



# 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
12X286: Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School	321200010286	NYC GEOG DIST #12 - BRONX	Yellow	SCEP
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	Lorraine Chanon, Principal	Aimee Horowitz, Executive Superintendent for Renewal Schools Rafaela Espinal Pacheco, Superintendent Sharon Rencher, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor	6, 7, 8, SE	268

## 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 Fannie Lou Hamer Middle 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.

Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School or FLHMS (12X286) is implementing all key strategies to improve instruction, student supports and parent involvement to drive school improvement efforts and meet the Receivership requirements for 2015-16. The school is using a process of examining student work and student assessment data on teacher teams and from this analysis teacher adjust their lessons and units to reflect specific student needs based on the data. The school leaders continuously monitor progress with support and direct guidance of the Superintendent. Thus far, Fannie Lou Hamer Middle School has fully implemented the Community Schools Model and an Expanded Learning Time (ELT) program for all students. In addition, the school has used data to track attendance and has clearly made progress in increasing daily attendance and decreasing chronic absenteeism. Administration has tied observation feedback to specific actions so teachers can improve their instruction in targeted areas. In terms of student performance, the school has used CCLS-aligned curriculum and is on track for meeting benchmark targets on reading comprehension for the school as a whole and for English Language Learners (ELLs). The school still needs to work on improving performance of Students with Disabilities (SWDs). The school has made progress in math in the Standards taught to meet the State benchmarks in those areas. However, since the math curriculum is cumulative, we will have more data in March to better determine how we are progressing in this area. One goal to re-align is parent involvement, while there has been much activity in this area, the data used to track its success is not aligned. An area in need of improvement is the level of safety at the school. This has been the first year in the history of the school that suspension data has gone up. The number of incidents has doubled due to an increase in drug-related incidents. While we are addressing the social-emotional needs of these at-risk students, it is a major concern that other environmental factors beyond the school may be affecting the school climate and culture.



**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 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
3-8 ELA Growth Percentile	Yellow	48.5	49.5	<p>The school provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS ELA standards (ELAP) and one to show overall progress in reading comprehension and determine reading level (DRP). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the ELAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the State ELA exam from fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year’s New York State ELA exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent ELAP assessment in early December indicates that 34 students are needed to ensure that 12% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4. In the December ELAP, 31 students hit a Level 3 or 4 meaning that the school is on track for meeting the goal that 11.6% of the students are at grade level for reading on the State ELA. To determine growth percentile, the school still needs to disaggregate the ELAP data and compare the “growth percentile” of the ELAP to the State ELA.</p> <p>On the January DRP reading assessment the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level</p>



				<p>3's and 4's. Once again, the school needs to disaggregate the % gain for students who are Level 1 and 2 to see if they are also "on track" and have made incremental gains toward grade level reading. In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by literacy specialists for ELA, science and social studies.</p>
Average Math Proficiency Rating	Yellow	2.20	2.21	<p>In order to determine if the school is on track for the average ELA proficiency rating, the school used two interim assessments three times a year, the school provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS math standards (MAP) and one to show overall progress in math skills and to determine student math level (Scantron). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the MAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the State Math exam from Fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year's New York State Math exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent MAP assessment in early December indicates that 38 students are needed to ensure that 14% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4 which would also impact the average math proficiency rating. However, the math standards are cumulative for the year so the December assessment can only show growth for the Standards taught in the fall. Based on the standards taught in the fall to our target</p>



				<p>population, standards mastery increased in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade an average of 20%, in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade an average of 24%, and there were no increases in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Thus, the school is on track in the standards assessed. However, students who were not in the target group had mixed performances throughout the school. As a result, the progress in math may be on track only for students at or approaching grade level at this time. In order to specifically determine the math proficiency rating, the school needs to measure the number of students who are at specific performance levels on the MAP as compared to a specific performance level on the State math test. Since the MAP data measured only multiple choice, the school compared the data to the multiple choice results on the State exam. This is the next steps of the school in February so when the March MAP is administered we will have a clearer picture of the progress, specifically in this area.</p> <p>In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by math specialist who supports them with content-area instruction.</p>
Grade 4 and 8 Science Percent Level 3 & Above	Yellow	22%	23%	<p>Science report card grades have remained consistent as compared to the same students' performance last year; however, students' mastery of key concepts presented on the State science test has increased significantly since the previous year. Students have been assessed on these concepts in a variety of ways,</p>



