Receivership Schools ONLY

Quarterly Report #1: *July 1, 2016 to October 30, 2016*

School Name	School BEDS Code	District	Lead Partner or EPO	Hyperlink to where this report will be posted on the district website: Check which plan below applies:	
EAST EPO – Lower School EAST EPO – Upper School	261600010105 261600010061	Rochester City School District	University of Rochester	SIG/SIF Cohort: Model:	SCEP

Superintendent/EPO	School Principal	Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight	Grade Configuration	% ELL	% SWD	Total Enrollment
Shaun C. Nelms, Ed.D	Marlene Blocker – (Upper School) Tanya Wilson (Lower School) Appointment Date: 7/2015 (Blocker) 7/2016 (Wilson)	Steve Uebbing- Project Director Lorna Washington- Spec. Asst. to EPO Superintendent Susan Meier – Chief Academic Officer	6-12	236	170	1167

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*.

As we work to reach our Demonstrable Indicator goals for this school year, the following information details some of the progress that has been achieved during quarter one.

Indicators that address ELA, Science and Math 3-8, and HS, Regents and graduation:

- We implemented a system of Key Measures in addition to our demonstrable improvement indicators to assist us in measuring those inputs we deem most essential to meeting our goals.
- New embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to the New York State Common Core Standards and also correlate with State assessments. These metrics will help us better assess how our students are doing individually and collectively.
- The total 5 year graduation rate goal of 63% is not on target to be met. Based on our current analysis, the highest possible graduation rate with the current total cohort = 57.5%

Attendance:

- Attendance data is examined weekly in a meeting between social workers, counselors, agencies, and the attendance clerk. Plans are developed, implemented, reported back on, and adjusted based on needs that are presented.

School Safety:

- To date, there have been no serious incidents reported for either the Lower or Upper Schools

Community School & Family and Community Engagement:

- As part of our plan to implement a Community School model, we have partnered with several agencies to support programs and services (such as Eastman Dental, Flaum Institute – vision, Villa of Hope- mental health,) that will be available for our scholars and eventually the larger community. We are also in the process of applying for several grants to support the expansion of these services to the community. Additionally, we have been meeting with a neighboring elementary school, neighborhood association and parents in an attempt to create a natural partnership that may increase the number of scholars who apply to attend EAST who live in the neighborhood.
- Family and community engagement for this quarter has consisted of progress towards meeting targets as measured by parent participation at events as well as parental involvement with writing of the Title 1 application and creation of the FACE budget, and planning for events for the school year.

Powers of the Receiver:

- The full school curriculum is being systematically reviewed and revised. We anticipate this process to continue for several years.
- We continue to screen and hire staff who subscribe to the "All In" philosophy of East. Where staff need support, we continue to provide appropriate training and coaching and needed. We have reviewed current positions and where applicable, made changes that best support the academic environment and promotes student learning.
- We continue to provide increased salaries which will allow us to retain and attract staff who exemplify qualities that support the academic and social culture we are building at EAST.
- We plan to continue analyzing the results of the strategies used when expanding the school day to determine if and how they have supported student learning. Adjustments based on this analysis will be implemented during the upcoming school year.

Professional Learning and Curriculum Writing:

- In addition to professional learning in other topics, summer 2016 also consisted of two full days of curriculum training using the UbD model with a focus on assessment which was followed up by five days of intensive curriculum writing for all classroom teachers.

Use of Technology:

- Currently we have 60 chrome carts in our building. An increase of 10 from last year. Most of the teachers are using google classroom as a learning management system for our scholars.

Budget:

- All expenditures from the approved 16-17 FS-10 are on target. These expenditures include professional salaries, purchased services, employee benefits, in direct costs and BOCES services. Last year, $ 428, 631 was not spent. We will file an amendment to request those funds to be carried over for this year.

Additional detailed information pertaining to each demonstrable improvement indicator and key strategies can be found within the remainder of this report.

Education Department. This document also serves as the Progress Review Report for Receivership schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) or School Innovation Fund (SIF) 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.

