

Receivership

Quarterly Report

1st Quarter - July 1, 2015 to October 30, 2015

School:	EAST EPO
District:	Rochester City School District
Superintendent:	Shaun C. Nelms, Ed.D
Date of Submission:	October 30, 2015

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT



Office of Accountability/School Turnaround

Receivership Quarterly Report			Dates: July 1 to October 30	
School	School BEDS Code	Persistently Struggling/Struggling School	SIG/SIF Model/Cohort (if Applicable)	
Lower School	261600010105	Persistently Struggling School	Additional District Personnel Responsible for Program Oversight and Report Validation	Grade Configuration
Upper School	261600010061			
Superintendent	School Principal			
Shaun C. Nelms, Ed.D	Marlene Blocker Anibal Soler	Steve Uebbing- Project Director Lorna Washington- Spec. Asst to EPO Superintendent	6-12	1,398

ATTESTATION: By signing below, I certify that the information in this quarterly report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Receiver (Print): Shaun Nelms

Signature of Receiver: 

Date: 10/29/15



Executive Summary

Please provide a *plain-language summary* of the current reporting 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, and made available to the public by the school's district office and posted on its web-site. Avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public, and limit the summary to no more than 500 words.

The EAST Educational Partnership Organization (EPO) plan has identified several key strategies that must be implemented in an effort to improve the academic progress of our scholars. This quarterly report provides a summary of the current work that is being done in each of the identified areas. During this first quarter (July 2015- October 2015) the key strategies shown below have begun to be implemented.

1. *Learning targets*- All teachers are posting lesson plans on our internal Share-point site. Reviews of teachers' lesson plans indicate that all posted plans have learning targets and long term goals.
2. *Sequenced learning experiences*- Posted lesson plans must note the dominant level of each lesson (Acquisition, Meaning Making or Transfer). Summer PD work required the creation of completed unit plans (6-8 weeks), an overview of major understandings long term goals and major assessments.
3. *Teacher/coach daily collaboration* - every teacher has daily collaborative planning time (CPT) where they collaborate around common planning, student assessment, and student work.
4. *Students who do not reach standards receive extra time and supports*- Over the summer, student records were examined and students were designated for between one to three support periods prior to the first day of School. Student schedules and number of support periods are adjusted as their needs change.
5. *In 9th grade, students supported through a second math period*- Additional math and literacy is available to East scholars. We anticipate that with adaptation/correction and continued support via coaching, our scholars will be able to achieve desired results.
6. *Required participation of staff in up to 20 days of professional learning*- A spreadsheet is available that shows the staff participation total for summer PD (over 12,000 hours). PD was offered in curriculum writing, lesson planning, program work, restorative practices, etc.
7. *Data collection/ adjustments to supports*- Tracking data has begun and will be used for targeted interventions. Support room progress is being tracked by support room teachers. Attendance data is being collected and home visits are being made.
8. *Collaboration built among stakeholders* - Family and Community Engagement committee is meeting monthly. Student Orientations, and Open Houses for both Lower and Upper Schools have been held. The Parent-Teacher-Student-Association (PTSA) has been formed and a president has been elected. A year-long calendar of meetings has been developed.
9. *Student-Led Family Conferences*- A student led conferences handbook has been created. Training dates and methods are being planned. Student led conferences to officially begin on March 1.
10. *Governance Council*- Governance Councils have been established for both Lower and Upper schools. The first monthly report has been created and will be available for the EPO Superintendent once approved by both Governance Councils.
11. *Administrators to review attendance data and assess interventions/support*- Administrators have been provided a guidance document that outlines which attendance reports should be reviewed, potential actions to be taken and trends that are being observed. Attendance data is being displayed within the building visible to scholars and staff.
12. *Implementation of restorative practices and resulting reduction in suspensions*- Over the summer, staff received training on Restorative Practices. These practices are being used by Administrators, Counselors and Social Workers. Suspensions have been significantly reduced as compared to this time last year.



The East EPO has a focus on engaging the community. There has been an emphasis placed on ensuring that documents are translated into appropriate languages reflective of our scholar population and communications are generally sent in a timely manner. There have been times where communication has not been as timely as we would like, so revisions to our current distribution processes have been made, including coordination and publishing of Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) and Family and Community Engagement (FACE/CET) meeting calendars. We have held three community meetings, an open house/parent teacher conference, parent information/scholar recruitment night and the parent forum on receivership, during this first quarter.

The Commissioner's Regulations have also allowed the East EPO to enact certain receivership powers. During this first quarter, the EAST EPO has systematically reviewed and revised the school curriculum, provided increased salaries and hired staff who embrace the "all-in" philosophy, reallocated the budget based on best practices, expanded the school day by embedding extended learning time into the school day, renegotiated the collective bargaining agreements (CBA) to incorporate best practices and implementation of strategies to improve scholar achievement levels.

The State provided Level 1 indicators which for Lower School focused on performance on the 3-8 ELA and Math assessments and for Upper School focused on 2011 and 2012 Cohorts passing the ELA/Math Regents exams and the 4 & 5 year graduation rates. The East EPO determined the Level 2 Indicators for both the Lower and Upper Schools. We were required to select a minimum of 5 Level 2 indicators for each school. Baseline data to support both the Level 1 and Level 2 indicators has been provided as part of the first quarterly report.

Attention – This document is intended to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to Receivership@NYSED.gov and Turnaround@NYSED.gov. It is a self-assessment of the implementation and outcome 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 schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) or School Innovation Fund (SIF) funds. Additionally, this document serves as the quarterly reporting instrument for schools with School Comprehensive Education Plans (SCEP).