				<p>as appropriate for the concepts. Examples of these such assessments are inquiry based assessments when determining physical properties such as volume, liquid and mass, multiple choice baseline assessments using previous 8th Grade science test released questions to ascertain prior knowledge in aligned topics, predictive assessments based on scientific figures and graphs, and writing predictions when analyzing Punnett squares and pedigrees. Students have also shown an increase in their performance on specific Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), as outlined in the literacy-aligned curriculum. These have been measured in CCLS- based portfolio projects, focusing on topics such as the development and importance of the brain in the body, physical properties of matter, and in genetics to describe inheritance within a family. Currently, students average a mastery level of 2.8 across the entire grade in State science test concepts and standards and a 2.4 in performance on CCLS writing standards and 2.4 in performance on CCLS reading standards, indicating that more than 25% of students are at proficiency for these standards.</p>
<p>Make Priority School Progress</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Meet progress criteria</p>	<p>As mentioned previously, the January DRP reading assessment shows that the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level 3's and 4's. As a result the school will make priority school progress in both its growth measure and performance index in ELA.</p> <p>Math MAP assessment in early December indicates that 38 students are needed to ensure that 14% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4 which would also</p>



				<p>impact the average math proficiency rating as well as student growth in math. The December assessment already shows growth for the standards taught in the fall. Based on the standards taught in the fall to our target population, standards mastery increased in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade by an average of 20%; in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade an average of 24%; and there were no increases in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade.</p> <p>All the aforementioned is indicative of pending priority progress.</p>
School Survey - Safety	Yellow	2.20	2.24	<p>The number of principals suspensions reached 16 over the first 5 months of school. While the school has many supports in place (school social worker, mandated counselor, guidance counselor, and two social work interns) there has been an increase in drug related incidents coming into the school. 5 of the 16 suspensions were drug-related. 9 other major and minor Online Occurance Reporting System (OORS) incidents in the school were caused by students who had drug-related histories and were directly connected to 4 students at the school. FLHMS is working with our CBO Partner, Talent Development, and has placed a behavior specialist in the school 4 days a week to work with students and staff on intervention plans as well as a Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports (PBIS) rewards program for the school. In addition, Talent Development is working with Astor Mental Health Services and NY State to place a Mental Health Clinic in the building before the end of the school year. In addition, the NYCDOE is working to get a full-service health clinic for the upcoming school year.</p>



**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	Yellow	2.21	2.22	<p>In order to determine if the school is on track for the average ELA proficiency rating, the school used two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS ELA standards (ELAP) and one to show overall progress in reading comprehension and determine reading level (DRP). The school analyzed results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the ELAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the state ELA exam from fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year’s New York State ELA exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. The school was able to determine, using the most recent ELAP assessment in early December, that 34 students are needed to ensure that 12% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4. In the December ELAP, 31 students hit a Level 3 or 4 meaning that the school is on track for meeting the goal that 11.6% of the students are at grade level for reading on the State ELA. In order to determine the ELA proficiency rating, the school needs to measure the number of students who are at specific performance levels on the ELAP as compared to a specific performance level on the state ELA. Since the ELAP data measured only multiple choice, the school compared the data to the multiple choice results on the State ELA. This is the next steps of the school in February so when the March ELAP is administered we will have a clearer picture of the progress, specifically in this area.</p>



				<p>On the January DRP reading assessment, the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level 3's and 4's. Once again, the school needs to disaggregate the % gain for students who are Level 1 and 2 to see if they are also "on track" and have made incremental gains toward grade level reading. In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by literacy specialists for ELA, science and social studies.</p>
Implement Community School Model	Yellow	N/A	Implement	<p>The school has partnered with John's Hopkins Talent Development (TD) to fully implement the Community School Model. TD has partnered with Astor to provide students and families with mental health services for the whole campus. The DOE has proposed a health clinic for the campus as well. TD has supported teacher professional development by providing one literacy and one math coach who come weekly to support teacher and student performance. TD has supported the school with the rollout of the ELT of one extra hour per week. TD has provided funding to support enrichment activities in the ELT. TD meets weekly to support interventions for attendance, for grade teams and for the school as a whole. TD meets with other CBO partners to ensure wraparound services like additional after school programming, parent involvement programs and student incentives with Children's Aid Society. TD also coordinates parent involvement activities with Americorp</p>



