



Draft

# Receivership Quarterly Report

*2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter - November 1, 2015 to January 15, 2016*

| School                                     | School BEDS Code       | District  | Status (R/Y/G)       | SIG/SIF/SCEP Cohort                                    |
|--|------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| 14K071: Juan Morel Campos Secondary School | 331400011071           | NYC GEOG DIST #14 - BROOKLYN  | Y                    | SIG Cohort 4   |
| Superintendent *(Chancellor)               | School Principal       | Additional District Personnel Responsible for Program Oversight and Report Validation   | Grade Configuration  | Number of Students *(Unaudited Register as of 1/15/16) |
| Carmen Fariña, Chancellor                  | Eric Fraser, Principal | Aimee Horowitz, Executive Superintendent for Renewal Schools<br>Alicja Winnicki, Superintendent<br>Sharon Rencher, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor | 06,07,08,09,10,11,12 | 618  |

### 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. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public, and limit the summary to no more than 500 words.

The new State Receivership law requires that “Persistently Struggling Schools” be given an initial one-year period to improve student performance, and “Struggling Schools” be given an initial two-year period to improve student performance. The State Education Department designated 62 New York City schools as Struggling or Persistently Struggling, which requires them to be placed in receivership under the Chancellor’s direction.



As part of this Administration's commitment to ensure that all of our students receive a high-quality education, Mayor Bill de Blasio and Chancellor Carmen Fariña launched the Renewal School program, which included a \$150 million commitment to provide unprecedented resources to turnaround 94 of our most challenged schools. Fifty of the 62 state-designated Struggling and Persistently Struggling Schools are in the City's Renewal Program. The remaining 12 are receiving similar resources and all 62 benefit from State-mandated supports.

Renewal Schools are implementing significant interventions to accelerate student performance and help close achievement gaps. Those interventions include an additional five hours of expanded learning time; working with partner community-based organizations to provide rich after-school programming; and, increased professional development for school leaders, teachers and other school-based staff through coaches and partnerships with institutions such as Teachers College at Columbia University. Additionally, each Renewal School is now a Community School, offering wraparound services to our students and their families.

The education reforms in the Renewal School Program have a strong record of driving improvement. First, strong, effective leadership is critical in initiating and sustaining turnaround efforts in struggling schools. Since the launch of the Renewal School Program, we have dispatched teams of experienced principals and assistant principals to strengthen leadership and to provide expertise these schools need to help change direction. Where it is needed, we have and will continue to replace school leadership to help transform a school and boost student achievement.

Second, increased high-quality professional development provides teachers and principals targeted support to develop their craft and improve classroom instruction practices. We are investing in deepening teachers' skills through professional development at every grade.

Third, expanded learning time extends the school day by one hour each day and enables struggling schools to create more time for core subject instruction, tailored academic support for students' unique needs, and enrichment activities provided in collaboration with community partners. Schools now have a more seamless school day that reinforces core subject material while providing students with helpful strategies and services that support active learning.

Finally, the Community School model, which incorporates academic and social services into the school environment, provides services to students and communities beyond the classroom needs, with the goal of helping students focus and stay on task during the school day. To oversee these efforts we established the Office of Community Schools and the Office of Renewal Schools. We also hired a team of district-based Directors of School Renewal (DSR) to support Renewal schools. DSRs participate in monthly professional development sessions. These professional development sessions focus on building capacity and facility in the areas of continuous school improvement processes,



instructional and leadership coaching, data driven progress monitoring, and establishing systems and structures for sharing best practices within and across their schools.

All Community Schools in the City have been matched with a lead community-based organization and have hired a community school director - a new leader in the school whose primary responsibility is to coordinate partnerships and interventions.

Through these partnerships, we are able to provide more time for learning, academic support, enrichment activities, health services and more. For example, some schools might have a food pantry so that hunger does not distract from learning. Others schools might have a physician's office on site to keep kids healthy so they do not miss school. Still others might offer English classes for families so parents can help kids with their homework. We are confident that these interventions and new programs will make this school year and those to come successful experiences, which will drive student achievement in our struggling schools.

We are closely tracking indicators that schools are moving in the right direction. Across Districts 1-32, attendance has increased from 91.5 percent in the 2013-14 school year to 92.1 percent in the 2014-15 school year and is at an all-time high. Citywide, we also saw a modest test score improvement over the past year, and while we are proud of this, we have much more work to do to ensure every child is reading on grade level and every student is graduating as a productive member of society.

Ensuring families are actively engaged in this work is critical. This summer we knocked on the doors of 35,000 families of Renewal School students to tell them what it meant for their school to be a Community School. We held family nights in all Community Schools in September to welcome families back to school, and get suggestions and feedback, and we're offering a 3-day training on Dr. Karen Mapp's Dual Capacity framework for all community schools. The training will be offered to teams from each school that are comprised of administration, parents, teachers and CBO staff.