Part I – Intervention Plan

Receivership Quarterly Report – 1st Quarter
July 1, 2015 to October 30, 2015
(As required under Section 211-f(11) of NYS Ed. Law)



Intervention Plan and Timeline – Key Strategies and Status of Implementation		
Items from this section relate specifically to key strategies identified in the Department-approved Intervention Plan (SIG, SIF, SCEP or Out of Time) and related Receivership addendum materials; as well as to any key strategies embedded in the plan and budget that are central to meeting project outcomes (e.g., intensive professional development, extended learning time).		
Key Strategies	Implementation Status	Evidence
List the Key Strategy from your approved Intervention Plan (SIG, SIF, SCEP or Out of Time) and Receivership addendum material.	Identify each strategy as RED, YELLOW or GREEN	Identify the evidence that supports your assessment of implementation/impact of key strategies, the connection to goals, and the likelihood of meeting targets set forth in the Intervention Plan and Receivership addendum material.
1. Lessons will have clear learning targets and opportunities for students to see the value of what they are asked to learn, how it relates to past learning and how it will relate to future learning	YELLOW	Teachers are expected to post their lesson plans daily (in their major content area). All teachers are posting. The school needs to work to improve the quality of lesson plan formats and ensure fidelity. Lesson plans include 1) long term goal or understanding, 2) daily learning target, 3) evidence of learning, and 4) the day's learning experiences. They also denote 5) the level of lesson (Acquisition, Meaning-making, or Transfer). Dipstick reviews of teacher lesson plans indicate all that are posted have learning targets and long term goals. In after school meetings, faculty worked together to identify targeted best practices relative to learning targets. Walk through data indicates the range of feedback being given to teachers in the target areas, which shows teachers being partially successful in the two target areas: 1) using the "I can" or "students will understand that (SWUT)" format and 2) posting, referencing, and using LTs during the lesson. The relationship between the daily learning target and the long term goal shows how the content fits into a trajectory of learning across the unit. Additional best practices in learning targets will be added monthly as the year proceeds.
2. Learning experiences to be carefully sequenced to engage students in acquisition of knowledge, meaning making with content that connects to their lives and the world outside of school	YELLOW	Teachers posted lesson plans must denote predominant level of each lesson (Acquisition, Meaning-making, or Transfer). Summer 2015 professional development work (five days for each department) required the creation of a completed unit plan (6-8 weeks), an overview of major understandings and long term goals, and the demarcation of major assessments. These units have been



			posted to the school's public website but are incomplete. Course Unit Plans were required to culminate in a performance assessment. Performance assessments are currently under development and were not assigned to be completed; they are being developed now. Consultants and University of Rochester faculty taught East teachers' summer 2015, and Superintendents' Conference Day, October 9, 2015, that performance assessment includes assessment of understanding at the transfer level, which means of use in the world outside of school.
3.	Teachers and coaches collaborate daily focusing on evidence of student learning for the purpose of informing their ongoing instruction and giving feedback to students on their progress	YELLOW	Every teacher has daily collaborative planning time (CPT). Protocols have been provided by University of Rochester faculty during the school opening-professional learning time September 1-3, 2015. Coaches and administrators facilitate daily CPT using these. Some CPT groups struggle to stay on task, but for the most part, collaboration around common planning, student assessment, and student work is occurring regularly. Five week assessments were evidence of this. Groups determined and/or designed formative assessments, administered and scored them, and reported on student performance in four categories by number and percentage. They will continue to do so every five weeks. Coaches' meetings are facilitated by University of Rochester faculty; these meetings also include reports and discussions of the CPT work.
4.	Students who do not reach standards will be identified and immediately spiraled back into the teaching and learning process through extra time and supports	YELLOW	Over the summer all students' records were examined and students were divided into four categories based on report card grades and/or state test scores (when available) per a formula (e.g. weighing math and English highest, social studies and science next, and non-core content third). Students were designated for one, two, or three support periods (out of ten, 72-minute periods, alternating over two days, five periods per day). The schedule was constructed with ten periods for this purpose; initial instruction is minimal; additional instruction is flexible. Students in need, which is almost all students at East, were scheduled for "Support" prior to the first day of school. After school opened and currently, students' schedules are changed as errors are found or as needs change. Support teachers are certified special education teachers. General education teachers are assigned to Support rooms to provide additional help to students throughout the



		YELLOW	<p>day. Support is embedded in the day. Support can be increased or decreased based on need throughout the year, through a conversation in CPT with the students' teachers. Academic support is not extra; it is embedded. Volunteers, interns, and service providers will be added to support across the year as the program develops. Students are assigned for Support room interventions through performance on NYS assessments, through teacher input, through reading and math assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are re-assessed for progress through RtI tracking, through literacy screenings, through math and reading screenings. • Assessments will be tracked at least quarterly. • Support room teachers are provided with two full weeks of support training in the summer of 2015, a refresher training for all staff in September 2015, refresher trainings throughout the year as well as a teacher advisory committee to address best practice and implementation strategies for support services. • A full time staffed test modification and pull out room has been provided to address additional time and supports as well. <p>The additional time helps scholars to develop critical thinking skills as well as concepts and skills in mathematics. It is difficult to tell how the new curriculum and the double period are impacting student learning. Scholars are having a challenging time learning with this inquiry approach since they have never experienced learning in this way. They have a hard time working in groups and doing the activities unless teacher scaffolds or chunks the problems for them. The teacher guide gives an idea of how long each activity should take. However, teachers are finding that it takes our scholars almost double the time that the guide says because they are working at a slow pace. Teachers are hopeful that scholars are learning the math better than the traditional curriculum (Engage NY) since Meaningful Math is effective in developing conceptual understanding. We anticipate that with adaptation/correction and continued support via coaching, East will be able to achieve desired results.</p>
5.	In 9 th grade, students will be supported through a second math period	YELLOW	