				volunteers, Children’s Aid parent involvement coordinator, Children’s Aid medical advocate and the FLHMS attendance team and attendance teacher, the Community School director serves as the liaison to all the above initiatives and is an integral part of the School Leadership Team (SLT).
Performance Index on State ELA Exam	Yellow	64	66	The performance index is determined by a formula that compares student growth from one year to the next. The formula designates if a student is “on track” for growth or “not on track” for growth. In order to determine if students were showing growth in ELA, the school provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS ELA standards (ELAP) and one to show overall progress in reading comprehension and determine reading level (DRP). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the ELAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the state ELA exam from fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year’s New York State ELA exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent ELAP assessment in early December indicates that 34 students are needed to ensure that 12% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4. In the December ELAP, 31 students hit a Level 3 or 4 meaning that the school is on track for meeting the goal that 11.6% of the students are at grade level for reading on the State ELA. The school is working to disaggregate the same data to assess the number of students who are “on track” or “not on track” as compared to the prior



				<p>State ELA.</p> <p>On the January DRP reading assessment the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level 3's and 4's. Once again, the school needs to disaggregate the % gain for students who are Level 1 and 2 to see if they are also "on track" and have made incremental gains toward grade level reading. In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by literacy specialists for ELA, science and social studies .</p>
<p>Performance Index on State Math Exam</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>58</p>	<p>60</p>	<p>School provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS Math standards (MAP) and one to show overall progress in math skills and to determine student math level (Scantron). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the MAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the State Math exam from fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year's New York State Math exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent MAP assessment in early December indicates that 38 students are needed to ensure that 14% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4 which would also impact the average math proficiency rating. However, the math standards</p>



				<p>are cumulative for the year so the December assessment can only show growth for the Standards taught in the fall. Based on the standards taught in the fall to our target population, standards mastery increased in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade an average of 20%, in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade an average of 24%, and there were not increases in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Thus, the school is on track in the Standards assessed. However, students who were not in the target group had mixed performances throughout the school. As a result, the progress in math may be on track only for students at or approaching grade level at this time. In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by math specialist who supports them with content-area instruction.</p>	
Provide 200 Hours of Extended Learning Time	Green	N/A	Implement	<p>All students are receiving 5 hours of additional academic instruction during the school’s Extended Learning Time Program Monday through Friday. During this time students are grouped strategically to receive either intervention or enrichment support in literacy or math. Some students are provided targeted counseling. Classes include ESL for newcomers, Book Clubs, Math Clubs, Literacy Circles, Girls Who Code, Citizen Science, Current Events and Technology and Rosetta Stone (to name a few). In addition, all students will be invited to attend a 7 week Saturday Academic Enrichment Program which began in March.</p>	
<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <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

<b>Key Strategies</b>			
<i>As applicable</i> , identify any key strategies being implemented during the current reporting period that are <i>not described above</i> , 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.
1.	<p><b>Rigorous Instruction</b></p> <p><b>Goals:</b>                      Rigorous Instruction - By June 2016, the school and CBO partner will use a common Instructional Focus to leverage the resources of the school as measured by the increase of grade-level performances in ELA from 8.7% of students at Level 3 or 4 in 2014 to 11.6% of students at Level 3 or 4 in 2016 on State ELA exam.</p> <p><b>Key Strategy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School leaders and CBO will develop a shared instructional focus between CBO and school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b>                      Classroom Implementation of Curricula/Writing Strategies                      Comprehensive Academic Assessment Plan                      Planning and Refinement of Written CCLS-aligned Curricula to Provide Access to All Students                      Professional Development: Academics                      Professional Development: Educating All Students                      RTI/AIS</p>	Yellow	<p>Assessment: School provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS ELA standards (ELAP) and one to show overall progress in reading comprehension and determine reading level (DRP). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the ELAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the State ELA exam from fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year’s New York State ELA exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent ELAP assessment in early December indicates that 34 students are needed to ensure that 12% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4. In the December ELAP, 31 students hit a Level 3 or 4 meaning that the school is on track for meeting the goal that 11.6% of the students are at grade level for reading on the State ELA. The school is working to disaggregate the same data to assess the number of students who are “on track” or “not on track” as compared to the prior State ELA. On the January DRP reading assessment the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level 3’s and 4’s. Once again, the school needs to disaggregate the % gain for students who are Level 1 and 2 to see if they are also “on track” and have made incremental gains toward grade level reading. Professional development in core classes: In order to increase student</p>



performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by literacy specialists for ELA, science and social studies.