Part I – *Demonstrable Improvement Indicators*

LEVEL 1 Indicators

Please list the school's Level 1 indicators and complete all columns below. This information provides details about the likelihood of meeting the established targets. If you choose to send us data documents that you reference, simply send a sample page or example, rather than the entire document. Your analysis of your data is the focus.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Baseline	Target	What means did you use to measure whether or not you were making progress on meeting this target?	What was the outcome during this quarter?
#1 Priority Schools Make Yearly Progress (LS & US)		NA	Make Progress	We implemented a system of Key Measures in addition to our priority school indicators to assist us in measuring those inputs we deem most essential to meeting our priority school goals. These measures include 3-5 measures in each tenet area of the DTSDE and will be expanding on in the document. These measures will not be available in the first quarter. We also revised and expanded our five-week assessments system (common formative assessments or CFAs) to create parallel assessments. The Superintendent's Conference Day and the first early release half day were spent on revising and aligning those assessments to standards and rubrics. Additional assessments are described in standards areas below. Additionally in our Lower School, 2 week progress reports are available in all content areas.	n/a
#9 3-8 ELA All Students Level 2 and Above (LS)		17%	42%	All students grades 6-9 have a course called "Literacy" for 180 minutes per week in addition to their English language arts period. The literacy program selected is READ180 and System 44 through Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH). The system for assessment in READ180 is advancement on the HMR	September 2016 Reading Inventory Results: Grade 6 (20 students) • Advanced: 2 (10%) • Proficient: 2 (10%) • Basic: 6 (30%) • Below Basic: 7 (35%) • Not Tested: 3 (15%)

				Reading Inventory. Student growth on the Reading Inventory should correlate to NYS comprehensive assessments. Additionally, we teach the grades 6-8 modules on Engageny.org and utilize the engageny.org assessments within those modules, with support from EL Learning. Student performance on module assessments correlates to NYS comprehensive assessments. Also, new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments. Almost all students have an additional “support period” for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year. Additionally in our Lower School, 2 week progress reports are available in ELA and Literacy	Grade 7 (149 students) • Advanced: 8 (5.4%) • Proficient: 12 (8.1%) • Basic: 37 (24.8%) • Below Basic: 84 (56.4%) • Not Tested: 8 (5.4%) Grade 8 (154 students) • Advanced: 6 (3.9%) • Proficient: 18 (11.7%) • Basic: 37 (24.0%) • Below Basic: 86 (55.8%) • Not Tested: 7 (4.5%)
#15 3-8 Math All students Level 2 and Above (LS)		21%	41%	All students in grades 6-9 have an additional period of math for 180 minutes per week or	September 2016 NWEA Results:

				360 minutes per week total math. The mathematics curriculum selected is Connected Mathematics Project 3 (CMP3) Mathematics grades 6-8 which received extensive support through University of Rochester's Center for Reform and Professional Development. This curriculum contains embedded assessments which align to NYS CC standards. Additionally we administer the NWEA assessment to all students grade 6-8. Also, new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments. Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	Grade 6 (20 students) • Hi: 1 (5%) • HiAvg: 1 (5%) • Avg: 2 (10%) • LoAvg: 4 (20%) • Lo: 9 (45%) • Not Tested: 3 (15%) Grade 7 (149 students) • Hi: 1 (0.7%) • HiAvg: 11 (7.4%) • Avg: 21 (14.1%) • LoAvg: 35 (23.5%) • Lo: 71 (47.7%) • Not Tested: 10 (6.7%) Grade 8 (154 students) • Hi: 4 (2.6%) • HiAvg: 8 (5.2%) • Avg: 20 (18.2%) • LoAvg: 31 (20.1%) • Lo: 74 (48.1%) • Not Tested: 17 (11.0%)
#33 3-8 ELA All Students MGP (LS)		42.17	50.72	All students in grades 6-9 have a course called "Literacy" for 180 minutes per week in addition to their English language arts period. The literacy program selected is READ180 and System 44 through Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH). The system for assessment in READ180 is advancement on the HMR	See indicator #9.

				Reading Inventory. Student growth on the Reading Inventory should correlate to NYS comprehensive assessments. Additionally, we teach the grades 6-8 modules on Engageny.org and utilize the engageny.org assessments within those modules, with support from EL Learning. Student performance on module assessments correlates to NYS comprehensive assessments. Also, new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments. Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	
#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP (LS)		47.14	51.17	All students in grades 6-9 have an additional period of math for 180 minutes per week or 360 minutes per week total math. The mathematics curriculum selected is Connected Mathematics Project 3 (CMP3) Mathematics grades 6-8 which received extensive support through University of	See indicator #15.

