

## Receivership Schools ONLY

### Quarterly Report #1: *July 1, 2017 to October 13, 2017*

School Name	School BEDS Code	District	Lead Partner or EPO	Hyperlink to where this report will be posted on the district website:				
Nathaniel Rochester School No. 3	2616000100003	Rochester City School District		Check which plan below applies:				
				SIG			SCEP	
				Cohort 4.2				
				Model: Transformation				
Superintendent/EPO	School Principal	Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight		Grade Configuration	% ELL	% SWD	Total Enrollment	
Barbara Deane-Williams	Rodney Moore	Beth Mascitti-Miller, School Chief Michele Alberti-White, Executive Director of School Innovation Brennen Colwell, School Ambassador, OSI		K - 8	9% *Internal SPA	16.6% *Internal SPA	526 *Internal SPA	
	Appointment Date: August 2013							

#### **Executive Summary**

Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this quarter in terms of implementing key strategies, engaging the community, enacting Receivership, and assessing Level 1 and Level 2 indicator data. The summary should be written in terms easily understood by the community-at-large. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public, and limit the summary to *no more than 500 words*.

NRCS School No. 3 remains focused on its transformation strategies to provide students with equitable opportunities for an engaging inquiry-based STEM education, using the expanded day to provide social-emotional supports and targeted academic interventions. The foundational structures have been developed and this year in particular has seen NRCS leading the way in STEM experiences and strengthening its ability to respond to student needs in an increasingly strategic manner. Specifically, strides have been made relative to these key strategies:



1. STEM-NRCS has continued to expand the amount and quality of STEM experiences for students, and this quarter has made strides in expanding the middle school programming with a career shadowing component to link students to industry partners.
2. Academic Interventions - NRCS has widened what was an original focus on reading/ELA, to include Math and Science. This shift utilizes innovative ways of increasing the intervention support for students, particularly in grades 3-8, using additional intervention specialists, item analysis and multiple sources of assessment data. The data that these practices generate help to inform student groupings and strategize placement/responsibility of instructional coaches to provide students more frequent and targeted interventions in smaller groups, in all subjects as needed. The school has also utilized an electronic platform for walkthrough observation to further align the instructional program with interventions.
3. Improvement of School Climate - NRCS is committed to a system that responds to students' social-emotional needs rather than a punitive system. Students are provided supports such as 3 crisis interventionists and two Reconnect Rooms. This is the second year of using a school-wide system to track and coordinate social-emotional supports, which allowed problem-solving and adjustment. Additionally, NRCS has focused on improving the climate of the Middle School component of the building, creating health spirited competition between grades 7 and 8 and also creating a Middle School space by giving students a separate entrance and exit (outside of the elementary students) and by creating "house" areas for each grade
4. Implementation of the Community Schools Model

**Attention** – This document is intended to be completed by the School Receiver and/or its designee and submitted electronically to [OISR@NYSED.gov](mailto:OISR@NYSED.gov). It is a self-assessment of the implementation and outcomes of key strategies related to Receivership, and as such, should not be considered a formal evaluation on the part of the New York State Education Department. This document also serves as the Progress Review Report for Receivership schools receiving Persistently Struggling School (PSSG), School Improvement Grant (SIG), and Community School Grant (CSG) funds. Additionally, this document serves as the quarterly reporting instrument for Receivership schools with School Comprehensive Education Plans (SCEP). The Quarterly Report, in its entirety, must be posted on the district web-site.



**Directions for Parts I and II** - District and school staff should respond to the sections of this document by both analyzing and summarizing the key strategies of the first quarter in light of their realized level of implementation and their impact on student learning outcomes. The District should ensure the key strategies address the needs of all learners, particularly the needs of subgroups of students and those at risk for not meeting the challenging State academic standards. District and school staff should consider the impact of proposed key strategies on student learning, as well as the long-term sustainability and connectivity of those key strategies to diagnostic review feedback.