The State-mandated receivership hearings have played a critical part in our larger goal of involving families in their children's education. The DOE held public meetings at all 62 Struggling and Persistently Struggling schools to discuss receivership and its requirements, and the Renewal Schools Program. We were pleased to hear directly from parents, students, and community members about what their schools need to improve to be successful. We recognize that families are key partners in achieving academic excellence for their children, and family engagement will continue to be a key element in these efforts.

All stakeholders at Juan Morel Campos Secondary School are committed to the continued improvement and the success of our students academically, socially and emotionally. Collectively, students, staff and families contribute to a school community that is safe and conducive



to learning. We have aligned our resources to build systems that are informed by input and feedback from the School Leadership Team (SLT) and Community Engagement Team (CET), and implemented by school staff and leadership, which meet regularly to evaluate progress based on qualitative and quantitative data.

Juan Morel Campos Secondary School (JMCSS) is a Title I SWP school located in the South Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn, NY and serves students and families who mostly reside in the communities surrounding the school, Williamsburg, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and Bushwick. The student body is 82% Hispanic, 15% Black, and 3% White and boys and girls make up roughly equal percentages of the population. The school is completing its third full year of support under a federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) in the Transformation model. This grant has helped to augment existing programs and provides for additional resources, coaching, and professional learning opportunities. The school tends to diverse needs and is proud of the adult teams who work tirelessly to individualize their efforts to meet the many social, health, and academic needs of the student body while holding them to high expectations academically. The school's vision and mission statements encapsulate this delicate balance between meeting students where they are developmentally as social and academic beings while holding all students to high expectations for post-secondary and adulthood outcomes.

An analysis of available data indicates that JMCSS is making progress towards meeting its Demonstrable Improvement Indicators. To monitor middle school student progress in ELA and math, students take interim Performance based assessments aligned to the CCLS as well as multiple choice assessments (DRP and Scantron). January results indicate that students are on track to meet the academic targets set. In grades 9-12, January results indicate that there needs to be a focused effort in preparing students for upcoming Regents exams as well as increased opportunities for students to take credit-bearing courses during Extended Learning time.

JMCSS has several programs in place to assist with College readiness. Additional Advances Placement courses in Literature and Composition are being offered as well as a comprehensive choice of Arts enrichment programs. The school is also partnering with CUNY "At Home in College" which supports Seniors in making the transition to the post-secondary setting. Student agency is being developed through the high school's participation in the Peer Enabled Restructured Classroom (PERC) program which has initiated the structuring of classrooms with students as one-on-one tutors and small group instructional leaders in classrooms beyond the scope of PERC.

School culture has made significant progress; as restorative practice grows throughout the school community, students are encouraged to voice their opinions in a structured environment. This is done through their partnership with Grand Street Settlement the Community Based Organization. Other partnerships such as Outward Bound, have assisted in the creation of "CREW" which is an advisory group of 8 and 9th graders who work with the implementation of Restorative Circles, a strategy used as an alternative to suspension.



The Parent Association works with the CBO to organize family outreach, and activities for the entire family. A team of staff, parents and students generate a public calendars of events, including spirit events, fundraising, and professional learning for parents. This has increase the number of opportunities to actively support families’ personal and professional development.

**Attention** – This document is intended to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to [OISR@NYSED.gov](mailto:OISR@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). The Quarterly Report in its entirety must be posted on the district web-site.

DRAFT



**Part I – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators**

| <b>LEVEL 1 – Indicators</b>   |                |            |            |   |         |               |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
|---|----------------|------------|------------|---|---------|---------------|--|---------|--|--|----------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|---------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Please list the school’s Level 1 indicator 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   |         |               |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| 3-8 ELA Growth Percentile   | Y              | 43.5       | 44.5       | <p>Highlighted in yellow are the numbers that correspond to indicators on the quarterly report. The other numbers are included here to provide further evidence and explanation for the Analysis/Report column.</p> <p>Status: The analysis of this data is that the school is “on track” in ELA.</p> <p>ELA</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Level I</th> <th colspan="3">Level II</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Oct % prof</th> <th>Jan % prof</th> <th>% improved</th> <th>Oct avg</th> <th>Jan avg</th> <th>Change in avg</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 6</td> <td>82%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>+0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 7</td> <td>77%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>+0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 8</td> <td>90%</td> <td>69%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>-0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>81%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>-0.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |         |               |  | Level I |  |  | Level II |  |  | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg | Jan avg | Change in avg | Grade 6 | 82% | 85% | 23% | 2.3 | 2.7 | +0.4 | Grade 7 | 77% | 96% | 6% | 2.7 | 2.6 | +0.1 | Grade 8 | 90% | 69% | 14% | 2.7 | 2.1 | -0.6 | Total | 81% | 78% | 14% | 2.6 | 2.3 | -0.3 |
|   | Level I        |            |            | Level II  |         |               |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
|   | Oct % prof     | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg   | Jan avg | Change in avg |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Grade 6   | 82%            | 85%        | 23%        | 2.3   | 2.7     | +0.4          |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Grade 7   | 77%            | 96%        | 6%         | 2.7   | 2.6     | +0.1          |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Grade 8   | 90%            | 69%        | 14%        | 2.7   | 2.1     | -0.6          |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Total   | 81%            | 78%        | 14%        | 2.6   | 2.3     | -0.3          |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| 3-8 ELA Percent Level 2 & Above   | Y              | 36%        | 37%        | <p>Highlighted in yellow are the numbers that correspond to indicators on the quarterly report. The other numbers are included here to provide further evidence and explanation for the Analysis/Report column.</p> <p>Status: The analysis of this data is that the school is “on track” in ELA.</p>   |         |               |  |         |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |         |     |     |    |     |     |      |         |     |     |     |     |     |      |       |     |     |     |     |     |      |