Instructional Focus: The school has made these gains through a common Instructional Focus of “Reading, Speaking, and Writing about Text in Every Class, Every Day.” The most recent evidence of this practice in action was a building walkthrough by the principal where ...

Planning and refining of curricula: The school also has implemented key CCLS aligned curricula that provide support of literacy. The ELA classes are using Expeditionary Learning and the science and social studies classes are using O’Dell – both Curricula emphasize reading, speaking and writing. While teachers struggled to initially implement these new units and new styles of pedagogy, the school used vertical teacher teams to support a common vision of implementation as evidenced by common vertical team binders where teacher collect best practices on Odell. vertical team minutes where teacher document discussions based on student work, what critical thinking skills are evident and how to best implement next instructional steps using their student work as evidence.

Access to All: (see goal 4)

Rtl/AIS: In examining the DRP data, despite the gains in grade level performance, there are a significant number of students lagging in progress on the DRP. The percentage of students “flatlining” on reading progress was 49% across the school. The majority of these students were low and mid-level 2’s on the previous ELA Exam. While the school already has all students programmed for ELT, it was agreed at a data analysis meeting on January 25, 2016, that these students needed daily attention in every class, every day to leverage their reading forward. As a result, teachers have created rosters pinpointing the names of each student to call on, check work and to prompt usage of targeted reading strategies. In addition, each Grade Team is implementing a targeted reading strategy common to all classes to improve reading



			<p>comprehension. The school continues to implement daily independent reading time and develop reflections to encourage student use of the targeted reading strategy to practice at their independent reading level.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Supportive Environment</b>  <b>Goals:</b>                  By June 2016, the school, with the support of CBO partners, will develop and use an “early warning indicator” system to track and support the academic progress of students who have been chronically absent and reduce the percentage of chronically absent students from 37% in 2014 to 30% in 2016.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school will develop an “early warning indicator” system to track and support the academic progress of chronically absent students.</li> <li>• Attendance systems &amp; structures</li> <li>• Community School Model</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yellow</b></p>	<p>1- Attendance leadership - School is using the New Visions Heat Map to track attendance of whole school, targeted groups as well as students who are chronically absent. Attendance team has weekly meetings with social worker, attendance teacher, parent coordinator, AP, guidance counselor and Americorp worker to determine Tier 1, 2, 3 level interventions for attendance.</p> <p>2- School-wide Initiatives include monthly raffles for students with perfect attendance for the month and incentives for students who have 100% attendance for the year, and pizza parties for classes with the highest attendance for the month, plus bulletin boards recognizing students with perfect attendance and classes with the highest attendance.</p> <p>3- Goal-setting for Tier 2 and Tier 3 – Attendance team has targeted students with 90 to 94% attendance to incentivize them to get over 95% attendance for the month of January. Students who succeeded had an ice cream party. Students with below 90% attendance are assigned a champion who checks in with them weekly and goes over their attendance and supports them with meeting their weekly goal of improve attendance or being on time. The progress of these chronically absent students is tracked weekly at the attendance meeting. If needed, there may be a home visit by the attendance teacher or by school personnel. Cases are discussed to assess potential negligence and referred to ACS if necessary.</p> <p>4- Parent Involvement – parents are called daily about student attendance by the parent coordinator or the student’s advisor. Parents were given copies of their child’s RISA at the November and again at the March Family Conferences. Parents are updated about their child’s attendance as part of the Promotion in Doubt process. Parents also were awarded in October if their child had 100% attendance. In December, the school sent a positive holiday card letting families of students with 95% or more attendance that the school was thankful for their support.</p>