				Rochester's Center for Reform and Professional Development. This curriculum contains embedded assessments which align to NYS CC standards. Additionally we administer the NWEA assessment to all students grade 6-8. Also, new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments. Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	
#85 Grades 4 and 8 Science All Students Level 3 and Above(LS)		31%	47%	This year we increased the time available for two science instructional coaches and sustained a high level of support from the University of Rochester's Center for Reform and Professional Development. We further have made a major shift in our curriculum model to increase attention on the NYS Science 8 assessment. Assessments in the course through Science 8 align to NYS standards and Science 8 state test.	**The initial 5-week assessment is to establish baseline and results are being compiled at this time.**

				Also, new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments. Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	
#5 School Safety (US)		59	<6 Serious Incidents	VADIR reporting system (PowerSchool)	LS = 0 reported to date US = 0 reported to date
#67 2012 Total Cohort Passing Math Regents (Score>=65) (US)		38%	59%	In addition to the previous additional period (double) for math in grade nine, the new CFA system and additional extensive curriculum support from the University of Rochester Center for Reform and Professional Development, Instructional coaches have been given increased release time to support curriculum, assessment, and instruction in mathematics. Upper school students are now screened in Support and receive targeted interventions that should be reflected in higher report card grades. Additional resources have been allocated to mathematics Regents review.	Students who first entered grade 9 in 2015-16 (2015 Total Cohort) passing any Math Regents with a score of 65 or above as of June 30, 2017. NYSAA and Safety Net rules not applied. All reported Regents exam scores used. As of September 2016: (177 in Total Cohort) • 80-100: 6 (3.4%) • 65-79: 89 (50.3%) • 55-64: 34 (19.2%) • 0-54: 22 (12.4%) • Not Taken: 26 (14.7%)
#69 2011 Total Cohort Passing ELA Regents (Score>=65) (US)		30%	53%	In addition to the previous additional period (Literacy) for English language arts in grade nine, the new CFA system and additional	Students who first entered grade 9 in 2014-15 (2014 Total Cohort) passing ELA Regents with a score of 65 or above as of June 30,

				extensive curriculum and instruction support from outside consultants, Instructional Coaches have been given increased release time to support curriculum, assessment, and instruction in mathematics. Upper school students are now screened in Support and receive targeted interventions that should be reflected in higher report card grades. Literacy services including small group instruction and access to READ180 have been expanded to grade 10 and therefore Reading Inventory data should have increased utility. Additional resources have been allocated to mathematics Regents review.	2017. NYSAA and Safety Net rules not applied. All reported Regents exam scores used. As of September 2016: (211 in Total Cohort) • 80-100: 1 (0.5%) • 65-79: 1 (0.5%) • 55-64: 1 (0.5%) • 0-54: 0 (0.0%) • Not Taken: 208 (98.6%)
#70 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate- All Students (US)		41%	57%	As written above, in addition, systems of support for all students to graduate on time include: • Support period(s) with certified teachers • universal screening and targeted interventions in Support • expanded literacy services to upper grades • schedule that includes 10 periods for additional time • volunteer system of additional tutors • CFA system to track student growth in seven periods across the year with results used for data cycle • collaborative planning time for all teachers to increase the quality of curriculum, instruction, assessments, and student interventions	Review of reported credits earned, Regents exam scores, and enrollment status. 2013 Total Cohort as of September 2016: 343 in Total Cohort Graduated = 19 students (5%) Still Active = 247 students (72%) • 16 or More Credits + 5 Regents with a 65 or above = 58 (16.9%) • 16 or More Credits + at least 3 Regents with a 65 or above = 117 (34.1%) • 11 or more Credits and 3-5 Regents with a 65 or above = 132 (38.5%) Dropped Out = 80 (23%)
#76 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate with Adv. Designation – All Students (US)		3%	11%	Review of reported credits earned, Regents exam scores, and counselor notes.	2013 Cohort as of September 2016: 343 in Total Cohort Number of students who this is possible for as projected by school counselors:

					• Schleining – No students • Dyer – 4 students • Burnell – 1 student • Diodato – 5 students • Terron - 0 • McGrath – 4 students • Gilbert - 2 16/343 = 4.7%
#88 Total Cohort 5-Year Grad Rate- All Students (US)		48%	63%	Review of reported credits earned, Regents exam scores, and enrollment status.	2012 Cohort (271 in Total Cohort) • Graduated = 109 (40.2%) • Still Active = 47 (17.3%) • Dropped Out = 115 (42.4%) Highest Possible Grad Rate with current Total Cohort = 57.5%

LEVEL 2 Indicators

Please list the school's Level 2 indicators and complete all columns below. This information provides details about the likelihood of meeting the established targets. If you choose to send us data documents that you reference, simply send a sample page or example, rather than the entire document. Your analysis of your data is the focus.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Baseline	Target	What means did you use to measure whether or not you were making progress on meeting this target?	What was the outcome during this quarter?
#2 Plan for and Implement Community School Model (LS)		N/A	The Community Engagement Team sets transformation targets for the school year	Increase of 3 % of scholars who live in the catchment area as part of conversion of East into a Community School. We have partnered with several agencies to support programs and services (such as Eastman Dental, Flaum Institute – vision, Villa of Hope- mental health,) that will be available for our scholars and eventually the larger community. We are also in the process of applying for several grants to support the expansion of these services to the	Will not know the outcome of this metric until 2nd or 3rd quarter. (Student enrollment for next year will not begin until at least March)

				community. Additionally, we have been meeting with a neighboring elementary school, neighborhood association and parents in an attempt to create a natural partnership that may increase the number of scholars who apply to attend EAST who live in the neighborhood. Information to be shared with the Community Engagement Team later this month.	
#6 Family and Community Engagement (DTSDE Tenet 6) (LS)		N/A	Developing Rating	**Parent Engagement** 5% increase in parental participation at CSE meetings (62.5% 2015-2016 which was an increase over the past) Have an average of at least 3 parent/family volunteers at each major school related event	Progress towards meeting targets was measured by parent participation at events as well as parental involvement with writing of the Title 1 application and creation of the FACE budget, and planning for events for the school year. At the end of September, we held an Open House/Agency Fair and the Community Forum on Receivership schools. There were approximately 90 families in attendance and three parent volunteers. We also showcased our "new" FACE room for parents beginning on the first day of school. It has been visited by almost 40 parents. On our first parent/teacher conference night and family dinner event, we saw 89 parents/guardians sign in on paper; teachers reported 91 ended up in their classrooms through an online sign up process. We had 4 parent volunteers, 1 community volunteer, and 1 volunteer from the UR. We served 185 meals at the family dinner. We also have held two FACE (CET) team meetings so far this year with an increase in parent attendance from last year. Finally, we were able to secure parent representatives for both our Lower and Upper school Governance Councils. 20 CSE meetings have been held in September and October with 95% attendance from parents/guardians. 1 student who was

					21 did not have a parent/guardian attend. 1 parent was not asked because of a history of abuse.
#10 3-8 ELA SWD Level 2 and Above (LS)		6%	19%	LS- 2 week progress reports in ELA and Literacy SRI scores	September 2016 SWD Reading Inventory Results: Grade 6 (1 student) • Advanced: 0 • Proficient: 0 • Basic: 1 (100%) • Below Basic: 0 • Not Tested: 0 Grade 7 (10 students) • Advanced: 0 • Proficient: 0 • Basic: 0 • Below Basic: 9 (90%) • Not Tested: 1 (10%) Grade 8 (25 students) • Advanced: 0 • Proficient: 0 • Basic: 2 (8.0%) • Below Basic: 23 (92.0%) • Not Tested: 0
#11-3-8 ELA Black Students Level 2 and Above (LS)		18%	37%	LS- 2 week progress reports in ELA and Literacy SRI scores	September 2016 Black Scholars Reading Inventory Results: Grade 6 (7 students) • Advanced: 0 • Proficient: 1 (14.3%) • Basic: 3 (42.9%) • Below Basic: 2 (28.6%) • Not Tested: 1 (14.3%) Grade 7 (91 students) • Advanced: 4 (4.4%) • Proficient: 7 (7.7%) • Basic: 26 (28.6%) • Below Basic: 51 (56.0%) • Not Tested: 3 (3.3%)