6.	Required participation of staff in up to 20 days of professional learning to develop curriculum and assessment practices, develop initial unit plans and deliver high quality data-driven instructional practices.	YELLOW	A spreadsheet is available of the total staff participation in summer professional development. Participation number of days varied by department with almost all staff participating in a minimum of nine full days of professional learning during the summer of 2015. The department time for content areas was devoted to curriculum writing, lesson planning, and program work using the Understanding by Design template. Special education teachers implementing the Layers of Support Model had ten days of department time; other departments each had five days. Counselors and social workers department time focused on attendance work, as that is a major problem. All teachers were required to attend one full day of work in Curriculum, one in Instructional Foundations, one in Restorative Practices, and five in subject specific work. Others chose to attend more intensive training in Restorative Practices (three days). All administrators attended an additional day. Grades 6-9 content area teachers attended Managing the Active Classroom, facilitated by Elschools. Training was offered to all administrators and teachers in grades 6-9, those staff members also participated in two days of Leader in Me training through the FranklinCovey organization. Additional hiring was conducted throughout the months of July-September which did not allow for all staff to attend/receive the same amount of training. Other subject specific training was provided by various consultants and University of Rochester faculty; details are available. Agendas and materials are available for all summer training.
7.	Data will be collected and utilized to inform staff and support service providers to allow for adjustments to supports	YELLOW	Tracking data has begun through student support center referrals to partnering agencies and internal supports including social workers and counselors. Attendance data is being collected and home visits are being made to students that have missed designated amounts of time. Data has been tracked and disseminated by the data administrator and shared with teams (administrator, social workers, counselors and will be used for further targeted interventions. Progress in support rooms is being tracked by support room teachers and progress will be determined on homework completion, course grades, and class attendance.



8.	Collaboration built among stakeholders that re-centers community and families and builds capacity for families and youth to transform themselves, their schools and their communities	YELLOW	<p>The Family and Community Engagement committee (FACE/CET) meets monthly to implement this strategy. Events we have planned all focus on families as the center of transformation. Events that have occurred (Orientations, Open House, Opening Day) showed mixed attendance across grade levels. We saw high attendance for lower school (93% and higher), average attendance for upper school and on track 9th graders (80% - 92.9%), and poor attendance (less than 80%) for students who are overage/under credited, (cohort 2014 or older). However, efforts to work with families who did not attend (phone calls, home visits) have resulted in increased attendance. Events to be held, specifically parent workshops, will focus on what families identify as strategies they need to better support their children in school. PTSA has been formed and a president has been elected. We have had two meetings thus far where parent attendance was stable across each meeting (7 parents attended each meeting). Communication about the second meeting was problematic which may account for a stable, rather than increased attendance. We developed a yearlong calendar of meetings that will be posted on the web and mailed to families. Phone calls will be made in advance of each monthly meeting or family event to remind families about attending. We anticipate these strategies will increase attendance and therefore engagement.</p>
9.	Student-led Family Conferences	YELLOW	<p>We have developed a handbook for student-led conferences that outlines processes and procedures. However, we have not yet trained teachers and students on implementation. There are 4 such conferences scheduled for the year. Due to the training delay, the first conference (Oct 8) was positioned as Open House/Parent Teacher Conferences. The second conference to be held Dec 3, 2015 will be similarly framed. Between now and the third conference (March 1), training will occur. Student led family conferences will begin at the March 1 event.</p>
10.	Governance Council which consists of teachers, administrators, family members, students, union representatives and others will serve as the governance	YELLOW	<p>We have governance councils in both the lower school (grades 6-8) and the upper school (grades 9-12). They have been meeting throughout the past month and working to finalize their respective charters. There are members represented</p>



	team for the school, meeting at least monthly and producing a monthly report for the EPO Superintendent and larger community		on both councils for each constituency. The first monthly report has been created and will be available for the EPO Superintendent once approved by the governance councils.		
11.	Administrators to conduct in-depth reviews of attendance data and assessment of implementation of interventions and support to improve student attendance	YELLOW	Administrators were provided an analysis document that details which reports should be reviewed in our student management system, potential actions that need to be taken and inaccuracies and trends that are being observed. Family Group "Carents," Administrators, Counselors, Social Workers and the Attendance Liaison found all no-show students for the lower school. Public displays of attendance data are visible for Lower School with new data being posted every two weeks.		
12.	Implementation of restorative practices and resulting reduction in suspensions	YELLOW	Throughout the summer, stakeholder groups within the building received training on Restorative Practices. Restorative practices are being used by Administrators, Counselors and Social Workers. There has been a drastic reduction in the number of suspensions from last year to this year for the month of September (201 to 20).		
Green	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> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.

Part II – Community Engagement Team

Community Engagement Team (CET)

Please complete the prompts/questions and include information regarding the type, nature, frequency and outcomes of meetings held by the entire Community Engagement Team and/or sub-committees charged with addressing specific components of the Community Engagement Plan.

Key Questions/Prompts	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis / Report Out
Describe goals and outcomes of meetings and committee work in terms of Community Engagement Plan implementation, school support and dissemination of information.	YELLOW	Meeting goals are listed on the agenda, which is sent to committee members in advance of our monthly meetings. Goals are aligned with the implementation plan timeline. Since July 1, 2015 we have had 3 committee meetings. Initial goals focused on family participation in Orientations, first day attendance, the public forum on receivership, and the first Open House/Parent Teacher conference. We created flyers in both English and Spanish, put details of events on the school website, sent robo-calls, purchased ad time on a local radio station, sent press releases, and made personal



Indicate here the way in which the CET was provided an opportunity to provide comments and suggestions on the draft quarterly report.		phone calls. We saw high attendance at Orientations (700 families) and approximately 180 families at Open House. We encountered some barriers to communication with families: 1) not all documents given to families were translated into Spanish; 2) interpreters were not available at all events; 3) untimely notice about some family events. However, we have seen increased attendance at Orientations, first day attendance was mixed but improved, parents report feeling a more welcoming environment, and we elected strong PTSA leadership.			
		The quarterly report was shared with the committee at a monthly meeting at which time they were given the opportunity to provide feedback and/or suggestions for improving communication, via telephone, e-mail or the Let's Talk communication tool.			
Explain the degree to which the evidence/outcomes of meetings and committee work suggest the need for adjustments to ensure successful implementation of the Community Engagement Plan.	YELLOW	Given the evidence about attendance and translations were mixed, the committee discussed ways to improve. A tenet 6 calendar was produced and approved by Governance Council, then made public on the school website. A PTSA calendar was coordinated with the tenet 6 calendar and publicized. By coordinating calendars and making them public, more timely communication will follow, as well as, ensuring translators are booked on time. All documents made available to families and the public were translated into Spanish. While the translation of some of these materials is expensive due to their size, these are start-up expenses and we remain on budget.			
Green	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> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.