			<p>Students with less than 95% attendance were wished well and asked to support in their child’s attendance in the upcoming school year. As a result of these initiatives, the overall school attendance rate is 94.7% and the chronic absentee rate is 14.6% thus we have met both benchmarks in this area.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Collaborative Teachers</b>  <b>Goals:</b>                  Collaborative Teachers - By June 2016, the teacher teams in the school will work collaboratively with the support of CBO partner to improve the grade-level proficiency of SWD and ENL students as measured by SWD students reaching grade-level proficiency from 4.3% to 10% on State ELA and move ENL students from 0% reaching proficiency to 10% on the ELA State Exams.</p> <p><b>Key Strategy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will use professional development time to collect and analyze student data to provide interventions for SWDs and ENLs</li> </ul> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b>                  Danielson Framework Implementation - Observation Cycle                  Inquiry                  Job-embedded Instructional Coaching</p>	<p><b>Yellow</b></p>	<p>Assessment: School provides two interim assessments three times a year, one aligned to key CCLS ELA standards (ELAP) and one to show overall progress in reading comprehension and determine reading level (DRP). The school analyzes results to compare progress from fall to winter and again in spring. The progress on the ELAP compares proficiency in the same standards used on the State ELA exam from Fall to winter. Benchmark or target scores were created based on last year’s New York State ELA exam and the percentage of correct responses necessary to meet Receivership targets. Most recent ELAP assessment in early December indicates that 34 students are needed to ensure that 12% of the students at FLHMS are Level 3 or 4. In the December ELAP, 31 students hit a Level 3 or 4 meaning that the school is on track for meeting the goal that 11.6% of the students are at grade level for reading on the State ELA. The school is working to disaggregate the same data to assess the number of students who are “on track” or “not on track” as compared to the prior State ELA.</p> <p>On the January DRP reading assessment the number of students who are at grade level across the school is an average of 25%. This data also supports that the school is on track for increasing the number of Level 3’s and 4’s. Once again, the school needs to disaggregate the percentage gain for students who are Level 1 and 2 to see if they are also “on track” and have made incremental gains toward grade level reading.</p> <p>Professional development in core classes: In order to increase student performance, teachers are participating in continuous professional development on using data from formative assessments to develop targeted intervention strategies and then monitoring student data to continually adjust instruction. In addition, teachers are being provided with one-on-one and team coaching by literacy specialists for ELA, science and social studies.</p>



			<p>Instructional Focus: The school has made these gains through a common instructional focus of “Reading, Speaking, and Writing about Text in Every Class, Every Day.”</p> <p>Planning and refining of curricula: The school also has implemented key CCLS-aligned curricula that provide support of literacy. The ELA classes are using Expeditionary Learning and the science and social studies classes are using O’Dell – both curricula emphasize reading, speaking and writing. While teachers struggled to initially implement these new units and new styles of pedagogy, the school used vertical teacher teams to support a common vision of implementation as evidenced by common vertical team binders where teacher collect best practices on Odell. vertical team minutes where teacher document discussions based on student work, what critical thinking skills are evident and how to best implement next instructional steps using their student work as evidence.</p> <p>Access to All: (see goal 4) The most recent data has shown that students with disabilities are struggling to make gains on the DRP, although the majority of ELL’s made improvements. This new data has led to a more targeted response by the special education team. The team is currently piloting a shared Google Doc where the Special Education (SE) and General Education (GE) teacher can look at each individual IEP goal and share strategies to leverage that goal forward using targeted differentiations. This document will be shared with GE teacher to align literacy instruction across each grade team. The SE team is brainstorming shorter and more frequent assessments to track progress prior to the next ELAP.</p>
4.	<p><b>Effective School Leadership</b>  <b>Goals:</b>                  Effective School Leadership: By June 2016, the school leadership will provide clear, strategic and actionable feedback in observations that will increase the effectiveness of teachers with ‘developing’ or ‘ineffective’ ratings based on Danielson Rubric 3c - “Using Questioning and Discussion” as measured by an increase by one rubric level (‘Ineffective’ to</p>	Yellow	<p>Since October, school leadership has asked that all teachers be paired with a coach/mentor and have SMART Goals and an action plan based on their individual data. In December, teachers and coach/mentors met at least twice a month and used observation feedback to monitor and adjust goals. Google Docs allow for the sharing of observation feedback and next steps with all consultants.</p> <p>Coaches have set up common binders for all content vertical teams so teacher could collect best practices, data, and Danielson related</p>