					Grade 8 (74 students) • Advanced: 3 (7.4%) • Proficient: 9 (12.2%) • Basic: 25 (33.8%) • Below Basic: 36 (48.6%) • Not Tested: 1 (1.4%)
#16 3-8 Math SWD Level 2 and Above (LS)		1%	20%	LS- 2 week progress reports in Math	September 2016 SWD NWEA Results Grade 6 (1 student) • Hi: 0 • HiAvg: 0 • Avg: 0 • LoAvg: 0 • Lo: 1 (100%) • Not Tested: 0 Grade 7 (10 students) • Hi: 0 • HiAvg: 0 • Avg: 0 • LoAvg: 1 (10%) • Lo: 8 (80%) • Not Tested: 1 (10%) Grade 8 (25 students) • Hi: 0 • HiAvg: 0 • Avg: 0 • LoAvg: 4 (16%) • Lo: 20 (80%) • Not Tested: 1 (4%)
#17 3-8 Math Black Students Level 2 and Above (LS)		24%	34%	LS- 2 week progress reports in Math	September 2016 Black Scholars NWEA Results: Grade 6 (7 students) • Hi: 1 (14.3%) • HiAvg: 0 • Avg: 0 • LoAvg: 1 (14.3%) • Lo: 4 (57.1%)

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>• Not Tested: 1 (14.3%)
Grade 7 (91 students)
• Hi: 1 (1.1%)
• HiAvg: 6 (6.6%)
• Avg: 11 (12.1%)
• LoAvg: 25 (27.5%)
• Lo: 44 (48.4%)
• Not Tested: 4 (4.4%)
Grade 8 (74 students)
• Hi: 1 (1.4%)
• HiAvg: 5 (6.8%)
• Avg: 11 (14.9%)
• LoAvg: 17 (23.0%)
• Lo: 34 (45.9%)
• Not Tested: 5 (6.8%)</td></tr>
<tr><td>#3 Student Attendance (US)</td><td></td><td>81%</td><td>89%</td><td>Average daily attendance</td><td>September 2016 Data
<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Upper School Enrollment by Grade and ADA</th></tr>
<tr><th>Grade</th><th>#</th><th>%</th><th>ADA</th></tr>
<tr><td>Grade 9</td><td>260</td><td>30.2%</td><td>80.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Grade 10</td><td>233</td><td>27.0%</td><td>83.0%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Grade 11</td><td>151</td><td>17.5%</td><td>85.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Grade 12</td><td>217</td><td>25.3%</td><td>79.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>861</td><td>100.0%</td><td>82.5%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>#21 HS ELA All Students Level 2 and Above (US)</td><td></td><td>70%</td><td>74%</td><td>Regents results; new embedded common formative assessments have been developed for this year which align to NYS CC standards and which also correlate with State assessments.</td><td>2013 Total Cohort HS ELA Results as of September 2016:
• Scoring at Level 4/5: 61 (17.84%)
• Scoring at Level 3: 48 (14.04%)
• Scoring at Level 2: 14 (4.09%)
• Scoring at Level 1: 37 (10.82%)
• Not Tested: 182 (53.22%)</td></tr>
</table>

				Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	
#27 HS Math All Students Level 2 and Above (US)		74%	80%	Regents results; Almost all students have an additional "support period" for 180 minutes per week. In the Support Room students receive assistance in the core subject areas. This year we added a Response to Intervention model which is in the process of being implemented in Support schoolwide grades 6-12. In this model, students participate in universal screeners with targeted interventions planned for groups and individuals based on those results. These are being developed for school year 2016-2017 and will not be implemented until part way through the year.	2013 Total Cohort HS Math Results as of September 2016: • Scoring at Level 4/5: 6 (1.75%) • Scoring at Level 3: 154 (45.03%) • Scoring at Level 2: 79 (23.10%) • Scoring at Level 1: 57 (16.67%) • Not Tested: 46 (13.45%)
#71 Total Cohort 4-Year Grad Rate- SWD Students (US)		17%	35%	Diploma status; transcript review	2013 Cohort as of September 2016: 48 SWDs in Total Cohort Graduated = 1 student (2.1%) Still Active = 46 students (95.8%)