|                            |            |            |            | <p>ELA</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Level I</th> <th colspan="3">Level II</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Oct % prof</th> <th>Jan % prof</th> <th>% improved</th> <th>Oct avg</th> <th>Jan avg</th> <th>Change in avg</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 6</td> <td>82%</td> <td>85%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>+0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 7</td> <td>77%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>+0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 8</td> <td>90%</td> <td>69%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>-0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>81%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>-0.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |               | Level I       |  |  | Level II |  |  | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg | Jan avg | Change in avg | Grade 6 | 82% | 85% | 23% | 2.3           | 2.7           | +0.4      | Grade 7 | 77% | 96% | 6%  | 2.7 | 2.6 | +0.1       | Grade 8 | 90% | 69% | 14% | 2.7 | 2.1 | -0.6      | Total | 81% | 78% | 14% | 2.6 | 2.3 | -0.3       |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---|---------------|---------------|--|--|----------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|
|                            | Level I    |            |            | Level II  |               |               |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
|                            | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg   | Jan avg       | Change in avg |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 6                    | 82%        | 85%        | 23%        | 2.3   | 2.7           | +0.4          |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 7                    | 77%        | 96%        | 6%         | 2.7   | 2.6           | +0.1          |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 8                    | 90%        | 69%        | 14%        | 2.7   | 2.1           | -0.6          |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Total                      | 81%        | 78%        | 14%        | 2.6   | 2.3           | -0.3          |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| 3-8 Math Growth Percentile | Y          | 45.1       | 46.1       | <p>Highlighted in yellow are the numbers that correspond to indicators on the quarterly report. The other numbers are included here to provide further evidence and explanation for the Analysis/Report column.</p> <p>Status: School analysis of these has determined that the school is “on track” to meet all goals, with the possible exception of math proficiency. <b>This is</b> because the changes in proficiency show a lot of variation across the grades. For example, Grade 8 shows essentially no change while Grade 7 shows out-sized improvement.</p> <p>Math</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Level I</th> <th colspan="3">Level II</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Oct % prof</th> <th>Jan % prof</th> <th>% improved</th> <th>Oct avg</th> <th>Jan avg</th> <th>Change in avg</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 6</td> <td>9%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>34 out of 100</td> <td>36 out of 100</td> <td>+2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 7</td> <td>12%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>33</td> <td>58</td> <td>+25 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 8</td> <td>2%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>21</td> <td>23</td> <td>+2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>7%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>29</td> <td>39</td> <td>+10 points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |               | Level I       |  |  | Level II |  |  | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg | Jan avg | Change in avg | Grade 6 | 9%  | 25% | 27% | 34 out of 100 | 36 out of 100 | +2 points | Grade 7 | 12% | 72% | 84% | 33  | 58  | +25 points | Grade 8 | 2%  | 5%  | 22% | 21  | 23  | +2 points | Total | 7%  | 31% | 52% | 29  | 39  | +10 points |
|                            | Level I    |            |            | Level II  |               |               |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
|                            | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg   | Jan avg       | Change in avg |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 6                    | 9%         | 25%        | 27%        | 34 out of 100   | 36 out of 100 | +2 points     |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 7                    | 12%        | 72%        | 84%        | 33  | 58            | +25 points    |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Grade 8                    | 2%         | 5%         | 22%        | 21  | 23            | +2 points     |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |
| Total                      | 7%         | 31%        | 52%        | 29  | 39            | +10 points    |  |  |          |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |     |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |            |         |     |     |     |     |     |           |       |     |     |     |     |     |            |