**Part I – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators (Level 1)**

Identify Indicator # and Name	Baseline	2017-18 Progress Target	Status (R/Y/G)	Based on the current implementation status, does the school expect to meet the 2017-18 progress target for this indicator? For each Level 1 indicator, please answer yes or no below.	What are the SCEP/SIG goals and or key strategies that have supported progress made in meeting this indicator? Describe adjustments made to key strategies since the approval of the 17-18 continuation plan and a rationale as to why these adjustments were made.	List the formative data points being used to assess progress towards meeting the target for this indicator?	Based upon those formative data points, provide quantitative and/or qualitative statement(s) that demonstrate impact towards meeting the target.
1. Priority School Make Yearly Progress				The school is uncertain as to whether or not it will make the progress target for this indicator for the 2017-18 school year.	Please see discussions below, as this is a cumulative measure of school improvement.	Please see discussions below, as this is a cumulative measure of school improvement.	Please see discussions below, as this is a cumulative measure of school improvement.
5. School Safety	8	20% reduction in serious incidents		No – with the current number of serious incidents, the school does not think they will meet the progress target for the 2017-18 school year. Although, the school is on pace to exceed the target they are making efforts to mitigate this from happening. Please see discussions in the fourth column.	The school has remained focused on its strategies of promoting a positive climate and designing systems to respond to behavior and social-emotional needs. Key areas of work have included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better utilization of ISS and Reconnect Room in an effort to decrease the use of out of school suspension.</li> <li>• Continued Town Hall meetings with students and staff to focus</li> </ul>	VADIR reporting  SPA, internal data warehouse  School tracking tool for social-emotional supports	There has <b>been 1 serious incident to date, which puts us on pace to either equal or slightly exceed the target, thereby possibly not making this metric.</b>  However, there is improvement in the climate. To date, 20 students have been suspended 21 times (9 Out of school suspensions and 12



					<p>on conveying academic and behavioral expectations to students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued 1:1 meetings with counselor and students that have multiple disciplinary incident to set goals and monitor progress.</li> <li>Allocated resources towards support for middle school. We have added an additional crisis interventionist and also reorganized the entrance and dismissal of our middle school students.</li> <li>The master schedule has changed, moving from 45 minute periods to 90 minute blocks (A/C, B/D) which has lessened the number of transitions in the building creating a calmer and more orderly environment.</li> </ul>		<p>In School suspensions) compared to 24 students have been suspended 30 times at this time last year.</p> <p>NRCS has increased the number of social-emotional supports for students, including proactive social-emotional curriculum and play therapy in primary grades, two “Reconnect Rooms” and a variety of crisis intervention rooms. Center for Youth staff collaborate with school supports to create crisis intervention plans, and new systems are being put in place to ensure communication with teachers as well. The school has developed and is using a google form to track all student supports provided, which administrators can review to look for trends, and to assess the effectiveness of interventions.</p>
9. 3 - 8 ELA All Students Level 2 & Above	20%	6% Increase (26%)		Yes	<p>NRCS has incorporated 4 reading /literacy specialists focused in grades K-2, 3-4, 5-6 and 7-8.</p> <p>K-2 intervention has focused on synthetic phonics in order to further</p>	<p>NWEA Fall Results (347 students)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 - 254 students (73%)</li> <li>Level 2 - 74 students (21%)</li> </ul>	<p>Based on the Fall NWEA data and the NYS Linking Study a total of 93 students (Grades 3-8) are projected to score a level 2 or above on the 2017 NYS ELA test. Our metric indicates that we need 87 students</p>