Part II – Receivership

Powers of the Receiver Please respond to the prompts/questions below regarding efforts on the part of the School Receiver to utilize powers pursuant to section 100.19 of Commissioner's Regulations pertaining to School Receivership. In addition, please include information regarding, but not limited to, the actions taken by the School Receiver to: 1) Review, alter or replace curriculum and program offerings of the school; 2) Replace teachers and administrators; 3) Increase salaries to attract and retain high-quality teachers and leaders; 4) Establish steps to improve hiring, induction, teacher evaluation, professional development, teacher advancement, school culture and organizational structure; 5) Reallocate the existing school budget; 6) Expand the school day; 7) Negotiate a Receivership agreement that modifies the existing collective bargaining agreement(s); and 8) Supersede any decision, policy or regulation of the superintendent of schools, chief school officer, or of the board of education.		
Key Questions/Prompts	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis / Report Out
Describe goals and outcomes related to Receivership powers currently being utilized (or in the developmental phase) in terms of their implementation/development status and their impact.	YELLOW	<p>Many of the powers of the receiver were utilized in the development and our current first year implementation of the East EPO plan.</p> <p>1) <i>Review, alter or replace curriculum and program offerings of the school</i>, the full school curriculum is being systematically reviewed and revised. We anticipate this process to continue for several years.</p> <p>2) <i>Replace teachers and administrators</i>- All staff were required to interview for positions here at EAST even those who were already working here. Approximately 60% of the staff was replaced. The goal of this action was to ensure that staff who were hired were truly staff that embraced the "all-in" philosophy and culture we are looking to build. The full impact of this decision has yet to be realized, however, current increased student attendance and decreased student suspensions support a positive change in culture and expectations.</p> <p>3) <i>Increase salaries to attract and retain high-quality teachers and leaders</i>: on average teachers received an @9% increase to work at East- by and large we have been able to retain high quality teachers and leaders. There have been very few instances of staff leaving which provides a consistent cadre of adults to support our scholars on a daily basis. Additionally, the EPO has negotiated an incentive for Bilingual teachers.</p> <p>4) <i>Establish steps to improve hiring, induction, teacher evaluation, professional development, teacher advancement, school culture and organizational structure</i>: The EAST EPO conducted over 600 interviews, and @275 classroom observations of the candidates who applied for open positions. There were over 12,000 hours of summer PD/curriculum writing attended by staff. Teacher leadership positions were established in all subject areas. The organizational structure and new school culture is being developed through targeted team building activities, clear expectations and accountability.</p> <p>5) <i>Reallocate the existing school budget</i>: The budget has been approved by the RCSD based on implementation of best practices.</p> <p>6) <i>Expand the school day</i>: The goal of expanding the school day was to allow for more time for our scholars to receive quality academic programming and to increase student achievement. The extended learning time was embedded into the school day. Lower School students attend school from 7:30-3pm and upper school from 8:3-30 pm. The impact of</p>



		<p>the increased time is not clearly evident at this early stage as we only have data collected from 5 week grades and assessments at this current time.</p> <p>7) <i>Negotiate a Receivership agreement that modifies the existing collective bargaining agreement(s)</i>: The goal of the modified collective bargaining agreements was to allow the staff and school leaders at East to aspire to attain greater achievement levels by implementing strategies and requiring the use of best practices within this building. For example, teachers' unit and daily lesson plans are posted and visible to other staff and administrators via a share-point site and collaborative planning time is being utilized more impact-fully, resulting in adjustments to instruction.</p> <p>8) <i>Supersede any decision, policy or regulation of the superintendent of schools, chief school officer, or of the board of education</i>. At this point, the EPO has not identified any decision, policy or regulation that required supersession.</p>			
<p>Explain the degree to which the evidence/outcomes of efforts to implement/develop Receivership plans suggest the need to adjust implementation of the intervention plan.</p>	YELLOW	<p>At this point, we have not identified any need to adjust implementation of the intervention plan.</p>			
<p>Green</p>	<p>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>Yellow</p>	<p>Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>	<p>Red</p>	<p>Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>



Part III – Metrics/Indicators

Level 1 Indicators																									
Please list the school's Level 1 indicators below and discuss each with respect to the type, nature and analysis (as applicable) undertaken during the current reporting quarter, as well as necessary course-corrections. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement.																									
Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out																					
#1 Priority Schools Make Yearly Progress (LS & US)		NA	Make Progress	Guidance needed from the State regarding what metrics will be used for this indicator																					
#9 3-8 ELA All Students Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	17%	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected ELA and Literacy curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Literacy.Administered Fall diagnostic assessments in Literacy (SRI and SPI). Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>50</td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>257</td><td>62%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>77</td><td>18%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>25</td><td>6%</td></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>7</td><td>2%</td></tr></table>	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	50	12%	Below Basic	257	62%	Basic	77	18%	Proficient	25	6%	Advanced	7	2%			
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																							
Not Yet Tested	50	12%																							
Below Basic	257	62%																							
Basic	77	18%																							
Proficient	25	6%																							
Advanced	7	2%																							
#15 3-8 Math All students Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	21%	38%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reviewed diagnostic data and adjusted scholar interventions accordingly.Met with all ELA and Literacy teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Literacy.Selected Math curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Math.Administered Fall diagnostic assessment in Math (NWEA Map 6+). Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>41</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>Low</td><td>212</td><td>51%</td></tr><tr><td>Low Average</td><td>98</td><td>24%</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>42</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>High Average</td><td>23</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	41	10%	Low	212	51%	Low Average	98	24%	Average	42	10%	High Average	23	5%	High	0	0%
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																							
Not Yet Tested	41	10%																							
Low	212	51%																							
Low Average	98	24%																							
Average	42	10%																							
High Average	23	5%																							
High	0	0%																							