| 3-8 Math Percent Level 2 & Above | Y          | 30%        | 31%        | <p>Highlighted in yellow are the numbers that correspond to indicators on the quarterly report. The other numbers are included here to provide further evidence and explanation for the Analysis/Report column.</p> <p>Status: School analysis of these has determined that the school is on track to meet all goals, with the possible exception of math proficiency. This is because the changes in proficiency show a lot of variation across the grades. For example, Grade 8 shows essentially no change while Grade 7 shows out-sized improvement.</p> <p>Math</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1026 662 1969 954"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Level I</th> <th colspan="3">Level II?</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Oct % prof</th> <th>Jan % prof</th> <th>% improved</th> <th>Oct avg</th> <th>Jan avg</th> <th>Change in avg</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 6</td> <td>9%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>34 out of 100</td> <td>36 out of 100</td> <td>+2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 7</td> <td>12%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>33</td> <td>58</td> <td>+25 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 8</td> <td>2%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>21</td> <td>23</td> <td>+2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>7%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>29</td> <td>39</td> <td>+10 points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |               | Level I       |  |  | Level II? |  |  | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg | Jan avg | Change in avg | Grade 6 | 9% | 25% | 27% | 34 out of 100 | 36 out of 100 | +2 points | Grade 7 | 12% | 72% | 84% | 33 | 58 | +25 points | Grade 8 | 2% | 5% | 22% | 21 | 23 | +2 points | Total | 7% | 31% | 52% | 29 | 39 | +10 points |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---|---------------|---------------|--|--|-----------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|----|-----|-----|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|------------|---------|----|----|-----|----|----|-----------|-------|----|-----|-----|----|----|------------|
|                                  | Level I    |            |            | Level II?   |               |               |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
|                                  | Oct % prof | Jan % prof | % improved | Oct avg   | Jan avg       | Change in avg |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| Grade 6                          | 9%         | 25%        | 27%        | 34 out of 100   | 36 out of 100 | +2 points     |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| Grade 7                          | 12%        | 72%        | 84%        | 33  | 58            | +25 points    |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| Grade 8                          | 2%         | 5%         | 22%        | 21  | 23            | +2 points     |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| Total                            | 7%         | 31%        | 52%        | 29  | 39            | +10 points    |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| 4-Year Graduation Rate           | Y          | 0.48       | 49%        | <p>Graduation rate and student growth needs to increase. Some adjustments will be made once the mid-year data has been revealed. Teams will revisit the instructional focus, and align the present student data to their plans and adjust lesson plans to meet the needs of their students. Based on the above data, the administration is hopeful that an increased number of students will pass the math and English Regents needed to graduate. This will support both the 4 and 5 year graduation rate. Extended Learning Time (ELT) and tutoring is being targeted to students who are behind in Regents/credit accumulation.</p>  |               |               |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |
| 5-Year Graduation Rate           | Y          | 56%        | 57%        | <p>Graduation rate and student growth needs to increase. Some adjustments will be made once the mid-year data has been revealed. Teams will revisit the instructional focus, and align the present student data to their plans and adjust lesson plans to meet the needs of their students. Based on the above data, the</p>  |               |               |  |  |           |  |  |            |            |            |         |         |               |         |    |     |     |               |               |           |         |     |     |     |    |    |            |         |    |    |     |    |    |           |       |    |     |     |    |    |            |



|   |          |       |       |  |
|---|----------|-------|-------|--|
|   |          |       |       | administration is hopeful that an increased number of students will pass the math and English Regents needed to graduate. This will support both the 4 and 5 year graduation rate. ELT and tutoring is being targeted to students who are behind in Regents/credit accumulation.   |
| College Readiness Index                       | <b>G</b> | 17.9% | 18.9% | <p>Programs in place to assist with College readiness are:<br/>                     Expanded learning time- for credit, credit recovery.<br/>                     Algebra 2, Regents preparation. Additionally, the high school’s participation in the Peer Enabled Restructured Classroom (PERC) program has initiated an ongoing professional focus on structuring classrooms with students as one-on-one tutors and small group instructional leaders in classrooms beyond the scope of PERC. As the program’s site explains:</p> <p>“The Peer Enabled Restructured Classroom (PERC) transforms students who have yet to meet college- ready benchmarks into scholars by placing them in the role of teacher. In our restructured math and science classrooms, Teaching Assistant Scholars (TASs) work under the guidance of a teacher to instruct small groups of their peers. Along the way, the TASs learn the material, become academic role models, and build the skills they need to succeed in college.</p> <p>Our program helps students, teachers, and administrators achieve the outcomes they want. PERC classrooms still have one teacher for every 30-plus kid. However, inside a PERC classroom there are also four to five TAS, drawn from the population of students who passed the state exams in science or math but have not yet achieved college-ready benchmarks.”</p> |
| English Regents Percent Pass By Year 3        | Y        | 39%   | 40%   | Currently @ 38.7% with an additional 20 students who scored between 55 and 64% according to the data defined on the New Vision Student Sorter. These students are provided with additional support through expanded learning time, and Saturday Academy  |
| Grade 4 and 8 Science Percent Level 3 & Above | Y        | 10%   | 11%   | This is an area in need of improvement. Coaching for the science teachers is providing through Generation Ready, and re-enforced through MSQI literacy   |