				<p>support the instruction in the classroom.</p> <p>Professional development has started in Writer’s workshop in grades K-5</p> <p>NRCS Coaches and classroom teachers are providing additional ELA support during pull out sessions throughout the day</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level 3 - 18 students (5%)</li> <li>● Level 4 - 1 students (1%)</li> <li>● <b>Level 2 and above (27%)</b></li> </ul> <p>Percentage of All Students Expected to be Proficient (level 3 or 4) on NYS Tests (Reading)</p>	<p>(Grades 3-8) to score Level 2 and above. Our data projections indicate that we will just meet this metric.</p>
15. 3 - 8 Math All Students Level 2 and Above	25%	6% Increase (31%)		<p>Yes</p> <p>NRCS has focused on and intensified their efforts on supporting this metric and providing mathematics interventions. These supports include identifying students to receive additional Math Intervention Grades 3-8 by identifying students that fell into the “high” range of levels 1, 2 and 3 on the previous year's NYS Math Assessment and creating small group intervention opportunities for them through pull outs in grades 3-6 and push ins and scheduled classes for grades 7 and 8. We have enhanced core instruction with the addition of ZEARN math in grades K-6 as well .</p> <p>Additionally, NRCS has:</p>	<p>NWEA Fall Results (369 students)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level 1 - 255 students (69%)</li> <li>● Level 2 - 92 students (25%)</li> <li>● Level 3 - 19 students (5%)</li> <li>● Level 4 - 3 students (1%)</li> <li>● <b>Level 2 and above (31%)</b></li> </ul>	<p>Based on the Fall NWEA data and the NYS Linking Study a total of 114 students (Grades 3-8) are projected to score a level 2 or above on the 2017 NYS Math test. Our metric indicates that we need 114 students (Grades 3-8) to score Level 2 and above. Our data projections indicate that we will just meet this metric.</p>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased the allocation of math-focused instructional coaching and utilizes outside partners (Americorps and Third Presbyterian Church) to create scheduled intervention and tutoring opportunities for all students</li><li>• Adjusting the job responsibilities of all “coaches “in the building. They will now be classified as intervention support teachers and spend at least 50% of their professional time with students.</li><li>• Added an additional Math teacher to the middle school to guarantee that tier 2 and tier 3 intervention can be accounted for in the master schedule</li><li>• I-Ready will be provided to all 7th and 8th grade students as an additional math support (built in the schedule)</li><li>• Moved from 1 section of Algebra to 3 sections of Algebra including a section of 7th grade students. Replicating last year's Algebra Regents pass rate of 90% (19 of 21 students) will have a</li></ul>	<b>Percentage of All Students Expected to be Proficient (level 3 or 4) on NYS Tests (Mathematics)</b>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--



					significant impact on our math results		
33. 3 - 8 ELA All Students MGP (Newly Identified 2016-17 Level 1 Indicators based on 2015-16 Results)	48.6	2% increase OR 50%		Yes	<p>NRCS has incorporated 4 reading /literacy specialists focused in grades K-2, 3-4, 5-6 and 7-8.</p> <p>K-2 intervention has focused on synthetic phonics in order to further support the instruction in the classroom.</p> <p>Professional development has started in Writer’s workshop in grades K-5</p> <p>NRCS Coaches and classroom teachers are providing additional ELA support during pull out sessions throughout the day</p>	<p>All Students - Mean Gap to Norm by Grade (ELA)</p>	This is an annual State -provided measure, relative to other students in the State. Hence, projections are not available. The decrease if students in Level 1 (NWEA) from the same point last school year suggest that we will meet this metric
39. 3 - 8 Math All Students MGP (Newly Identified 2016-17 Level 1 Indicators based on 2015-16 Results)	48%	2% Increase OR 50%		Yes	<p>NRCS has focused on and intensified their efforts on supporting this metric and providing mathematics interventions. These supports include identifying students to receive additional Math Intervention Grades 3-8 by identifying students that fell into the “high” range of levels 1, 2 and 3 on the previous year's NYS Math Assessment and creating small group intervention opportunities for them through pull outs in grades 3-6 and push ins and scheduled classes for</p>	<p>All Students - Mean Gap to Norm by Grade (Mathematics)</p>	This is an annual State -provided measure, relative to other students in the State. Hence, projections are not available. The decrease if students in Level 1 (NWEA) from the same point last school year suggest that we will meet this metric