					• 16 or More Credits + 5 Regents with a 65 or above = 4 (8.3%) • 16 or More Credits + at least 3 Regents with a 65 or above = 14 (29.2%) • 11 or more Credits and 3-5 Regents with a 65 or above = 14 (29.2%) Dropped Out = 1 student (2.1%) Through Safety Net Lens: • 16 or More Credits + 5 Regents with a 55 or above = 6 (12.5%) • 16 or More Credits + at least 3 Regents with a 55 or above = 19 (39.6%) • 11 or more Credits and 3-5 Regents with a 55 or above = 20 (41.7%)
#82 Drop Out Rate (US)		14%	<=7%	Enrollment status; weekly meetings to review average daily attendance, grades, and behavioral issues	2013 Cohort dropout info included with indicator #70. Annual Dropout Rate for 2016-2017 thus far is: 15/856 = 1.8% (856 = Enrollment on 9.1.16)

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 II – *Key Strategies*

Key Strategies Identify and analyze the implementation of all key strategies used this reporting period that are *not described above*, but are part of the approved SCEP, SIG or SIF plan.		
Identify key strategy.	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis of evidence supporting QR#1 status in reaching the goal identified in the plan. If you need to make a course correction during QR#2, please describe.

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		For school year 2016-2017 all teachers are engaged in monthly professional learning on the criteria for quality learning targets as per our school rubric and then receive scheduled and structured follow up work with their collaborative planning time (CPT) subject area peers through their Instructional Coach, including writing learning targets which inform instruction and result in increased learning. The school wide rubric is reflected in the walk through tool, through which administrators give feedback to teachers using our collective indicators with a focus on learning targets. Increased support for coaches (more release time) has resulted in more coaching cycles for every teacher to ensure all are meeting the criteria for evidence-based instruction
2.	Teachers and coaches collaborate daily focusing on evidence of student learning for the purpose of informing ongoing instruction, curriculum planning and giving feedback to students on their progress		Collaborative Planning Time includes 1) subject specific focus on planning curriculum and instruction led by the Instructional Coaches every other day for 50 minutes and 2) cross-curricular teams (IDCPT) meeting every other day for 50 minutes to determine which students are struggling and to plan interventions which are led by administrators. Co-planning during subject-specific CPTs to implement curriculum written Summer 2016 has resulted in uniform curriculum implementation for all teachers who teach the same course. Additionally, increased support for coaches (more release time) has resulted in more coaching cycles for every teacher to ensure all are meeting the criteria for evidence-based instruction. Evidence of progress includes observations of coaches during the coaching cycle; report outs from coaches at meetings every other day; co-walk throughs of administrators, the CAO and the instructional coaches of all department teachers; reports from administrators of interventions in IDCPT. Additional work will include using the data cycle starting with administration two or three of the new CFAs.
3.	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.		In addition to professional learning in other topics, Summer 2016 consisted of two full days of curriculum training using the UbD model with a focus on assessment which was followed up by five days of intensive curriculum writing for all classroom teachers. This year teachers improved their year-long overview, developed their five week common formative assessments, added a curriculum-embedded performance assessment, and continued to expand their fully developed UbD units. All products were collected and we are currently engaged in using consultants and specialists to evaluate and give feedback on those required products.
4.	Data will be collected and utilized to inform staff and support service providers to allow for adjustments to supports.		Attendance data is examined weekly in a meeting between social workers, counselors, agencies, and the attendance clerk. Plans are developed, implemented, reported back on, and adjusted based on needs that are presented. Referrals to student support center are collected and distributed to the specific staff member or agency to have their needs met. Care providers report back to the group on a regular basis to update case progress and status and make adjustments as needed. Further, Care Rooms are