|                                     |   |      |                        |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|------|------------------------|---|
|                                     |   |      |                        | initiative for middle school students. These teachers are also provided support through the peer collaborative teacher and model teachers.  |
| Make Priority School Progress       | Y | N/A  | Meet progress criteria | Graduation rate and student growth needs to increase. Some adjustments will be made once the mid-year data has been revealed. Teams will revisit the instructional focus, and align the present student data to their plans and adjust lesson plans to meet the needs of their students.  |
| Math Regents Percent Pass By Year 2 | Y | 29%  | 30%                    | Currently @ 17.3% and additional 20 students who scored between 55 and 64%, according to the data defined on the New Vision Student Sorter. These students are provided with additional support through expanded learning time, and Saturday academy.   |
| School Survey - Safety              | Y | 2.96 | 3.00                   | As restorative practice grows throughout the school community, students are encouraged to voice their opinions in a structured environment. This is done through their partnership with Grand Street Settlement the CBO. Work habit rubric designed by the middle school staff. Other partnerships such as Outward Bound, who assisted in the creation of "CREW" which is an advisory group of 8 and 9 <sup>th</sup> graders who work with the implementation of restorative circles. |

DRAFT



**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   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Average ELA Proficiency Rating      | Y              | 2.01      | 2.02      | Middle school teachers examine data through coaching provided by Eskolta. These coaches provide on and off-site professional learning, assisting the teachers in looking at current data and developing lessons to accommodate the needs of their diverse students. Once this data is gathered they receive additional support from an MSQI coach as well as Math coach from Generation Ready. Also ELT will include Just Words and testing scaffolds to support students who are struggling. See data above. |
| Framework: Supportive Environment   | Y              | 3.04      | 3.08      | A collaborative effort continues to support student attendance and engagement. Adults in the high school have been assigned a “go to” adult who is there to support their social and emotional well-being. Outward Bound, BRIC, Ramapo have developed programs that interest students through art, and character building activities.   |
| Implement Community School Model    | Y              | N/A       | Implement | Grand Street Settlement has a full-time director of community based organization based full-time at Juan Morel Campos. The CBO provides support during ELT, and additional support after ELT with social, athletic and arts activities. The CBO has also provided family activities such as ice skating trips, shopping adventures, and attendance incentives.  |
| Performance Index on State ELA Exam | Y              | 42        | 44        | Students will be provided with additional targeted support during ELT. They will be grouped according to academic performance. The additional support will be   |



|   |  |       |               |  |            |   |
|---|--|-------|---------------|--|------------|---|
|   |  |       |               | provided by Just Words, math remediation, and ESL strategies for the ENL student. See data above.  |            |   |
| Progress Toward Graduation-Years 2 and 3    | Y  | 30.1% | 31.1%         | Credit accumulation and student growth on Regents exams needs to increase. Some adjustments will be made once the mid-year data has been revealed. Teams will revisit the instructional focus, and align the present student data to their plans and adjust lesson plans to meet the needs of their students. Based on the above data, the administration is hopeful that an increased number of students will pass the math Regents needed to graduate. ELT and tutoring is being targeted to students who are behind in Regents/credit accumulation. |            |   |
| Provide 200 Hours of Extended Learning Time | G  | N/A   | Implement     | Expanded learning time is 5 hours per week, plus Saturday academy. All students are programmed according to need, and it is compensatory for all students to attend. The middle school students are engaged in ELA and Math remediation and enrichment through debate and project based social studies activities. The high school students are engaged in regents preparation, credit recovery and college readiness activities.  |            |   |
| Regents Completion Rate                     | Y  | 31.1% | 32.1%         | Student growth on Regents exams needs to increase. Some adjustments will be made once the mid-year data has been revealed. Teams will revisit the instructional focus, and align the present student data to their plans and adjust lesson plans to meet the needs of their students. The administration is hopeful that an increased number of students will pass the Regents needed to graduate. ELT and tutoring is being targeted to students who are behind in Regents exams.   |            |   |
| <b>Green</b>                                | Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <u>with impact</u> . |       | <b>Yellow</b> | Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.  | <b>Red</b> | Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required. |



## Part II – Key Strategies

### Key Strategies

As *applicable*, identify any key strategies being implemented during the current reporting period that are *not described above*, but are embedded in the approved intervention plan/budget and instrumental in meeting projected school improvement outcomes.