				<p>grades 7 and 8. We have enhanced core instruction with the addition of ZEARN math in grades K-6 as well.</p> <p>Additionally, NRCS has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Increased the allocation of math-focused instructional coaching and utilizes outside partners (Americorps and Third Presbyterian Church) to create scheduled intervention and tutoring opportunities for all students</li><li>● Adjusting the job responsibilities of all “coaches “in the building. They will now be classified as intervention support teachers and spend at least 50% of their professional time with students.</li><li>● Added an additional Math teacher to the middle school to guarantee that tier 2 and tier 3 intervention can be accounted for in the master schedule</li><li>● I-Ready will be provided to all 7th and 8th grade students as an additional math support (built in the schedule)</li><li>● Moved from 1 section of Algebra to 3 sections of Algebra including a section of</li></ul>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--





					<p>7th grade students. Replicating last year's Algebra Regents pass rate of 90% (19 of 21 students) will have a significant impact on our math results</p>		
85. Grades 4 and 8 Science All Students Level 3 and Above	42%	6% Increase 48%		Unsure	<p>Students in grade 4 are meeting in small intervention groups outside of Core Science instruction to focus on performance and content review of the 4th grade science curriculum.</p> <p>Students in grade 8 have a push in model of intervention with 2 highly qualified science teachers. Additionally, there are 2 sections of Living Environment this year which will hopefully have a positive impact on science 8 achievement.</p> <p>Emphasis has been on using hands-on activities to engage students and support application of conceptual understanding of science based tasks.</p> <p>NRCS will be working with Sfyf to create spiraled curriculum and benchmark assessments that will be used to drive instructional decisions</p>	<p>Newly created science benchmark assessments through Syfr (TBD)</p> <p>Released Science 4 and 8 NYS assessments</p> <p>Released Living Environment regents assessments</p>	<p>NRCS needs 77 total students from grades 4 and 8 to score a level 3 on either the science 4 or 8 NYS science assessment or a passing Living Environment science regents score. Preliminary information from pre-assessment data shows that meeting the science benchmark will be a challenge again this year.</p>



<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	<b>Red</b>	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.
--------------	--	---------------	---	------------	---

**Part II – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators (Level 2)**

Identify Indicator # and Name	Baseline	2017-18 Progress Target	Status (R/Y/G)	Based on the current implementation status, does the school expect to meet the 2017-18 progress target for this indicator? For each Level 2 indicator, please answer yes or no below.	What are the SCEP/SIG goals and or key strategies which have supported progress made in meeting this indicator? Describe adjustments made to key strategies since the approval of the 17-18 continuation plan and a rationale as to why these adjustments were made.	List the formative data points being used to assess progress towards meeting the target for this indicator?	Based upon those formative data points, provide quantitative and/or qualitative statement(s) which demonstrate impact towards meeting the target.
14. 3 - 8 ELA ED Students Level 2 and Above	20%	6% Increase OR 26%		Yes	<p>NRCS has incorporated 4 reading /literacy specialists focused in grades K-2, 3-4, 5-6 and 7-8.</p> <p>K-2 intervention has focused on synthetic phonics in order to further support the instruction in the classroom.</p> <p>Professional development has started</p>	<p>NWEA Fall Results (347 students)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level 1 - 254 students (73%)</li> <li>● Level 2 - 74 students (21%)</li> <li>● Level 3 - 18 students (5%)</li> <li>● Level 4 - 1 students (1%)</li> <li>● <b>Level 2 and above (27%)</b></li> </ul>	Current data suggest that the “all students” target will meet the progress target, but at this time we cannot identify what the gap between ED and non ED will be because paperwork from families that determines identification has not been completely turned in. During the 2017-2018, this metric was