			now active in the US and student visits are tracked and additional needs are identified by social workers in the room and referrals are made as required.
5.	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		We continue to engage in a system of evidence based practices, with a major emphasis on schoolwide approach to learning targets and a schoolwide curriculum development model. The Understanding by Design (UbD) curriculum model requires all elements to be aligned. October 7 Supt Conference Day we had teachers evaluate their CFAs to ensure they were aligned to standards and to the rubrics for assessing student performance. Learning targets criteria includes that students must be engaged in meaning making experiences (level of challenge). We will use the data cycle to review student performance on our new CFAs; the walk through tool to evaluate learning experiences observed in the classrooms; and the Learning Targets Rubric to rate teacher created learning targets. New this year also are checklists to evaluate the quality of performance assessments and CFAs and within a week we will have a checklist to evaluate rubrics.
6.	Student-Led Family Conferences		Student led conferences were piloted last year and are being rolled out for 2 of the 4 parent teacher conference nights this year. The first one is scheduled for December 8. We have developed a handbook for teachers and assessment tools for students and their families. We are in the process of training teachers and students for the December full school implementation.
7.	Family Group		The purpose of Family group is for all to feel a sense of belonging through positive relationships, to develop healthy habits and to empower all to have a voice. This year we added a co-"carent" (adult facilitator) to every group and reformed the groups. We further created a school-wide mission and vision statement. Applied to Family Group this reads: Family Group provides a forum where scholars exercise their tenacity through goal setting, participate in 'purposeful play' through team building activities and learn to advocate for self and others by expressing their thoughts and opinions and exhibiting leadership skills. Our data indicate that Family Group is making progress: 70% said Family group went well in our first year with another 17% saying it went OK; 76% of our students agreed and 19% of our students somewhat agreed that they experienced positive relationships between carents and scholars.

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 III – *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 and its sub-committees that may be charged with addressing specific components of CET Plan. Describe outcomes of the CET plan implementation, school support, and dissemination of information.

Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out
	FACE committee (CET) meetings are held monthly. Two meetings have been held this quarter. At the first meeting, the committee reviewed our response to last year's DIIR report and gave input. All stakeholders signed off on the response. The second meeting focused on reviewing quarterly report 1 and on upcoming FACE events. A planning subcommittee has met to ensure family events are planned and executed well. Open House/Agency Fair was our first event on September 29. 90 family members attended according to sign in sheets and 3 parent volunteers helped with sign ins and directing families to their child's classroom. We implemented a new event survey to document how parents/guardians/family members felt about the value of the event, whether they felt connected to the school, and whether the event was informative. 11 family members filled out the new event survey. 81% rated the event very good or excellent, 19% rated the event good or fair; 81% felt the event was extremely/very valuable in helping them feel more connected to the school, 19% felt it was somewhat valuable; 91% stated the staff was extremely/very informative, 9% stated staff was somewhat informative. Written comments indicated that one parent thought there were too many events on one night and though we should allot more time. Letters were sent to East families, a robocall was delivered, and notification was posted on our website. All information was translated into Spanish, including the event survey. The second major event was October 13 and was a combined parent teacher conference/parent workshop/family dinner night. We combined events based on our experiences last year that more families attended if there were more events to participate in. The second event, parent teacher conferences/family dinner/parent workshop, was held October 13. 91 families signed in either on paper or electronically. 26 people turned in the event survey: 92% rated the event excellent/very good, 8% good/fair; 96% felt the event was extremely/very valuable in helping them feel more connected to the school, 4% felt it was somewhat valuable; 96% stated the staff was extremely/very informative, 4% stated staff was somewhat informative. 18/26 people left comments about the event and/or what they would like to see done differently next time. Changes they would like to see included sending event flyers earlier, having class schedules available, making room numbers and maps available, having teachers in the same rooms they are assigned to so parents don't have to look for them, more time, later time so parents can come after work, all teachers on the same floor, chairs outside of classrooms so parents can sit while waiting, better signage. The remaining comments praised the school for a wonderful event. 185 meals were served for family dinner.

Powers of the Receiver

Describe this quarter's use of the School Receiver's powers (pursuant to those identified in CR §100.19). Discuss the goals and the impact of those powers.

Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out
	Review, alter or replace curriculum and program offerings of the school; the full school curriculum is being systematically reviewed and revised. We anticipate this process to continue for several years. We continue to screen and hire staff who subscribe to the "All In" philosophy of East. Where staff need support, we continue to provide appropriate training and coaching and needed. We have reviewed current positions and where applicable, made changes that best support the academic environment and promotes student learning. We continue to provide increased salaries which will allow us to retain and attract staff who exemplify qualities that support the academic and social culture we are building at EAST.

