

Receivership

Quarterly Report *and* Continuation Plan (2016-17)

3rd Quarter - January 18, 2016 to April 15, 2016

School	School BEDS Code	District	Status (R/Y/G)	SIG/SIF/SCEP Cohort
09X022: J.H.S. 022 Jordan L. Mott	320900010022	NYC GEOG DIST # 9 - BRONX	Yellow	SIG Cohort 2
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	Edgar Lin	Aimee Horowitz, Executive Superintendent for Renewal Schools Leticia Rodriguez-Rosario, Superintendent Sharon Rencher, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor	06,07,08	431

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. Last 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 Jordan L. Mott 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.

Part I – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators

LEVEL 1 – Indicators

Please list the school's Level 1 indicators below. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement and the impact on student learning. Responses should be directly aligned with approved 2015-16 interventions plans (SIG, SIF or SCEP), and should include evidence and/or data used to make determinations.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out	2016-17 School Year Continuation Plan
3-8 ELA Growth Percentile	Yellow	48.5	49.5	The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the	N/A



			<p>school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted ELA instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted intervention ELA students meet daily for instructional support, including ELLs and SWDs.</p> <p>With the student body including 37% English Language Learners and 22% students with disabilities, ELA instruction is tailored to meet the needs of subgroups, across grades.</p> <p>In ELA, the school undertook a comprehensive diagnostic and proficiency teaching and assessment cycle. Using NYS Assessment data, essential CCLS standards in ELA were identified and scope and sequence aligned to engageNY was created to ensure CCLS mastery or significant progress towards CCLS mastery by students. Compared with baseline data obtained via 2014-15 NYS ELA Assessment, significant increases in the percent of students demonstrating standard mastery or making significant progress towards standard mastery has been made.</p> <p>6th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 19.5% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS Standards RL.2, RI.2 and RI.4. 7th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 10% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>increases in CCLS Standards RL.2, RI.5.</p> <p>8th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 21% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS standards RL.3 and RI.5.</p>	
3-8 ELA Percent Level 2 & Above	Yellow	36%	37%	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted ELA instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted intervention ELA students meet daily for instructional support, including ELLs and SWDs.</p> <p>In ELA, the school undertook a comprehensive diagnostic and proficiency teaching and assessment cycle. Using NYS Assessment data, essential CCLS standards in ELA were identified and scope and sequence aligned to engageNY was created to ensure CCLS mastery or significant progress towards CCLS mastery by students. Compared with baseline data obtained via 2014-15 NYS ELA Assessment, significant</p>	N/A



				<p>increases in the percent of students demonstrating standard mastery or making significant progress towards standard mastery has been made.</p> <p>6th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 19.5% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS Standards RL.2, RI.2 and RI.4.</p> <p>7th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 10% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS Standards RL.2, RI.5.</p> <p>8th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 21% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS standards RL.3 and RI.5.</p>	
3-8 Math Growth Percentile	Yellow	37.4	38.4	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating their formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school fully implements student-specific academic intervention services across all grades.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted math Instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted math students meet daily for</p>	N/A



				<p>instructional support.</p> <p>In Math, the school undertook a comprehensive diagnostic and proficiency teaching and assessment cycle. Using NYS Assessment data, essential CCLS standards in Math were identified and scope and sequence aligned to engageNY was created to ensure CCLS mastery or significant progress towards CCLS mastery by students. Compared with baseline data obtained via 2014-15 NYS Math Assessment, significant increases in the percent of students demonstrating standard mastery or making significant progress towards standard mastery has been made.</p> <p>6th grade – Overall, students made an average of 20.5% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS Standards RP.2, EE.3, EE.7, and NS.1.</p> <p>7th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 15% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in RP.2b and EE.2.</p> <p>8th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 22.8% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in EE.1, EE.7, EE.8, G.2, and G.3.</p>	
3-8 Math Percent Level 2 & Above	Yellow	24%	25%	The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the	N/A