| List the Key Strategy from your approved Intervention Plan (SIG, SIF, SCEP or Out of Time).  | Status of each strategy (R/Y/G) | 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.   |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <p>1. <b>Rigorous Instruction</b><br/> <b>Goals:</b><br/>                     During the 2015-2016 school year, school leaders and teachers will collaborate to enhance the existing Common-Core aligned curricula for all students, and implement more student-centered pedagogy, to support our target of increasing the average student proficiency rates to 2.09 for ELA and 2.04 for math, as evidenced by data from the NYS ELA and math exams, and our target of increasing the Regents Completion Rate to 34.8%, all by July 2016.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school will focus curriculum design and revisions on ensuring that appropriate entry points and scaffolds are in place for sub-groups like ELLs and SWDs.</li> <li>Inquiry teams will focus common planning time to design experiences and materials to help students grow with regard to the “Top Ten Skills” identified during their inquiry cycles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b></p> | <p>Y</p>                        | <p>Significant support is offered to the instruction of social studies, math, science and literacy through the various partners at Juan Morel Campos. Additional support is provided through Creative Solution about the integration of technology into classroom lessons. Teachers are working in PLC inquiry groups examining student data and making adjustments when needed. Teachers worked in inquiry cycles to identify the “Top Ten Skill” aligned with the CCLS that students were struggling with. Instruction as adjusted to target these skills, and teach, test and re-teach if necessary. As evident in the above charts growth has been noted in areas of ELA. An enrichment unit in the area of social studies has been developed to challenge these students to work to their potential. This final product will be presented to community council in the spring.</p> |



|    |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|--|
|    | Classroom Implementation of Curricula/Writing Strategies<br>Planning and Refinement of Written CCLS-aligned Curricula to Provide Access to All Students   |   |  |
| 2. | <p><b>Supportive Environment</b><br/> <b>Goals:</b><br/>                 By June 2016, collaborative efforts to support and engage students will improve student attendance to 81.4% (from 79.8) in the high school and 89.8% (from 88.2%) in the middle school.<br/>                 Additionally, by June 2016, the percentage of second and third year high school students on track to graduate with a Regents diploma will increase to 43.9% (from 30.1%).</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school will continue to work with Eskolta and Outward Bound experts to determine the best ways of engaging students and to design a progression of activities that supports their character and social behavior development.</li> <li>• The school intends that the additional restorative practices will provide students with more proactive supports for their academic, social, and emotional needs.</li> <li>• Staff who have participated in restorative practice initiatives over the last two years will take increased responsibility for developing the capacity of their peers.</li> <li>• Attendance systems and structures</li> </ul> | Y | <p>This year the New Vision Student Sorter has assisted in examining attendance for all students. Through the attendance team, and Borough Field Support, student attendance data is visible to all. The attendance team has revised systems to support attendance growth. Incentives will be increased, scanning will be increased and attendance will be taken at the beginning of every period. Also the CBO director is looking into a technology component that will end a text to guardians period to period of daily attendance.</p> <p>Restorative justice programs, restorative circles and proactive structures for managing challenging behaviors are continuing here at the school. The impact is that referral and suspension numbers are on the decline. This is as a result of Outward Bound and Ramapo for Children. The supportive environment is further developed through the ELT program. Upon analysis of data students are assigned to ELT classes according to need or enrichment activities.</p> |