					in Writer’s workshop in grades K-5  NRCS Coaches and classroom teachers are providing additional ELA support during pull out sessions throughout the day		suppressed due to the gap being less than 30 students																								
17. 3 - 8 Math Black Students Level 2 and Above	25%	6% Increase OR 31%		Yes	<p>NRCS has focused on and intensified their efforts on supporting this metric and providing mathematics interventions. These supports include identifying students to receive additional Math Intervention Grades 3-8 by identifying students that fell into the “high” range of levels 1, 2 and 3 on the previous year's NYS Math Assessment and creating small group intervention opportunities for them through pull outs in grades 3-6 and push ins and scheduled classes for grades 7 and 8. We have enhanced core instruction with the addition of ZEARN math in grades K-6 as well.</p> <p>Additionally, NRCS has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased the allocation of math-focused instructional coaching and utilizes outside partners (Americorps and Third Presbyterian Church) to create scheduled intervention and tutoring opportunities for all students</li> <li>Adjusting the job responsibilities</li> </ul>	<p>NWEA Fall Results (289 students)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 - 196 students (68%)</li> <li>Level 2 - 77 students (27%)</li> <li>Level 3 - 14 students (5%)</li> <li>Level 4 - 2 students (&gt;1%)</li> <li><b>Level 2 and above (32%)</b></li> </ul> <table border="1"> <caption>Percentage of Black Students Expected to be Proficient (level 3 or 4) on NYS Tests (Mathematics)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade Level</th> <th>Fall (%)</th> <th>RCSD avg (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3 (49,0)</td> <td>14.3</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 (40,0)</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 (37,0)</td> <td>5.4</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 (31,0)</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 (64,0)</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 (68,0)</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (289,0)</td> <td>5.9</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Key: ■ fall      * RCSD avg</p> <p><b>Percentage of Black Students Expected to be Proficient (level 3 or 4) on NYS Tests (Mathematics)</b></p>	Grade Level	Fall (%)	RCSD avg (%)	3 (49,0)	14.3	*	4 (40,0)	2.5	*	5 (37,0)	5.4	*	6 (31,0)	3.2	*	7 (64,0)	6.2	*	8 (68,0)	2.9	*	Total (289,0)	5.9		<p>Based on the Fall NWEA data and the NYS Linking Study a total of 114 students (Grades 3-8) are projected to score a level 2 or above on the 2017 NYS Math test. Our metric indicates that we need 114 students (Grades 3-8) to score Level 2 and above. Our data projections indicate that we will just meet this metric.</p>
Grade Level	Fall (%)	RCSD avg (%)																													
3 (49,0)	14.3	*																													
4 (40,0)	2.5	*																													
5 (37,0)	5.4	*																													
6 (31,0)	3.2	*																													
7 (64,0)	6.2	*																													
8 (68,0)	2.9	*																													
Total (289,0)	5.9																														



					<p>of all “coaches “ in the building. They will now be classified as intervention support teachers and spend at least 50% of their professional time with students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added an additional Math teacher to the middle school to guarantee that tier 2 and tier 3 intervention can be accounted for in the master schedule</li> <li>• I-Ready will be provided to all 7th and 8th grade students as an additional math support (built in the schedule)</li> <li>• Moved from 1 section of Algebra 1 to 3 sections of Algebra 1 including a section of 7th grade students. Replicating last year's Algebra Regents pass rate of 90% (19 of 21 students) will have a significant impact on our math results</li> </ul>		
49. 3 - 8 ELA ED Level 2 and Above Gap with non-ED Students	16%	6% decrease OR 22%		Yes	Current data suggest that the “all students” target will meet the progress target, but there may be more than a 10% gap between ED and non ED students. There has been a push to better identify ED students prior to the calculation of 2017-2018 results by monitoring the number of students that have not turned in the appropriate	See ELA information above	Based on results from last year and new monitoring structures that are in place, NRCS is on pace to meet this metric or the metric may be suppressed



					paperwork that determines ED designation. Additionally, this metric may be suppressed if the number of students that make up the “gap” is less than 30. This was the case in the 2016-2017 school year		
94. Providing 200 Hours of Extended Day Learning Time (ELT)	NA	TBD		Yes		District progress monitoring through the Expanded Learning Time initiative	NRCS has a 7 ½ hour school day from 9am – 4:30pm, serving all students K-8 through these extended hours. The program builds in time for intervention, social-emotional time, and enrichments which offer a mix of arts, STEM and social-emotional opportunities. It also allows time for facilitated teacher collaboration.
98. Chronic Absenteeism	NA	TBD		Yes	Current data suggest there will be a reduction in Chronic Absenteeism for the 2017-2018 school year. Even though we are waiting on the baseline determination, we have seen reductions in this metric in each of the last 2 years. Nathaniel Rochester Community School (NRCS) #3 greatly improved its rates of chronic Absenteeism in the past two years. With 27.7%of students chronically absent, it was deemed a target school during the 2016-2017 academic year. By the end of last year, rates improved	SPA data  Weekly Attendance Team meeting data	Based on the history of chronic absenteeism reduction, increase in daily attendance rates and new organizational structures in place to monitor and address issues of attendance (featured in a district wide publication), we project that we will meet this metric.