			<p>school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted math instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted math students meet daily for instructional support.</p> <p>In Math, the school undertook a comprehensive diagnostic and proficiency teaching and assessment cycle. Using NYS Assessment data, essential CCLS standards in Math were identified and scope and sequence aligned to engageNY was created to ensure CCLS mastery or significant progress towards CCLS mastery by students. Compared with baseline data obtained via 2014-15 NYS Math Assessment, significant increases in the percent of students demonstrating standard mastery or making significant progress towards standard mastery has been made.</p> <p>6th grade – Overall, students made an average of 20.5% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in CCLS Standards RP.2, EE.3, EE.7, and NS.1.</p> <p>7th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 15% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant increases in RP.2b and EE.2.</p> <p>8th Grade – Overall, students made an average of 22.8% gains in percent of CCLS mastery with significant</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



				increases in EE.1, EE.7, EE.8, G.2, and G.3.	
Grade 4 and 8 Science Percent Level 3 & Above	Yellow	19%	20%	The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.	N/A
Make Priority School Progress	Yellow	N/A	Meet progress criteria	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are taking steps in order to make every effort to meet our target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available pending SED release of information.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted math instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted math students meet daily for instructional support.</p> <p>Schoolwide analysis of progress monitoring data for an overall 75% improvement of student outcomes</p>	N/A



			<p>determine effectiveness of interventions and re-tiering of students in ELA and math with focus on SWDs, ELLs and lowest-third students.</p> <p>Academic Subgroup – ELA/Math School designed standards-based assessments aligned to CCLS.</p> <p>ELA- SWD</p> <p>6th Grade – Assessment data indicates that SWD students are keeping pace with their grade-level cohorts. In Cycle 1, grade wide average was 72% where as SWD EngageNY performed at 70%. In Cycle 2, grade-wide average was 57% with SWDs performing at 56%. In Cycle 3, SWDs outperformed the grade-wide average by a percentage point. In Cycle 4, SWDs equaled grade-wide performance with a 60% average.</p> <p>7th Grade – Assessment data indicates that SWD students continue grade-wide trend of progress. In Cycle 1, SWDs equaled grade-wide performance with a 69% average. Cycle 2 data indicates a 1% lag behind grade-wide performance. In Cycle 3, SWDs performed at 44% mastery compared to 48% grade-wide. For Cycle 4, SWDs outpaced grade-wide average by a 11%.</p> <p>8th Grade – Though growth with SWDs is not as strong as with 6th and 7th grade, student progress is significant. In Cycle 1, SWDs made a 24% growth in proficiency. In Cycle 2, SWDs scored an average of 7% points below grade-wide average. In Cycle 3, SWDs made a 6% gain in proficiency. In Cycle 4, SWDs scored 5% less than grade-wide average.</p> <p>ELA – ELL: 40.8 percent of students at Jordan L. Mott</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>are classified as ELLs.</p> <p>6th Grade – Though not performing at grade-wide average, ELL student performance has progressed or kept pace through each of the Cycles. In Cycle 1, grade-wide average was 72% with ELL performance at 67%. For Cycle 2, ELL performance equaled grade-wide performance at 57%. Cycle 3 indicates a 5% lag behind grade-wide average, yet 54% average outperforms 2014-15 grade-wide cohort of 39% proficiency. Cycle 4 data remains consistent with Cycle 3. Though lagging behind grade-wide average, ELLs outperformed previous year’s grade-wide cohort by 10% points.</p> <p>7th Grade – Seventh grade continues the school-wide trend of progress for the ELL sub-group. Though performing slightly lower than grade-wide averages, ELLs have demonstrated significant progress over baseline data.</p> <p>8th Grade – Though performing lower than grade-wide averages, ELL progress has shown consistent double-digit increase over the 4 assessment cycles.</p> <p>Math – SWD</p> <p>6th Grade – Over the 4 assessment cycles, SWDs performed an average of 3.5% below grade-wide average and continued the trend of double-digit progress towards standard mastery when compared to baseline data.</p> <p>7th Grade – SWDs in the 7th grade performed slightly better than their 6th grade counterparts performing an average of 2% points below grade-wide average over the 4 assessment cycles.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>8th Grade – SWDs outperformed grade-wide average in 2/4 assessment cycles. Of the remaining 2 cycles, SWDs averaged 1% point below grade-wide average.</p> <p>Math – ELL</p> <p>6th Grade – ELLs in the 6th grade performed an average of 3% points below grade-wide average on ¾ assessment cycles and outperformed grade-wide cohort in the final assessment cycle.</p> <p>7th Grade – ELLs performed and average of 2% points below grade-wide average and equaled grade-wide performance on assessment Cycle 1.</p> <p>8th Grade – Eighth grade ELLs fared worse than their 6th and 7th grade counterparts, averaging 10% points below grade-wide performance in all assessment cycles. However, overall progress of ELLs surpasses baseline 2014-15 8th grade cohort data.</p>	
School Survey - Safety	Green	2.44	2.48	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The evidence below shows a trajectory of this work and progress towards meeting this indicator:</p>	N/A