#33 3-8 ELA All Students MGP (LS)	YELLOW	42.17	50.72	<div>Met with all Math teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Math.</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected ELA and Literacy curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Literacy.Administered Fall diagnostic assessments in Literacy (SRI and SPI). Baseline data above.Reviewed diagnostic data and adjusted scholar interventions accordingly.Met with all ELA and Literacy teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Literacy.Also scheduled common standards-based assessments every 5 weeks to monitor progress and inform instruction.Initial 5-Week Assessment Results for 6-8 ELA (as reported by teachers):</div>																																
<div><div><div>Grade 6</div><table><tr><th>5-Week Assessments</th><th>1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</th></tr><tr><td>Student Performance Levels</td><td>(n) %</td></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>6 8%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>46 58%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>15 19%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>7 9%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>5 6%</td></tr></table></div><div><div>Grade 7</div><table><tr><th>5-Week Assessments</th><th>1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</th></tr><tr><td>Student Performance Levels</td><td>(n) %</td></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>6 4%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>68 42%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>11 7%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>74 46%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>3 2%</td></tr></table></div><div><div>Grade 8</div><table><tr><th>5-Week Assessments</th><th>1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</th></tr><tr><td>Student Performance Levels</td><td>(n) %</td></tr></table></div></div>					5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct	Student Performance Levels	(n) %	Not Tested	6 8%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	46 58%	Approaching Standards	15 19%	Meeting Standards	7 9%	Exceeding Standards	5 6%	5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct	Student Performance Levels	(n) %	Not Tested	6 4%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	68 42%	Approaching Standards	11 7%	Meeting Standards	74 46%	Exceeding Standards	3 2%	5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct	Student Performance Levels	(n) %
5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																																			
Student Performance Levels	(n) %																																			
Not Tested	6 8%																																			
Not Yet Approaching Standards	46 58%																																			
Approaching Standards	15 19%																																			
Meeting Standards	7 9%																																			
Exceeding Standards	5 6%																																			
5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																																			
Student Performance Levels	(n) %																																			
Not Tested	6 4%																																			
Not Yet Approaching Standards	68 42%																																			
Approaching Standards	11 7%																																			
Meeting Standards	74 46%																																			
Exceeding Standards	3 2%																																			
5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																																			
Student Performance Levels	(n) %																																			



				<table><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>85</td><td>43%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>16</td><td>8%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>31</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>65</td><td>33%</td></tr></table>	Not Tested	85	43%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	16	8%	Approaching Standards	31	16%	Meeting Standards	0	0%	Exceeding Standards	65	33%																											
Not Tested	85	43%																																												
Not Yet Approaching Standards	16	8%																																												
Approaching Standards	31	16%																																												
Meeting Standards	0	0%																																												
Exceeding Standards	65	33%																																												
#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP (LS)	YELLOW	47.14	51.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected Math curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Math.Administered Fall diagnostic assessment in Math (NWEA Map 6+). Baseline data above.Met with all Math teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Math.Also scheduled common standards-based assessments every 5 weeks to monitor progress and inform instruction.Initial 5-Week Assessment Results for 6-8 Math (as reported by teachers):																																										
<div><div><div>Grade 6</div><table><tr><td>5-Week Assessments</td><td>1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Student Performance Levels</td><td>(n)</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table></div><div><div>Grade 7</div><table><tr><td>5-Week Assessments</td><td>1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Student Performance Levels</td><td>(n)</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>13</td><td>11%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>35</td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>42</td><td>36%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>27</td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr></table></div><div><div>Grade 8</div></div></div>					5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct		Student Performance Levels	(n)	%	Not Tested			Not Yet Approaching Standards			Approaching Standards			Meeting Standards			Exceeding Standards			5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct		Student Performance Levels	(n)	%	Not Tested	13	11%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	35	30%	Approaching Standards	42	36%	Meeting Standards	27	23%	Exceeding Standards	0	0%
5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																																													
Student Performance Levels	(n)	%																																												
Not Tested																																														
Not Yet Approaching Standards																																														
Approaching Standards																																														
Meeting Standards																																														
Exceeding Standards																																														
5-Week Assessments	1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																																													
Student Performance Levels	(n)	%																																												
Not Tested	13	11%																																												
Not Yet Approaching Standards	35	30%																																												
Approaching Standards	42	36%																																												
Meeting Standards	27	23%																																												
Exceeding Standards	0	0%																																												



				<table><tr><th colspan="2">5-Week Assessments</th><th colspan="2">1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</th></tr><tr><th>Student Performance Levels</th><th>(n)</th><th></th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>19</td><td></td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>48</td><td></td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>37</td><td></td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>57</td><td></td><td>35%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>0</td><td></td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	5-Week Assessments		1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct		Student Performance Levels	(n)		%	Not Tested	19		12%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	48		30%	Approaching Standards	37		23%	Meeting Standards	57		35%	Exceeding Standards	0		0%
5-Week Assessments		1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																														
Student Performance Levels	(n)		%																													
Not Tested	19		12%																													
Not Yet Approaching Standards	48		30%																													
Approaching Standards	37		23%																													
Meeting Standards	57		35%																													
Exceeding Standards	0		0%																													
#85 Grades 4 and 8 Science All Students Level 3 and Above(LS)	YELLOW	31%	44%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected a new Science curriculum for Grade 8 and trained teaching staff accordingly.The Science Department is continuously being supported through Professional Development from the University of Rochester.Met with all Science teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement.Established a schedule for 5-week progress monitoring assessments aligned to the NYS Science 8 Assessment.Baseline Assessment Data:<table><tr><th colspan="2">5-Week Assessments</th><th colspan="2">1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct</th></tr><tr><th>Student Performance Levels</th><th>(n)</th><th></th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>31</td><td></td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Approaching Standards</td><td>28</td><td></td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>Approaching Standards</td><td>51</td><td></td><td>38%</td></tr><tr><td>Meeting Standards</td><td>20</td><td></td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Exceeding Standards</td><td>3</td><td></td><td>2%</td></tr></table>	5-Week Assessments		1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct		Student Performance Levels	(n)		%	Not Tested	31		23%	Not Yet Approaching Standards	28		21%	Approaching Standards	51		38%	Meeting Standards	20		15%	Exceeding Standards	3		2%
5-Week Assessments		1st 5 Weeks Sept/Oct																														
Student Performance Levels	(n)		%																													
Not Tested	31		23%																													
Not Yet Approaching Standards	28		21%																													
Approaching Standards	51		38%																													
Meeting Standards	20		15%																													
Exceeding Standards	3		2%																													
#5 School Safety (US)	YELLOW	59	<7 Serious Incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Trained all school staff in restorative practices.Trained staff in school-wide expectations for positive behavior supports (LEADER).Baseline suspension data:<table><tr><th>School Year</th><th>September Suspensions</th><th>October Suspensions</th><th>Total Yearly Suspensions</th></tr><tr><td>2015-2016</td><td>6</td><td>12*</td><td>18*</td></tr><tr><td>2014-2015</td><td>201</td><td>405</td><td>2,543</td></tr><tr><td>2013-2014</td><td>182</td><td>252</td><td>1,902</td></tr></table>* As of 10.19.15Baseline data specific to Serious Incidents:	School Year	September Suspensions	October Suspensions	Total Yearly Suspensions	2015-2016	6	12*	18*	2014-2015	201	405	2,543	2013-2014	182	252	1,902												
School Year	September Suspensions	October Suspensions	Total Yearly Suspensions																													
2015-2016	6	12*	18*																													
2014-2015	201	405	2,543																													
2013-2014	182	252	1,902																													



