spending on track.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that at William C. March invoices submitted by the Education Management Organization (EMO) have regularly been returned for revisions and more specifics. This action has delayed payment and is reflected in the large encumbered amount and low percentage spent in this category.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in January and March 2011. Budget changes for William March included increasing the amount allocated for the John Hopkins Talent Development contract, adding two new lab positions, hiring teachers for elective classes (SPAR teachers) and hiring hall monitors.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 18:	Section 5:	SIG School Budget for Baltimore IT Academy Middle School, Tier I	
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $ 465,091	**School Budget Spent:** $ 71,857	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 15%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 242,287	**Budgeted:** $ 174,350	**Budgeted:** 0	**Budgeted:** N/A
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $ 128,853	**Encumbered:** 0	**Encumbered:** N/A
Spent (amount): $ 34,871 **Spent (%):** 14%	**Spent (amount):** $ 21,095 **Spent (%):** 12%	**Spent (amount):** 0 **Spent (%):** 0	**Spent (amount):** N/A **Spent (%):** N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Baltimore IT has spent $ 71,857. This amount is 15% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $ 128,853 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that the grant activities including spending were affected when the principal had to be changed. Resolving staffing issues was also a barrier to activities occurring. Baltimore IT Academy has been put on BCPSS "rapid response protocol". This action should assist the school in getting the activities and spending moving forward.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that stipends were not originally budgeted for extending learning and this activity does not have a large number of students; both had an impact on budget. Additionally, professional development has not occurred as planned.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in March 2011. Budget changes for Baltimore IT included moving a substantial amount of funds into materials to purchase technology.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.

TABLE 19:	Section 5:	SIG School Budget for Garrison Middle School, Tier I	
MSDE Reviewers: Geri Taylor Lawrence, Jim Newkirk			**Monitoring Date:** March 18, 2011
Level of Implementation: NOT MET			
Total SIG Allocation: $1,207,071	**School Budget Spent:** $247,474	**Percent of School Budget Spent:** 21%	**Spend Down Data as of:** February 28,2011
Salaries & Wages	**Contractual Services**	**Supplies & Materials**	**Other**
Budgeted: $ 257,827	**Budgeted:** $ 700,000	**Budgeted:** $ 199,600	**Budgeted:** N/A
Encumbered: 0	**Encumbered:** $398,247	**Encumbered:** 0	**Encumbered:** N/A
Spent (amount): $ 46,065 **Spent (%):** 18%	**Spent (amount):** $ 151,753 **Spent (%):** 22%	**Spent (amount):** $ 45,165 **Spent (%):** 23%	**Spent (amount):** N/A **Spent (%):** N/A

1. **How much of the school budget, based on the LEA's approved application, has been expended to date (amount and %)?**
   BCPSS provided documentation that showed Garrison has spent $247,474. This amount is 21% of their approved SIG budget. An additional amount of $398,247 has been encumbered.

2. **Is school spending consistent with budget timeline? If not, what steps are being taken to expend the funds as planned?**
   BCPSS indicated that school spending is consistent with the plan but is slow. The actions outlined in questions three and four should assist with the spending efforts at Garrison.

3. **What action steps or planned activities have not taken place that would impact the budget?**
   BCPSS indicated that planned activities are on target but invoices submitted by the EMO have regularly been returned for revisions and more specifics. This action has delayed payment and is reflected in the large encumbered amount and low percentage spent in this category. Reallocating funds from the leadership position will assist Garrison's spending in the salaries category.

4. **Has a budget amendment been submitted?   If yes, what budget changes were requested for this school?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that a budget amendment had been submitted in March 2011. Budget changes for Garrison included moving funds from several categories to cover cost for extended day and increase the amount allocated for the EMO. Funds were removed that had been allocated for a leadership position and Garrison proposes to hire a staff member to assist in implementing the ATS Model as one response to climate needs at Garrison.

5. **How often are school expenditures monitored by the LEA? Who monitors?**
   BCPSS provided evidence that the Grants Administration Office provides monthly reports. These reports are disseminated to Turnaround Office staff, school principal, Title I Coordinator and EMO Operator if applicable. The reports are color coded and categories that have spending concerns are denoted in red. If the school principal has questions or concerns, they are addressed by the Turnaround Office business manager. Other recipients contact designed staff in the Grants Administration Office regarding questions.