				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyzed attendance data for 20% improvement for chronic absentees• Reviewed referral data to determine 100% adherence to referral procedures• Progress toward 100% fidelity of implementation of PBIS was determined• Monitored incident data for reduction in level 4 and 5 occurrences• Monitored incident and suspension data for minimum of 5% reduction• The school is engaged in restorative justice circles and Champs program in Safe Schools.	
--	--	--	--	--	--



LEVEL 2 Indicators

Please list the school’s Level 2 indicators below. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement and the impact on student learning. Responses should be directly aligned with approved 2015-16 interventions plans (SIG, SIF or SCEP), and should include evidence and/or data used to make determinations.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out	2016-17 School Year Plan
Framework: Collaborative Teachers	Yellow	3.12	3.16	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The statements below show a trajectory of this work and progress towards meeting this indicator prior to summative data sources being readily available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom observation data, captured in faculty development tracker, reflected reading strategies implemented in 100% of classrooms. • Examined progress monitoring data for 75% improvement (student outcomes) to determine effectiveness of interventions and re-tiering of students in ELA and mathematics with focus on SWDs, ELLs and lowest-third students. 	N/A
Implement Community School Model	Green	N/A	Implement	The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this	N/A



				<p>demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The statements below show a trajectory of this work and progress towards meeting this indicator prior to summative data sources being readily available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzed attendance data for 20% improvement for chronic absentees Reviewed referral data to determine 100% adherence to referral procedures Progress toward 100% fidelity of implementation of PBIS was determined Monitored incident data for reduction in level 4 and 5 occurrences. Monitored incident and suspension data for minimum of 5% reduction 	
Performance Index on State ELA Exam	Yellow	43	45	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted ELA instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted intervention ELA students meet daily for instructional support, including ELLs</p>	N/A



				<p>and SWDs.</p> <p>With the student body including 37% English Language Learners and 22% students with disabilities, ELA instruction is tailored to meet the needs of subgroups across grades.</p> <p>Schoolwide analysis of progress monitoring data for an overall 75% improvement of student outcomes to determine effectiveness of interventions and re-tiering of students in ELA with focus on SWDs, ELLs and lowest-third students.</p>	
Performance Index on State Math Exam	Yellow	25	27	<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). Data is not yet available for this indicator. We are confident that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>The school programs and implements targeted math instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted math students meet daily for instructional support.</p>	N/A
Provide 200 Hours of Extended Learning Time	Green	N/A	Implement	<p>The Receivership quarterly report #2 evidenced the following work within this demonstrable improvement area. ELT is being fully implemented for all students.</p>	N/A



			<p>The school engages in a process of evaluating its formative and summative data sources throughout the school year to identify growth towards this demonstrable improvement indicator. This work is articulated within each framework area of the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The statements below show a trajectory of this work and progress towards meeting this indicator prior to summative data sources being readily available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed unit plans and lesson plans for 100% inclusion of specific reading strategies, 100% inclusion of academic vocabulary instruction, • 100% of mid-term grades were aligned with results of benchmark assessments • The school programs and implements targeted ELA instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted intervention ELA students meet daily for instructional support, including ELLs and SWDs. 		
<p>Green</p>	<p>Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i>.</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>	<p>Red</p>	<p>Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>



Part II – Key Strategies

Key Strategies				
<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. 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. Responses should be directly aligned with approved 2015-16 interventions plans (SIG, SIF or SCEP), and should include evidence and/or data used to make determinations. If the school has a SIF grant, or has selected the SIG 6 Innovation Framework model, please include as one of the key strategies the analysis of effectiveness of the lead partner working with the school.				
List the Key Strategy from your approved Intervention Plan (SIG, SIF or SCEP).	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis / Report Out	2016-17 School Year Plan	
<p>1. Rigorous Instruction</p> <p>Goals:</p> <p>By June 2016, across all content areas, faculty will collaboratively refine CCLS-aligned curricula and common formative assessments aligned to each instructional unit. Resulting in 80% of students with 80% attendance or better passing all core courses and meeting of student achievement progress benchmarks for ELA and Mathematics (ELA PI = 50; Math PI = 38, average math proficiency = 2.02).</p> <p>Key Strategies:</p> <p>Provide literacy and math coaches to support the implementation of instructional focus; the development of curriculum aligned</p>	Green	<p>During the April progress monitoring period, schools were expected to have met their benchmarks, as articulated in the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The benchmark statements below evidence this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed unit plans and lesson plans for 100% inclusion of specific reading strategies and 100% inclusion of academic vocabulary instruction 100% of mid-term grades were aligned with results of benchmark assessments. <p>The school programs and implements targeted math instructional groups that aim to gain more students on grade level. Targeted math students meet daily for instructional support, including designated subgroups, ELLs and SWDs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide literacy and math coaches to support the implementation of instructional focus; the development of curriculum aligned to the Common Core; Implement modeling of instructional 	N/A	