				<table><tr><th>School Year</th><th>September Serious Incidents</th><th>October Serious Incidents</th><th>Total Yearly Serious Incidents</th></tr><tr><td>2015-2016</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1*</td></tr><tr><td>2014-2015</td><td></td><td></td><td>53</td></tr><tr><td>2013-2014</td><td></td><td></td><td>59</td></tr></table> <p>* As of 10.19.15</p>	School Year	September Serious Incidents	October Serious Incidents	Total Yearly Serious Incidents	2015-2016	0	1	1*	2014-2015			53	2013-2014			59
School Year	September Serious Incidents	October Serious Incidents	Total Yearly Serious Incidents																	
2015-2016	0	1	1*																	
2014-2015			53																	
2013-2014			59																	
#67 2012 Total Cohort Passing Math Regents (Score>=65) (US)	YELLOW	38%	56%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cohort analysis conducted.Scholars strategically scheduled for Math class and intervention and support.Current status: <table><tr><th colspan="4">Current 2012 Total Cohort Math Regents Results</th></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>Level 1 0-54</td><td>Level 2 55-64</td><td>Level 3, 4, 5 65-100</td></tr><tr><td>21%</td><td>15%</td><td>15%</td><td>49%</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">We have already demonstrated improvement from the baseline score of 38%, increasing the % of scholars who have scored 65 and above to 49%.	Current 2012 Total Cohort Math Regents Results				Not Tested	Level 1 0-54	Level 2 55-64	Level 3, 4, 5 65-100	21%	15%	15%	49%				
Current 2012 Total Cohort Math Regents Results																				
Not Tested	Level 1 0-54	Level 2 55-64	Level 3, 4, 5 65-100																	
21%	15%	15%	49%																	
#69 2011 Total Cohort Passing ELA Regents (Score>=65) (US)	YELLOW	30%	51%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cohort analysis conducted.Scholars strategically scheduled for ELA class, intervention, and support.Current status: <table><tr><th colspan="4">Current 2011 Total Cohort ELA Regents Results</th></tr><tr><td>Not Tested</td><td>Level 1 0-54</td><td>Level 2 55-64</td><td>Level 3, 4, 5 65-100</td></tr><tr><td>35%</td><td>15%</td><td>9%</td><td>41%</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">We have already demonstrated improvement from the baseline score of 30%, increasing the % of scholars who have scored 65 and above to 41%.Analysis of credit accumulation and potential credits for 2012 Total Cohort – Sept 2015	Current 2011 Total Cohort ELA Regents Results				Not Tested	Level 1 0-54	Level 2 55-64	Level 3, 4, 5 65-100	35%	15%	9%	41%				
Current 2011 Total Cohort ELA Regents Results																				
Not Tested	Level 1 0-54	Level 2 55-64	Level 3, 4, 5 65-100																	
35%	15%	9%	41%																	
#70 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate- All Students (US)	YELLOW	41%	55%	<table><tr><th>Total Cohort Completion Status</th><th>(n)</th><th>% of Total Cohort</th></tr></table>	Total Cohort Completion Status	(n)	% of Total Cohort													
Total Cohort Completion Status	(n)	% of Total Cohort																		



Left school, no documentation of transfer	4	1.43%
Transferred to other high school equivalent	11	3.93%
Left school: first-time dropout	48	17.14%
Left school: previously counted as a dropout	4	1.43%
Graduated (earned a Regents or local diploma)	4	1.43%
Still Enrolled	209	74.64%
Total	280	100%

Students Still Enrolled – Credit Accumulation	(n)	% of Total Cohort
0 – 5 Credits	25	9%
5.5 – 11 Credits	43	15%
11.5 – 17 Credits	52	19%
Over 17 Credits	89	32%

Students Still Enrolled – Regents Passed	(n)	% of Total Cohort
0 Regents	65	23%
1 Regents	32	11%
2 Regents	18	6%
3 Regents	16	6%
4 Regents	25	9%
5 Regents	53	19%

- 1.43% have already graduated.
- 51% of the Currently Enrolled 2012 Cohort have earned enough credits to be scheduled to graduate this year (and will earn the required 22 credits if they pass the credit-bearing courses they are enrolled in).
- Additionally, 51% of the 2012 Cohort have passed 1 or more of the 5 required Regents exams with a 65 or above – this also puts us on track toward the 55% target.
- To make up the difference between the 51% of on track scholars and the goal of 55%, we are strategically targeting a subgroup of the students who have passed 0 Regents to meet Regents benchmarks in both January and June and are exploring credit recovery and evening school options to provide scholars who are not yet scheduled to graduate the opportunity to earn additional credits, which should allow us to get at least a few more on track in order to meet our target of 55%.