<p>'Developing' or 'Developing' to 'Effective') for 90% of the teaching staff between September 2015 and June 2016.</p> <p><b>Key Strategy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School leaders will provide clear, strategic, and actionable feedback in observations that will increase the effectiveness of teachers with developing or ineffective ratings based on the Danielson Rubric, component 3c, "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques."</li> </ul> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b>                  Leadership Coaching</p>	<p>instructional strategies developed by vertical teams.</p> <p>Calibration- In October, school leaders conducted one walkthrough to calibrate observations between the principal and the AP. School leaders also were supported in a walkthrough related to the Arts. In December, the math consultant did a model lesson to show questioning and discussion techniques for an ICT class. In November and December, MSQI coach did two models (one for ELA, one for Math and one for Science) modeling academic language acquisition, in November, the literacy coach modeled questioning and discussion techniques for the social studies team for an ICT class. In January, the MSQI coach did a second modelling of language acquisition combined with questioning and discussion strategies for the ELA team</p> <p>Observations and Feedback - By October, all teaching staff had their Initial Planning Conference (IPC) to review their observation data and student assessment data to set goals and present plan to support teacher effectiveness as well as one informal observation by administration with feedback provided to teachers in a non-evaluative database for coaches and mentors to use to support teaching staff. Administration and PD coach meet weekly with coaches and mentors to discuss how to support teacher practice related to observation feedback. In December, coaches were given preliminary Danielson scores for all their mentees to develop target areas. In December, teachers opened Google Classroom trackers to describe their professional development work related to observation feedback. In December and January, administration completed 1-2 more observations of returning staff and new or developing teachers with feedback provided to teachers, coaches and mentors. Next steps for the administration is to put a plan in place to ensure that teachers are following up with the actionable feedback by the deadline. Administration is meeting with coaches and mentors to ensure that feedback is discussed as part of coaching sessions and acted upon. Ongoing teacher development on "3b-Questioning and Discussion," one of the school's prioritized Danielson competencies, is apparent across the school. As a result, the school, with the support of the coaches and mentors, has developed questioning and discussion strategies</p>
---	--



5.	<p><b>Strong Family-Community Ties</b>  <b>Goals:</b>                  By June 2016, the school with the support of CBO partner will have a 18% increase in parent involvement in all areas (academic, social and emotional developmental health) provided by the school in partnership with our community based organizations to support student success as measured by parent participation in the school Learning Environment survey from 42% to 60%.</p> <p><b>Key Strategy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school and CBO partner Talent Unlimited will increase parent involvement in all areas including academic, social and emotional developmental health.</li> </ul>	Yellow	<p>documented in newly refined lesson plans.</p> <p>Talent Development, FLHMS' CBO partner has taken the lead on parent engagement. The Community School director, with the support of an Americorps Intern, the parent coordinator and the parent involvement coordinator from Children's Aid Society has created multiple initiatives to increase parent involvement in the school. "One on one" sessions, personalized meetings with parents, occur on a continuous basis to increase the development of genuine relationships between parents and the school. Already identified parent leaders are being trained to facilitate these one on one sessions with other parents. Parent representatives were elected for the SLT and the PA in the fall, and regular meetings for both entities have taken place on monthly basis. In each of these settings, feedback from families is assessed verbally or visually on interactive surveys capturing needs, concerns, and ideas for implementation. Parent leadership was sought out to develop and deepen the understanding of an additional team structure for implementation: the community school team. Communication channels have been diversified so that outreach for family events occurs through written communication, email communication, text communication and by telephone using a systematic phone banking protocol. All communication is bilingual to assure that all families are able to understand. Parent outreach and communication to at-risk students is a regular feature of student intervention team meetings as a strategy to address student concerns documented in the New Visions Student Sorter. A system of data collection was implemented via excel spreadsheet in order to track family presence and attendance at several parent/family events. Thus the Parent involvement activities have increased tremendously. However, the increased activities for parents and the benchmark for the Renewal School comprehensive plan are not clearly aligned. The school needs to reconsider this benchmark indicator so that the pro-parent activities are captured in a more specific goal instead of being separate entities that are not indicative of FLHMS parent involvement successes. The SLT is considering using a different data point and one recommendation has been parent</p>
----	---	--------	---



			participation in family conferences, however, even this data point is very limited in scope. This matter will be addressed in the upcoming February SLT meeting.
<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.

DRAFT



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

<b>Community Engagement Team (CET)</b> 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>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:</p> <p><b>Superintendent-Approved CET Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More hands-on work in classes to increase student engagement. Students should be given more opportunities to explain their answers and have more hands-on learning opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Powers of the Receiver</b> 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		
Green	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. Listed below are any other efforts to utilize the powers of the School Receiver.		
<b>Green</b>	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.
<b>Red</b>	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.		

### Part IV – Best Practices (Optional)

<b>Best Practices</b>	
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.	
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, Rafaela Espinal Pacheco

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

Date: February, 2016

DRAFT