	<p>to the Common Core; modeling of instructional strategies aligned with instructional shifts; the development of learning tasks representing cognitively challenging activities and assessment, aligned with instruction and how instruction is adjusted, based on assessment data.</p> <p>Renewal School Priority Areas: Planning and Refinement of Written CCLS-aligned Curricula to Provide Access to All Students Professional Development: Academics RTI/AIS</p>		<p>strategies aligned with instructional shifts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of learning tasks representing cognitively challenging activities and assessment aligned with instruction • Schoolwide analysis of progress monitoring data for an overall 75% improvement of student outcomes, to determine effectiveness of interventions and re-tiering of students in ELA and math with focus on SWDs, ELLs and lowest-third students. 	
2.	<p>Supportive Environment Goals: By June, 2016, all faculty will engage in monthly inquiry cycles, focusing on strategies and skills to support student social-emotional developmental health, resulting improvements in faculty and student responses for all four indicators of the 2015-2016 NYCDoe Learning Environment Survey and</p>	Yellow	<p>During the April progress monitoring period, schools were expected to have met their benchmarks, as articulated in the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The benchmark statements below evidence this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed attendance data for 20% improvement for chronic absentees • Reviewed referral data to determine 100% adherence to referral procedures • Progress toward 100% fidelity of implementation of PBIS was determined • Monitored incident data for reduction in level 4 and 5 occurrences. 	N/A



	<p>91% or better attendance.</p> <p>Key Strategies: Continued use and refinement of PBIS and Restorative Justice structures and strategies to develop and sustain a safe and orderly school climate</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitored incident and suspension data for minimum of 5% reduction. • April attendance data has steadily climbed to over 92%, as of April, 2016. <p>OORS Data Analysis</p> <p>Over the past 3 years, Jordan L. Mott has made significant improvements in school tone and culture. OORS data indicates a reduction in incidents from 171 in 2013-14 to 101 in 2014-15 to 36 YTD in 2015-16. Further disaggregation also indicates a drop in Level 4/5 incidents from 56 to 34 to 23 in the same 3 year period. Correspondingly, suspension rates have also dropped dramatically. In 2013-14, there were 94 total suspensions. This dropped to 58 in 2014-15 to a current YTD of 19 suspension.</p> <p>Attendance Analysis</p> <p>YTD attendance is currently 92.8%. An over 4% increase from 2014-15.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Collaborative Teachers</p> <p>Goals: By June 2016, reading strategies supporting each student’s meaning-making of text and academic vocabulary development will be integrated into CCLS-aligned curriculum in all content areas resulting in 80% of students with 80% attendance or better passing all core courses and meeting of</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>During the April progress monitoring period, schools were expected to have met their benchmarks, as articulated in the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The benchmark statements below evidence this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom observation data, captured in faculty development tracker, reflected reading strategies implemented in 100% of classrooms. • Examined progress monitoring data for 75% 	<p>N/A</p>



	<p>student achievement progress benchmarks for ELA and mathematics (ELA PI = 50; math PI = 38, average math proficiency = 2.02.</p> <p>Key Strategies: Monthly cycle of DDI will be scheduled during professional development and common planning time to analyze student data and determine necessary RTI interventions for meeting student learning needs.</p> <p>Renewal School Priority Areas: Danielson Framework Implementation - Observation Cycle Inquiry</p>		<p>improvement (student outcomes) to determine effectiveness of interventions and re-tiering of students in ELA and mathematics with focus on SWDs, ELLs and lowest-third students</p> <p>The most recent NYC DOE Quality Review, dated March 2, 2016, rated the following sub indicator 4.2 as proficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams, using an inquiry approach that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning The above referenced Quality Review noted the impact that high expectations result in a system of accountability for all members of the school community. Ongoing feedback to parents about student achievement provides support for families to understand student progress toward those expectations. 	
4.	<p>Effective School Leadership</p> <p>Goals: By June 2016, using the observation process based on the Danielson <i>Framework for Teaching</i>, 80% all faculty will demonstrate improved delivery of rigorous CCLS-aligned instruction in all content areas that</p>	Yellow	<p>During the April progress monitoring period, schools were expected to have met their benchmarks, as articulated in the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The benchmark statements below evidence this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty observation data and common learning assessments were analyzed to ensure that 100% of observation data aligns 	N/A