#76 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate with Adv. Designation – All Students (US)	YELLOW	3%	9%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Analysis of credit accumulation and potential credits underway.	
#88 Total Cohort 5-Year Grad Rate- All Students (US)	YELLOW	48%	61%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Analysis of credit accumulation and potential credits underway.	
Green	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> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.



Part III – Metrics/Indicators

Level 2 Indicators																												
Please list the school's Level 2 indicators below and discuss each with respect to the type, nature and analysis (as applicable) undertaken during the current reporting quarter, as well as necessary course-corrections. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement.																												
Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out																								
#2 Plan for and Implement Community School Model (LS)	YELLOW	N/A	Develop Implementation plan with targets; conduct needs assessment, convene community engagement team, designation of Coordinator	Partnering with 7 elementary schools within a 1 ½ mile radius of EAST to target potential students for our 6 th and 7 th grade class. Holding a parent information/scholar recruitment night on October 28 th to provide information for prospective incoming 6 th and 7 th graders. Shared information about the event with the Community Engagement Team. Parent Liaison has helped to coordinate the event and president of the PTSA has agreed to participate. Currently house a student health center on site.																								
#6 Family and Community Engagement (DTSDE Tenet 6) (LS)		N/A	Developing Rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Baseline Parent Teacher Conference Data from First PTC of the year on October 8:<table><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th># of Parents</th><th>% of Parents</th></tr><tr><td>Grade 6</td><td>33</td><td>42%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 7</td><td>33</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 8</td><td>36</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 9</td><td>22</td><td>6%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 10</td><td>20</td><td>8%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 11</td><td>18</td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade 12</td><td>17</td><td>8%</td></tr></table>	Grade Level	# of Parents	% of Parents	Grade 6	33	42%	Grade 7	33	22%	Grade 8	36	19%	Grade 9	22	6%	Grade 10	20	8%	Grade 11	18	12%	Grade 12	17	8%
Grade Level	# of Parents	% of Parents																										
Grade 6	33	42%																										
Grade 7	33	22%																										
Grade 8	36	19%																										
Grade 9	22	6%																										
Grade 10	20	8%																										
Grade 11	18	12%																										
Grade 12	17	8%																										
#10 3-8 ELA SWD Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	6%	17%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected ELA and Literacy curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Literacy and for Support periods as appropriate.Designated student case managers and ensured IEP dissemination to all instructional staff.																								



				<ul style="list-style-type: none">Administered Fall diagnostic assessments in Literacy (SRI and SPI). Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>12</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>44</td><td>70%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>6</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>1</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>Reviewed diagnostic data and adjusted scholar interventions accordingly.Met with all SPED, ELA and Literacy teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Literacy.Currently initiating tier 3 literacy services.	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	12	19%	Below Basic	44	70%	Basic	6	10%	Proficient	1	1%	Advanced	0	0%
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																				
Not Yet Tested	12	19%																				
Below Basic	44	70%																				
Basic	6	10%																				
Proficient	1	1%																				
Advanced	0	0%																				
#11-3-8 ELA Black Students Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	18%	35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Selected ELA and Literacy curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Literacy.Administered Fall diagnostic assessments in Literacy (SRI and SPI).Disaggregated data by subgroups. Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>8</td><td>4%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>153</td><td>68%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>46</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>15</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>3</td><td>1%</td></tr></table>Reviewed diagnostic data and adjusted scholar interventions accordingly.Met with all ELA and Literacy teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Literacy.Currently initiating tier 3 literacy services.Selected Math curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Math and for Support periods as appropriate.Designated student case managers and ensured IEP dissemination to all instructional staff.	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	8	4%	Below Basic	153	68%	Basic	46	20%	Proficient	15	7%	Advanced	3	1%
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																				
Not Yet Tested	8	4%																				
Below Basic	153	68%																				
Basic	46	20%																				
Proficient	15	7%																				
Advanced	3	1%																				
#16 3-8 Math SWD Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	1%	18%																			



				<ul style="list-style-type: none">Administered Fall diagnostic assessment in Math (NWEA Map 6+). Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>7</td><td>11%</td></tr><tr><td>Low</td><td>45</td><td>71%</td></tr><tr><td>Low Average</td><td>10</td><td>16%</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>High Average</td><td>1</td><td>2%</td></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>Met with all SPED and Math teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Math.Selected Math curriculums and trained teaching staff accordingly.Scheduled all scholars in Grades 6-8 for double periods of Math.Administered Fall diagnostic assessment in Math (NWEA Map 6+). Disaggregated data by subgroups. Baseline data on current 6-8 scholars:<table><tr><th>Performance Level</th><th># of scholars</th><th>% of scholars</th></tr><tr><td>Not Yet Tested</td><td>20</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>Low</td><td>113</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>Low Average</td><td>60</td><td>27%</td></tr><tr><td>Average</td><td>22</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>High Average</td><td>10</td><td>4%</td></tr><tr><td>High</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>Met with all Math teachers to set SMART goals around student achievement in Math.Creation and implementation of a school-wide data-driven attendance intervention process.Aggressive pursuit of accurate attendance data (e.g. withdrawing students enrolled in other districts, ensuring that staff submit timely and accurate attendance, etc.).Weekly and monthly attendance monitoring.Baseline Attendance data:	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	7	11%	Low	45	71%	Low Average	10	16%	Average	0	0%	High Average	1	2%	High	0	0%	Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars	Not Yet Tested	20	9%	Low	113	50%	Low Average	60	27%	Average	22	10%	High Average	10	4%	High	0	0%
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																																												
Not Yet Tested	7	11%																																												
Low	45	71%																																												
Low Average	10	16%																																												
Average	0	0%																																												
High Average	1	2%																																												
High	0	0%																																												
Performance Level	# of scholars	% of scholars																																												
Not Yet Tested	20	9%																																												
Low	113	50%																																												
Low Average	60	27%																																												
Average	22	10%																																												
High Average	10	4%																																												
High	0	0%																																												
#17 3-8 Math Black Students Level 2 and Above (LS)	YELLOW	24%	32%																																											
#3 Student Attendance (US)	YELLOW	81%	88%																																											