				by almost 7%, now with 20.8%of its students chronically absent.		
<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .		<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	<b>Red</b>	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.

**Part III – Additional Key Strategies – (As applicable)**

<u>Key Strategies</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not repeat strategies described in Parts I and II.</li> <li>If the school has selected the SIG 6 or SIG 7 Innovation Framework model, include an analysis of the evidence of the impact of the required lead partner.</li> <li>Every school must discuss the use of technology in the classroom to deliver instruction.</li> </ul>			
List the Key Strategy from your approved intervention plan (SIG or SCEP).	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out	
1. Use of technology in the classroom to deliver instruction	G	School 3 recently received 7 additional Chromebook Carts. Teachers are using the technology in the classrooms to supplement instruction with programs such as Zearn Math (as a treatment school), iReady, Lexia and Compass Odyssey. They are also using Google Apps for Education and other online tools, including Google Classroom, to engage students, enhance learning and differentiate instruction.	
2. EPO (lead partner) for SIG 6 and SIG 7 ONLY		N/A	



3.			
4.			
5.			
<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.
			<b>Red</b> Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.

**Part IV – Community Engagement Team and Receivership Powers**

**Community Engagement Team (CET)**

Describe the type, nature, frequency and outcomes of meetings conducted this quarter by the CET. Describe the same for sub-committees. Describe specific outcomes of the CET plan implementation; school support provided; and dissemination of information to whom and for what purpose. If the 17-18 CET plan and/or the 17-18 CET membership changed, please attach copies of those updated documents to this report.

Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out
Green	<p>The CET for 17-18 has new membership that gives a better representation of the community partners that work with the school. The team meets the 1st Wednesday of each month from 7:45am-8:45am. The CET will focus on finding additional resources to better serve the academic and social emotional needs of our students and also the implementation of the community schools model. Membership is comprised of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rodney Moore – Principal (Chair)</li> <li>Elyette Clyburn – Center For Youth</li> <li>Andrea Ingham – Teacher</li> <li>Kimberly Brown – Teacher</li> <li>Tina Rodger – Teacher</li> <li>Briana Bendlin – Teacher</li> <li>Jessica Perez – Teacher</li> <li>Whitney Andrecolich – Teacher</li> <li>Jacqueline Swink – Parent</li> <li>Nicole Stroughter – Parent</li> <li>Chad Thomas - Parent</li> </ul>