|           |  |          |   |
|-----------|--|----------|---|
| <p>3.</p> | <p><b>Collaborative Teachers</b><br/> <b>Goals:</b><br/>                 Teacher teams will met on a regular basis from September 2015-June 2016 to analyze student performance data and students work samples with a focus on improving teacher practice as evidenced by an increase in the average teacher proficiency from 2.58 to 2.82 on Danielson's "Component 3d".</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school will retain the inquiry facilitator role, however, we will alter its structure for inquiry, moving to teams that balance department and grade level interests.</li> <li>• The inquiry facilitator will continue to be integral to supporting this work and reporting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b><br/>                 Job-embedded Instructional Coaching</p> | <p>Y</p> | <p>To assist in engaging teachers in a collaborative inquiry the professional learning calendar has been designed to meet the needs of the staff and students. The teachers have been provided with professional development through Eskolta in the area of inquiry, discussing setting norms, using protocols for looking at student work and understanding data driven inquiry cycle. In the cycle of inquiry teacher teams work together to align their instructional practices and develop assessments and collecting and analyzing formative assessment data. Grade level team meetings are once a month, in addition to PLC's. In addition, peer collaborative and model teachers work with PLC's on targeted skills and strategies to enhance their practice. These teachers are provided with leadership through the Department of Education lead teacher. There needs to be more work in the area of inquiry to increase academic performance.</p> |
| <p>4.</p> | <p><b>Effective School Leadership</b><br/> <b>Goals:</b><br/>                 During the 2015-16 school year the school leader will ensure that the organizational and supervisory structure of the school and allocation of resources create opportunities for staff and students to work effectively to improve the 4-year and 6-year graduation rates; specifically, the 4-year rate for Cohort R will improve to 60.1% and the 6-year rate for Cohort P to 64.7%.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p>  | <p>Y</p> | <p>The Principal is provided with one on one coaching from a mentor principal. He is also part of the Model Principal cohort of the District, and is supported through the Renewal Office with professional development opportunities.</p> <p>The graduation rate benchmarks for this measure will be achieved when the school successfully organizes the student program and professional learning opportunities to have a dramatic impact on student achievement. For this to be accomplished, the student program must optimize opportunities for students to accumulate necessary credits and prepare for required exit exams (Regents). The school leaders will work to align their own professional learning plans for teachers to key student achievement and teacher performance indicators. This includes</p>  |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school will continue to use coaching reports and periodic check-ins to ensure alignment to school wide needs and goals.</li> <li>• Leaders will monitor student achievement data, survey data, and teacher observation data as indicators of a coach’s impact.</li> <li>• An online survey tool will be developed to more regularly collect feedback and observations from teachers participating in professional development with each coach or partner organization.</li> </ul> | <p>observation report data aligned with the rated components of the Danielson “Framework”, literacy, math, and content area skills monitoring, course pass rates, Regents completion rates, and credit accumulation data. Furthermore, all partnering organizations and coaches have aligned their work plans to these achievement and teacher performance indicators that will combine to positively impact graduation rates. In order to monitor the progress of how coaching is impacting student achievement the school’s leaders regularly check-in with coaches to monitor work plan alignment to goals and overall implementation.</p> <p>For example, the school’s leadership recently conducted a series of planning sessions with a coach from the NYC Department of Education’s Middle School Quality Initiative (MSQI) to use student performance data on a reading assessment to revise student groups and supports during its ELT program. The tiering of students that resulted from this data analysis has resulted in the targeted application of specific reading interventions as the Spring semester gets underway. This type of mid-year action plan assessment and adjustments based on mid-year student performance are underway in the middle and high school based on the latest school wide inquiry data. The school has also completed an assessment of mid-year teacher performance data to assess and re-direct the professional learning plan and coaching supports for teachers.</p> <p>The school leverages a differentiated set of professional learning structures to pursue school wide consistency and coherence and individualized support for each teacher. This ensures that professional learning is authentic for all teachers as a collective body and as individuals. To ensure that professional development impacts student achievement the school organizes its professional learning opportunities based on student and teacher performance indicators. For example, because many teachers struggled with component 3d of the Danielson “Framework” in the 2014-15 school year the school identified assessment design as a major element of its instructional focus, which in turn drives professional learning topics. The more direct connection with student</p> |
|--|---|



|    |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|--|
|    |   |   | <p>achievement in the professional learning plan results from the inclusion of an inquiry calendar and school wide inquiry meetings, facilitated by lead teachers and coaches, where teacher teams look at school wide data trends to make adjustments to upcoming instructional plans.</p> <p>The administrative cabinet has balanced teacher observations on an annual calendar to ensure that teachers receive actionable feedback verbally and in writing throughout the school year. Additionally, the principal observes every teacher in the school to ensure consistent expectations across classrooms and to calibrate application of the “Framework” with other rating leaders. The feedback that the administrators provide includes references to recent and upcoming professional learning opportunities, refers to previous observation reports or feedback, and connects evidence of student performance to recommendations for next steps when appropriate.</p> <p>Moving forward the school will distribute a mid-year survey to staff who work with partner organizations and coaches to solicit feedback about the impact of coaching on teaching practices and student achievement. This survey is currently being developed and will be deployed by March 1<sup>st</sup>.</p> |
| 5. | <p><b>Strong Family-Community Ties</b><br/> <b>Goals:</b><br/>                 By June 2016, multiple means of communication will be leveraged to inform families of events and will result in an 8% increase in attendance at Parent Teacher Conferences.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school will continue with monthly mailings and newsletters to communicate with families.</li> </ul> | Y | <p>The Parent Association works with the CBO to organize family outreach, and activities for the entire family. They are also instrumental with food and clothing drives for the community. The CBO has organized family events to include all students; some examples are ice skating evening, and college preparation parent information night in conjunction with the school. The school with the CBO has organized a team of staff, parents and students to generate public calendars of events, including spirit events, fundraising, and professional learning for parents. This is to increase the number of opportunities to actively support the school and their personal and professional development.</p>  |



|              |  |               |   |
|--------------|--|---------------|---|
|              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additionally, the automated phone messenger system will reinforce communications that are mailed home.</li> <li>• The school will continue to expand opportunities for families to engage positively with the school community by offering adult learning opportunities in conjunction with ELT programs for students and to increase opportunities for families to meet with key school personnel about student progress and ways that they can support their children at home.</li> </ul> |               |   |
| 6.           |  |               |   |
| <b>Green</b> | Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .   | <b>Yellow</b> | Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results. |
| <b>Red</b>   | Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.  |               |   |