				<table><tr><th>School Year</th><th>September Avg Daily %</th><th>October Avg Daily %</th></tr><tr><td>2015-2016</td><td>78%</td><td>80%*</td></tr><tr><td>2014-2015</td><td>80%</td><td>79%</td></tr></table>	School Year	September Avg Daily %	October Avg Daily %	2015-2016	78%	80%*	2014-2015	80%	79%																																																																												
School Year	September Avg Daily %	October Avg Daily %																																																																																							
2015-2016	78%	80%*																																																																																							
2014-2015	80%	79%																																																																																							
#21 HS ELA All Students Level 2 and Above (US)	YELLOW	70%	72%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cohort analysis conducted.Scholars strategically scheduled for ELA class, intervention, and support.																																																																																					
#27 HS Math All Students Level 2 and Above (US)	YELLOW	74%	79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cohort analysis conducted.Scholars strategically scheduled for Math class, intervention, and support.																																																																																					
#71 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate-SWD Students (US)	YELLOW	17%	33%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Analysis of credit accumulation and potential credits for 2012 Total Cohort Students With Disabilities – September 2015 <table><tr><th colspan="3">Total Cohort Completion Status</th><th>(n)</th><th>% of Coh</th></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Transferred to other high school equivalent</td><td>2</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Left school: first-time dropout</td><td>18</td><td>26%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Still Enrolled</td><td>49</td><td>71%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Total</td><td>69</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Students Still Enrolled – Credit Accumulation</th><th>(n)</th><th>% of Coh</th></tr><tr><td colspan="3">0 – 5 Credits</td><td>8</td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">5.5 – 11 Credits</td><td>12</td><td>17%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">11.5 – 17 Credits</td><td>15</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Over 17 Credits</td><td>12</td><td>17%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Students Still Enrolled – Regents Passed</th><th>(n)</th><th>% of Coh</th></tr><tr><td colspan="3">0 Regents</td><td>24</td><td>35%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">1 Regents</td><td>8</td><td>12%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">2 Regents</td><td>3</td><td>4%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">3 Regents</td><td>3</td><td>4%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">4 Regents</td><td>1</td><td>1%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">5 Regents</td><td>8</td><td>12%</td></tr></table>	Total Cohort Completion Status			(n)	% of Coh	Transferred to other high school equivalent			2	39%	Left school: first-time dropout			18	26%	Still Enrolled			49	71%	Total			69	100%	Students Still Enrolled – Credit Accumulation			(n)	% of Coh	0 – 5 Credits			8	12%	5.5 – 11 Credits			12	17%	11.5 – 17 Credits			15	22%	Over 17 Credits			12	17%	Students Still Enrolled – Regents Passed			(n)	% of Coh	0 Regents			24	35%	1 Regents			8	12%	2 Regents			3	4%	3 Regents			3	4%	4 Regents			1	1%	5 Regents			8	12%
Total Cohort Completion Status			(n)	% of Coh																																																																																					
Transferred to other high school equivalent			2	39%																																																																																					
Left school: first-time dropout			18	26%																																																																																					
Still Enrolled			49	71%																																																																																					
Total			69	100%																																																																																					
Students Still Enrolled – Credit Accumulation			(n)	% of Coh																																																																																					
0 – 5 Credits			8	12%																																																																																					
5.5 – 11 Credits			12	17%																																																																																					
11.5 – 17 Credits			15	22%																																																																																					
Over 17 Credits			12	17%																																																																																					
Students Still Enrolled – Regents Passed			(n)	% of Coh																																																																																					
0 Regents			24	35%																																																																																					
1 Regents			8	12%																																																																																					
2 Regents			3	4%																																																																																					
3 Regents			3	4%																																																																																					
4 Regents			1	1%																																																																																					
5 Regents			8	12%																																																																																					



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a support model for students with disabilities that provides them with access to individualized and small group instruction embedded within their day and targeted toward areas of need. • 39% of the 2012 Cohort SWD's have earned enough credits to be scheduled to graduate this year (and will earn the required 22 credits if they pass the credit-bearing courses they are enrolled in) – this put us on track toward the 33% target. • 33% of the 2012 Cohort SWD's have passed 1 or more of the 5 required Regents exams with a 65 or above – this also puts us on track toward the 33% target. • Implementation of alternative programs that still lead to a diploma for students at risk of dropping out: East Big Picture and Quest.
#82 Drop Out Rate (US)	YELLOW	14%	<=8%	
Green	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy with impact.	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.



Part IV – Budget/Fiscal

Budget and Interim Fiscal Report Questions from this section relate specifically to key strategies identified in the Receivership Fund application, as well as key strategies embedded in the Intervention Plan (SIG/SIF/SCPE) and budget that are critical to meeting project outcomes (e.g., intensive professional development, extended learning time).				
Key Questions/Prompts	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out		
Identify and describe areas where spending is not on budget and explain the reasons. Provide an analysis of progress period expenditures in terms of desired outcomes, alignment to project plan/timeline, and impact on instructional practices/key strategies/student engagement.	GREEN	Currently the East budget is operating with a small surplus which we anticipate continuing for the remainder of the school year. We have hired 188.25 of the original 194.5 teaching staff, implemented off-site programs through Big Picture Learning and Freedom School as well as an in house program geared towards course recovery- Encompass/Quest. All of the initial program initiatives of the EPO proposal have been implemented with the exception of East Evening, a further school day extension, which we anticipate beginning in December.		
Identify any potential budget adaptations or amendments that may be needed as a result of this budget analysis.	YELLOW	Amendment 1- Increase \$154,278 for Professional Development consultants Amendment 2- Increased costs associated with EPO implementation. (Both amendments were caused by miscommunication between the RCSD and the EPO during budget development.) Amendment 3- Shifting of \$210,000 to RCSD for BOCES services.		
Green	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> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.