	<p>meets the needs of all learners, as indicated in observation data of Danielson 3C, resulting in 80% of students with 80% attendance or better passing all core courses and meeting of student achievement progress benchmarks for ELA and mathematics (ELA PI = 50; math PI = 38, average math proficiency = 2.02.</p> <p>Key Strategies: School structure will be maximized so that each grade is assigned a teacher grade leader and guidance counselor, supervised by an assistant principal, to ensure that groups of faculty were responsible for the knowledge of a small group of students. Weekly content and grade team meetings designed for DDI among grade teams and content team constituents ensure timely and effective student academic, social-emotional, and student support.</p>		<p>with student learning outcomes for all faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Development Tracker indicated faculty increasing their proficiency in implementing questioning and discussion techniques (3b), student engagement (3c), and using assessment in instruction (3d) of the Danielson <i>Framework for Teaching</i> by one level (e.g. ineffective to developing; developing to effective; effective to highly effective. Content area and grade team meetings programmed to enable DDI-aligned grade teams and content teams to ensure timely and effective student academic, social-emotional, and student support A focus on inquiry has resulted in teachers supporting standards-based work and reflecting on their practice. Distributive leadership ensures that teacher teams have voice in all decisions supporting students and their achievement. 	
5.	<p>Strong Family-Community Ties Goals:</p>	Green	During the April progress monitoring period, schools were expected to have met their benchmarks, as	N/A



	<p>By June 2016, all faculty will engage in meaningful collaboration with families to promote shared responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being, resulting in 60% of all parent respondents reporting very satisfied on all four indicators of the 2016 NYCDoe Learning Environment Survey.</p> <p>Key Strategies: School will continue to use school’s advisory system; advisors will continue to be responsible for communicating with and encouraging parent/family involvement. Advisor-Caregiver conferences provided formal opportunities that allowed for personal interactions between advisors and families.</p>		<p>articulated in the school comprehensive educational plan (SCEP). The benchmark statements below evidence this work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caregiver Survey was distributed to track caregiver satisfaction, with expectation of 5% improvement in three key areas – instructional core, systems for improvement, and school culture to make necessary adjustments. 	
<p>Green</p>	<p>Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i>.</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>	<p>Red</p> <p>Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>



Part III – Community Engagement Team and Receivership Powers

Community Engagement Team (CET)		
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. Please identify any changes in the community engagement plan and/or changes in the membership structure of the CET.		
Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis / Report Out	2016-17 School Year Plan
Green	<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>Superintendent-Approved CET Recommendations: Increase teacher leadership roles and responsibilities. Provide budgetary resources to support teacher-leader decision-making.</p> <p>Goals/Outcome of CET meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure reciprocal communication with parents and families. • To ensure instruction is rigorous across all grades, including AIS and ELT, and afterschool programming. • To ensure alignment in teacher practice is effective or highly effective as noted in the performance levels of the Danielson Framework for Teaching, specifically focused on components 1e and 3c, as per district-wide initiative. <p>The CET continually assesses and reports on the implementation of the plan, informed by current data regarding school performance on</p>	<p>During the first week of the 2016-17 school year, written notice will be sent to the parents of, or persons in parental relation to, students attending the school about its designation and receivership. The NYCDOE will conduct 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.</p> <p>The Superintendent will review and provide approved recommendations to the school which will be used to inform planning and adjustments needed to the Renewal School Comprehensive Educational Plan (RSCEP).</p> <p>The CET will continue to assess and report 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's utilize the goals and benchmarks in the Renewal School Comprehensive Plan (RSCEP) as well as SIG/SIF improvement plans to track progress towards meeting their school specific goals and demonstrable improvement metrics. CET meetings are held once a month a time that is convenient for parents – either weekday evenings or Saturday mornings</p>



	<p>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. The monthly CET meetings are in addition to the monthly School Leadership Team (SLT) meetings conducted by the school.</p>	
--	--	--

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	2016-17 School Year Plan
Green	<p>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:</p> <p>Middle school 22 has engaged teachers in ongoing professional development opportunities aligned specifically to curriculum and assessment. The teacher leadership in the school continue to</p>	<p>The NYCDOE will continue to engage in regular consultation with the leadership of its collective bargaining units 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. 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.</p> <p>Middle School 22 continues to implement the powers of receivership with fidelity to the overall benefit of the learning community.</p>



expand. Currently, there is a lead teacher on every grade to ensure collaboration related to instructional practices.