	<p>Jenny Thomas - Parent  Melenie Mroz – G2  Deb Bishop – Third Presbyterian Church  Tammi Pantone – Corn Hill Association  Ricky Harvey – Mt. Olivet Baptist Church</p>		
<p><b><i>Powers of the Receiver</i></b></p>			
<p>Describe the use of the School Receiver’s powers (pursuant to CR §100.19) during this reporting period. Discuss the goal of each power and its expected impact.</p>			
<p>Status (R/Y/G)</p>	<p>Analysis/Report Out</p>		
<p style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center;">Green</p>	<p>The Superintendent Receiver Authority continues to be utilized in multiple ways for the 17-18 school year:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Election to Work Agreements (EWA) continue to ensure that teachers at Receivership schools committed to the priorities of each school. Additionally, the EWA allowed Principals to involuntarily transfer teachers out of the school who were not aligned to the priorities of the school or hold teachers who were being recruited by other schools.</li> <li>2. Staffing continues to be a priority for all Receivership schools by the Department of Human Capital Initiatives. Flexible opportunities for hiring teachers and Receivership schools are given first access to available teachers.</li> <li>3. Student Placement procedures at the District level were reorganized for Receivership schools by allowing minimal new placements in the schools. All placements are reviewed by the School Chief before any decisions were made.</li> <li>4. The Chief of Superintendent’s Receivership Schools holds weekly team phone calls to focus on short-term needs and monthly professional learning/team meetings to focus on additional professional development opportunities and long range planning.</li> <li>5. Curricular and master scheduling flexibility was a priority for the Receivership schools allowing flexibility for the Receivership Principals to focus on their student needs that other comprehensive schools in the District were not allowed.</li> </ol>		
<p style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center;">Green</p>	<p style="background-color: #76b82a; color: white; text-align: center;">Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i>.</p>	<p style="background-color: #fff200; color: black; text-align: center;">Yellow</p> <p style="background-color: #fff200; color: black; text-align: center;">Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>	<p style="background-color: #ff0000; color: white; text-align: center;">Red</p> <p style="background-color: #ff0000; color: white; text-align: center;">Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>





**Part V – Community Schools Grant (CSG)**

*(This section needs to be completed by every Receivership school receiving CSG funds during the 8/1/17 – 6/30/18 budget period.)*

<u>Community Schools Grant (CSG)</u>	
As per CR §100.19, Receivership schools receiving CSG funds will submit quarterly written reports to the Commissioner containing specific information about the progress of the planning, implementation, and operations of the CSG and the requirements of the regulations.	
Required Activities	Provide updates to each activity with regard to its planning, implementation, or operations.
Community-Wide Needs Assessment (if one is being conducted in 17-18)	Schools entering this inaugural year of the community school strategy (3, 8, 41, Monroe, NE) will integrate the communication and understanding of the community school strategy into existing structures and events during the first part of the year. During the year as the schools build internal capacity to design and implement an appropriate needs and asset assessment process, the public forums and active surveying will occur.  CET – Parents, teachers, community partners, and community members serve on the schools’ CET, and teams convene at least quarterly – most monthly, to contribute to and review Quarterly Reports.
To ensure substantial parent, teacher, and community engagement at this school, provide specific details about these three areas for this reporting period:	Schools entering this inaugural year of the community school strategy (3, 8, 41, Monroe, NE) will integrate the communication and understanding of the community school strategy into existing structures and events during the first part of the year. During the year as the schools build internal capacity to design and implement an appropriate needs and asset assessment process, the public forums and active surveying will occur. See information above regarding School 3’s Community Engagement Team.
1. public meetings held with parents, teachers, and community members to provide information and solicit input (CR §100.19: held at least quarterly during the school year)	
2. written notices and communications provided to parents, teachers, other school personnel, and community members (emails, postings, translated into recipients’ native language)	The District centrally supports timely communication to all stakeholders, as it has during the past two years of Receivership communication, through the District’s Office of Communications. Two staff positions were recently added to the department - Assistant to the Superintendent for Communication and Community Outreach, and a Communications Assistant so support social media use at the district and schools. The nature of Community School strategy is local, and holds that relationships are central, requiring that the bulk of communication be as close to the school as possible. All communication is provided, minimally, in English and Spanish, with Arabic, Somali, and Nepali if required. There is a Spanish translator on staff in the District Communications Office.
3. parents, teachers, and community members’ access to Community School Site Coordinator and Steering Committee	Each school’s site coordinator serves (or will serve when identified) as part of the school leadership team, be a member of the School-based Planning Team, the CET, and other community/building roles as the principal assigns. Ongoing professional development is provided for site coordinators and leadership teams to deepen CS understanding, align their roles to their specific schools, and align their stakeholder communication skills.
Steering Committee (challenges, meetings held, accomplishments)	As implementation of the community schools framework at School 3 is in its infancy stages, at School 3 the CET currently serves as the steering committee for this work. See Part IV above.