	We plan to continue analyzing the results of the strategies used when expanding the school day to determine if and how they have supported student learning. Adjustments based on this analysis will be implemented during the upcoming school year. At this point the EPO has not needed to supersede any decision, policy or regulation of the superintendent of schools, chief school officer, or of the board of education.

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 – *Instructional Technology Plan*

Instructional Technology Plan

Describe the current status of the implementation of the District Technology Plan pertinent to this school, as well as the use of technology in classrooms.

Key Components		Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis of evidence supporting QR#1 status in reaching the goal identified in the plan. If you need to make a course correction during QR#2, please describe.
1.	Current status of the District Technology Plan pertinent to this school	Yellow	Currently we have 60 chrome carts in our building. An increase of 10 from last year. (2-carts are specifically dedicated to just supporting our Read180 program; only allowing R180 to be active on those specific chromebooks) The carts this are currently supporting 90 teachers; with training happening in IDCPT to increase teacher training by department. This summer we held specific google training only available to our teachers and had 27 teachers receive the training including 7 new teachers.
2.	Use of technology in the classroom	Yellow	Most of the teachers are using google classroom as a learning management system for our scholars. Besides the use of google products, there are many teachers that also use additional free apps while teaching with the chromebooks; class-craft, orange slice, geogebra, quizlet, kahoot etc. Our music teacher uses an app that creates sheet music for her scholars as they play. There is a smartboard in every teaching space at East. Many teachers still feel comfortable using a document camera alongside their smartboards. Our 8-1-2 classroom uses Ipads specific their scholar's individual needs. There is a 3D printer available in our optics lab.

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 V – *Budget*

Budget Analysis

The LEA/school should propose expenditures that are reasonable and necessary to support the identified Receivership school's initiatives and goals. The LEA/school should provide appropriate and complete required budget elements identified below.

Expenditures	Status(R/Y/G)	If expenditures from the approved 16-17 FS-10 and Budget Narrative are on target, describe their impact with regard to the implementation of the plan. If there is a challenge with expenditures, discuss the course correction to be put in place for QR#2.
		All expenditures from the approved 16-17 FS-10 are on target. These expenditures include professional salaries, purchased services, employee benefits, in direct costs and BOCES services. The BOCES services provides a nurse and aide for our lower school students in grades 6-8. The professional salaries expenditure helps pay for the one hour of expanded learning time for all students during the school day. This will include doubling instructional time in math and literacy in lower school and to provide more intensive academic support for all students. Students in grades 10-12 will have additional opportunities for college and career preparation.
		Currently the East budget is operating with a small surplus which we anticipate continuing for the remainder of the school year. Last year, $ 428, 631 was not spent. We will file an amendment to request those funds to be carried over for this year.

Part VI: *Best Practices (Optional)*

Best Practices

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 that has resulted in significant improvements in student performance, instructional practice, student/family engagement, and/or school climate. 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 a best practice in place this quarter in terms of its impact on the implementation of the plan. Discuss the analysis of evidence to determine its success. Discuss the possibility of replication in other schools.
1.	Focus on Evidence Based Practices	Alignment between curriculum, instruction, assessment, walk throughs, coaching cycles, feedback, faculty meetings, and professional development, with long range (five year) plan systematically developed over time. Includes an annual focus and relationship to Key Measures. Can be replicated.
2.	Support Model	Certificated teachers, ten period schedule, embedded support periods, coordination with core content classes. Can be replicated.
3.	Family Group	Every adult serves with a colleague as "Carents" (People that care, like parents) to approximately 10 scholars. They meet each day for 30 minutes to discuss life, academics, restorative practices and school spirit. Can be replicated.
4.	Teacher leadership model and collaborative planning time	Instructional coaches in all subject areas who 1)lead curriculum development 2) meet every other day with department to support instruction and planning within the school day 3)lead assessment writing and implementation and 4) participate in recurring coaching cycles with all teachers in the department, Can be replicated.

Part VII – *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): Shaun C. Nelms
Signature of Receiver:
Date: 10/31/2016

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 has had the opportunity to review, and update if necessary, its 2016-2017 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print): Reneé Judkins
Signature of CET Representative:
Date: 10-28-16