This school year the principal, and all teachers are engaged in inquiry based Teacher Rounds, through a district wide initiative.

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



Part IV – Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) Plan Required Components (As applicable)

2016-17 School Year Plan			
<i>As applicable</i> , please provide additional information to describe 2016-17 school year plans and rationale for required components of a Title I Schoolwide Program plan. If a required component has already been addressed in one or more section above, please use the “2016-17 School Year Plan” column to indicate which sections contain this information. A brief rationale should be included for <i>each</i> required component.			
Ten Required Components of SWP		2016-17 School Year Plan	Rationale
1.	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Diagnostic Tool School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE), both state-led and district-led satisfy this requirement.	N/A
2.	Schoolwide Reform Strategies	N/A	N/A
3.	Instruction by Highly Qualified Teachers	N/A	N/A
4.	High Quality and On-going Professional Development	N/A	N/A
5.	Strategies to Attract High Quality Highly Qualified Teachers to High Needs Schools	N/A	N/A
6.	Strategies to Increase Parental Involvement	N/A	N/A
7.	Transition Plans to Assist Pre-school Children from Early Childhood Programs to the Elementary School Program	N/A	N/A
8.	Measures to Include Teachers in Decisions Regarding the Use of Academic Assessment Data to Inform Instruction	N/A	N/A
9.	Activities to Ensure the Students Who Experience Difficulty Attaining Proficiency Receive Effective and Timely Additional Assistance	N/A	N/A
10.	Coordination and Integration of Federal, State and Local Services and Programs -	N/A	N/A



Part V – Best Practices (Optional)

Best Practices

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.	



Part VI – Fiscal

Budget Analysis/Narrative and Budget Documents – The LEA/school should propose expenditures that are reasonable and necessary to support the identified Receivership school’s initiatives and goals. The LEA/school should provide appropriate and complete required budget elements identified below. <u>Please note</u> , separate budget narratives and FS-10’s must be submitted for a SIG, SIF and/or Persistently Struggling Schools (PSS) grant.		
Design Element	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis of 2015-16 School Year
Provide an analysis of the current implementation period <u>expenditures in terms of desired outcomes, alignment to project plan/timeline, and impact on instructional practices/key strategies/student engagement.</u>		N/A
Additionally, <u>under separate attachment</u> , the LEA/school must provide a Budget Narrative and an FS-10 for the upcoming 2016-17 implementation period. The budget narrative must identify and explain all proposed costs for district and school-level activities. For each activity, identify costs associated and provide an explanation/justification for the cost that connects to the project activity, goals, and outcomes previously identified throughout the 2016-17 Continuation Plan and/or Persistently Struggling Schools (PSS) grant. The budget items must be clear and obvious about how the proposed activities are directly impacting the school-level and district implementation of its intervention plan. The proposed expenditures must be reasonable and necessary to support the initiatives and goals of the LEA/school, and commensurate to size and need. Schools no longer receiving SIG or SIF funds need not submit budget narratives and FS-10’s.		



Part VII – Attestation

RECEIVER:

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): _____

Signature of Receiver: _____

Date: _____

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TEAM:

By signing below, I certify that the community engagement team (CET) was directly consulted in the preparation of this document.

Name and Position of CET Representative (Print): _____

Signature of Receiver: _____

Date: _____



The University of the State of New York - THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT - Albany, NY 12234

2016-17

School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

School Innovation Fund Grant

Persistently Struggling Schools Grant

Continuation Plan Cover Page

District Name	
School Name	
Contact Person	Telephone ()
E-Mail Address	
<p>I hereby certify that I am the applicant's chief school/administrative officer and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, application guidelines and instructions, Assurances, Certifications, the terms and conditions outlined in the Master Grant Contract and that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of this project. It is understood by the applicant that this application constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the NYS Education Department or renegotiated to acceptance, will form a binding agreement. It is also understood by the applicant that immediate written notice will be provided to the grant program office if at any time the applicant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.</p>	
Authorized Signature (in blue ink)	Title of Chief School/Administrative Officer
Typed Name:	Date:

DRAFT