### Part III – Community Engagement Team and Receivership Powers

| <b>Community Engagement Team (CET)</b><br>Please provide 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. Describe goals and outcomes of meetings and committee work in terms of Community Engagement Plan implementation, school support and dissemination of information. |  |
|--|--|
| Status (R/Y/G)   | Analysis / Report Out  |
| Y  | <p><b>The Community Engagement Team (CET) makes recommendations for improving the school and solicits input regarding its recommendations through public engagement. Listed below are the Superintendent-approved CET recommendations incorporated into the revised improvement plan:</b></p> <p><b>Superintendent-Approved CET Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand opportunities for students to participate in internships, CTE programs, and other school/work learning experiences through partner organizations, such as the Brooklyn Navy Yard</li> <li>• Engage all students in personalized plans and supports to maintain social-emotional well-being and habits that allow them all to strive for their own goals.</li> <li>• Schedule opportunities to provide students with positive reinforcement and public celebrations.</li> <li>• Explore opportunities to create structured time for teachers to meet for common planning during the day in addition to already established after-school time.</li> <li>• Create an internal calendar of assessments and Inquiry to guide the monitoring of key academic benchmarks and our progress toward meeting interim, and year-end goals</li> <li>• Develop plans to ensure that programs are implemented and impacts are visible to students and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Establish a committee of staff, parents, and students to generate and publish a public calendar of fundraising, spirit events, and professional learning sessions, to ensure that parents and families are able to take advantage of an increase in the number of activities hosted by the school.</li> <li>• Convene a committee of staff and family members to ensure recruitment, marketing, and branding of programs and activities offered at the school are cohesive and in pursuit of improved academic achievement. This will enhance the name and reputation of the school.</li> <li>• Evaluate, in partnership with the CBO (Grand Street Settlement), the social and emotional needs of students and families to ensure universal and targeted mental health services become more readily available.</li> <li>• Ensure the “Renewal Hour” provides students with extensive opportunities for credit recovery and elective courses not previously offered</li> </ul> |



- Ensure ELT and enrichment time allows students to participate in activities that improve their access to engaging and academically rigorous clubs that are supportive, and facilitate positive relationships amongst students, staff, and the school community

During the first week of the 2015-16 school year, written notice was sent to the parents of, or persons in parental relation to, students attending the school about its designation and receivership. The NYCDOE conducted a public hearing for the purposes of discussing the performance of the school and the concept of receivership, and soliciting input through public engagement regarding recommendations for improving the school. Once the school’s hearing was held, a summary of recommendations was provided to the school based on commentary from speakers captured in a transcript of the public hearing, a recommendations form provided to participants at the hearing, an online survey on our NYCDOE website, any email feedback received to our receivership@schools.nyc.gov email address, or by mail. The CET met to review the public input and finalize school improvement plan recommendations, which were submitted to the Superintendent, acting on behalf of the Chancellor as Receiver, for review. Upon Superintendent determination of which CET recommendations would be incorporated, the improvement plan was revised and resubmitted.

The CET continually assesses and reports on the implementation of the plan, informed by current data regarding school performance on selected Demonstrable Improvement Metrics and any other information necessary to assess the implementation of the plan, provided by the Superintendent and the Principal. CET meetings are held once a month a time that is convenient for parents – either weekday evenings or Saturday mornings.

**Powers of the Receiver**

Please provide information 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. 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.

| Status (R/Y/G) | Analysis / Report Out |
|----------------|-----------------------|
|----------------|-----------------------|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| G | Beginning in July 2015, the NYCDOE engaged in regular consultation with the leadership of its collective bargaining units representing teachers – United Federation of Teachers (UFT) – and school supervisors – Council of School Supervisors and Administrators (CSA) – regarding the construct of receivership and related requirements. NYCDOE is considering any elements of the revised SCEP, SIG, or SIF plans that require changes to the collective bargaining agreements, for example mandatory participation of all school staff in summer professional development activities. The timeline for engagement with local collective bargaining units is the 2015-16 school year for implementation in the 2016-17 school year. Larry Becker, NYCDOE CEO of Human Resources and Labor, is planning and conducting the engagement activities with UFT and CSA. Following our engagement process, the NYCDOE will determine what changes may need to be made to collective bargaining agreements. |
|---|---|



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

DRAFT



**Part IV – Best Practices (Optional)**

| <p><b><u>Best Practices</u></b></p> <p>The New York State Education Department recognizes the importance of sharing best practices of schools and districts. Please take this opportunity to share one or more successful strategy 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.</p> |   |
|--|---|
| List the best practice currently being implemented in the school.  | Describe the best practice in terms of the impact it is having, the evidence being collected to determine its value, and the manner in which it might be replicated in other schools/districts. |
| 1.   |   |
| 2.   |   |
| 3.   |   |

DRAFT



**Part V – Attestation**

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): Superintendent, Alicia Winnicki

Signature of Receiver: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: February, 2016

DRAFT