Feeder School Services (specific services offered and impact)	N/A
Community School Site Coordinator (accomplishments and challenges)	School 3 has begun the hiring process for this position.
Programmatic Costs (accomplishments and challenges based on the approved activities on the Attachment C school plan)	The Community Schools Grant documents and FS-10 were submitted to NYSED and are under programmatic review. Preparations have been made so that both Central Office and each school is poised to initiate work the moment approval is given.
Capital Cost Project(s) (accomplishments and challenges based on the approved activities on the Attachment C school plan)	The Community Schools Grant documents and FS-10 were submitted to NYSED and are under programmatic review. Preparations have been made so that both Central Office and each school is poised to initiate work the moment approval is given.

<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	<b>Red</b>	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.
--------------	--	---------------	---	------------	---

**Part VI – Budget**

(This section should be completed by all schools funded by the Persistently Struggling Schools Grant (PSSG), the School Improvement Grant (SIG), and the Community Schools Grant (CSG). Add rows as needed.)

<u>Budget Analysis</u>		
Identify the grant.	Status(R/Y/G)	If expenditures from the approved 17-18 FS-10 are on target, describe their impact. If there are challenges describe the course correction to be put in place for Quarter 2.
PSSG:	n/a	
SIG		<b>Code 15:</b> Includes .5 FTE Intervention/Prevention Teachers will serve as a teacher leader for improving instructional quality. S/he will support students through the entire school day including expanded day programming and provide direct academic interventions to students. This also provides additional pay for teacher hourly to cover Expanded Learning Time which is an additional hour per day.



		<p><b>Code 40:</b> Includes funding to secure services for implementation of <i>Leader in Me</i> curriculum.</p> <p><b>Code 45:</b> Supplies and materials to support implementation of the <i>Leader in Me</i> curriculum.</p> <p><b>Code 80:</b> The school has requested to amend for District set-aside to be allocated to this Code to allow for purchase of EL curricular materials.</p>
CSG:		<p>Under NYSED review. Proposed expenditures, for this school specifically, include:</p> <p><b>Code 15</b> - Community Schools Site Coordinator, hourly pay for teachers to conduct training in CPI, TCIS and Restorative Practices, hourly pay for Social Worker to create community database.</p> <p><b>Code 16</b> - Civil service hourly pay to support ELT initiatives.</p> <p><b>Code 40</b> - Contracted services from Center for Youth and STARBridge.</p> <p><b>Code 45</b> -ELT supplies and flexible fund to support families in transition.</p> <p><b>Code 46</b> - Travel to Community Schools Conference.</p> <p><b>Code 30</b> - Updates to 3rd floor to create intervention spaces.</p>

Part VII: Best Practices (Optional)

<u>Best Practices</u>	
The New York State Education Department recognizes the importance of sharing best practices within schools and districts. Please take this opportunity to share one or more best practices currently being implemented in the school.. It is the intention of the Department to share these best practices with schools and districts in Receivership.	
List the best practice currently being implemented in the school.	Describe the significant improvements in student performance, instructional practice, student/family engagement, and/or school climate that the best practice has had. Discuss the analysis of data/evidence to determine the impact. Describe the possibility of replication in other schools.
2.	
3.	



Receivership Quarterly Report and Continuation Plan – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter  
 July 1, 2017-October 13, 2017  
 (As required under Section 211(f) of NYS Ed. Law)

List the best practice currently being implemented in the school.	Describe the significant improvements in student performance, instructional practice, student/family engagement, and/or school climate that the best practice has had. Discuss the analysis of data/evidence to determine the impact. Describe the possibility of replication in other schools.
1.	
2.	
3.	

Part VIII – Assurance and Attestation

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this quarterly report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge; and that the all requirements with regard to public hearings and the Community Engagement Teams, as per CR§ 100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print): Barbara Deane-Williams  
 Signature of Receiver: [Handwritten Signature]  
 Date: 10/31/17

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the Community Engagement Team has had the opportunity to provide input into this quarterly report, and the opportunity to review, and update if necessary, its 2017-2018 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print): Elyette Clyburn  
 Signature of CET Representative: [Handwritten Signature]  
 Date: 10/30/17