

## Receivership

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

*3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter - January 18, 2016 to April 15, 2016*

School	School BEDS Code	District	Status (R/Y/G)	SIG/SIF/SCEP Cohort
01M015: P.S. 015 Roberto Clemente	310100010015	NYC GEOG DIST # 1 - MANHATTAN	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	IRENE SANCHEZ	Aimee Horowitz, Executive Superintendent for Renewal Schools Daniella Phillips, Superintendent Sharon Rencher, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor	PK,0K,01,02,03,04,05	168

#### 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.

The Roberto Clemente School is currently on track to implementing key strategies and action steps outlined within their 2015-2016 Renewal School Comprehensive Education Plan (RSCEP). The school is engaging the community and meeting its state and Renewal progress monitoring benchmarks for the 2015-2016 school year. Improvements in school leadership, student learning products, teacher practice, culture/environment, and collaborative teacher inquiry are evident across the school, as determined from on-site visits.

**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	42.1	43.1	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	N/A



			<p>target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>Modifications and enhancements to the ELA curriculum maps for grades 3-5 show evidence of the following: emphasis on Common Core focus standards for ELA; scaffolds included for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities (SWDs); integration of Teacher’s College writing units; embedded strategic independent reading time.</p> <p>ELA Curriculum: Teachers College Reading and Writing Units. Assessment: IRLA In grade K, 82.8% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 1, 51.7% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 2, 51.4% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 3, 69.6% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 4, 50% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 5, 58.8% of students are reading at proficiency.</p> <p>As of May 2016, 60.9% of students are reading at proficiency and 37.1% can apply CCSS to grade level texts.</p> <p>In writing, 35.9% of the students are at writing proficiency. 32% are at a level 2 and 32% are at level 1 as of April 2016. This is down from 64.9% level 1 in September 2015 demonstrating significant gains.</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows: In grade K, 62.9% of students were writing at proficiency.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>In grade 1, 63.3% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 28.5% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 8% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 11.7% of students were writing at proficiency.</p> <p>In Reading,                  In grade K, 83.3% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 22% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 45.8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 14% of IEP students were at proficiency.</p>	
3-8 ELA Percent Level 2 & Above	Yellow	37%	38%	<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>IRLA data, rigor of student work tasks, improvements in teachers’ instructional practices, and student learning products indicate progress towards realizing demonstrable improvement.</p>	N/A



			<p>ELA  Curriculum: Teachers College Reading and Writing Units.  Assessment: IRLA  In grade K, 82.8% of students are reading at proficiency.  In grade 1, 51.7% of students are reading at proficiency.  In grade 2, 51.4% of students are reading at proficiency.  In grade 3, 69.6% of students are reading at proficiency.  In grade 4, 50% of students are reading at proficiency.  In grade 5, 58.8% of students are reading at proficiency.</p> <p>As of May 2016, 60.9% of students are reading at proficiency and 37.1% can apply CCSS to grade level texts.</p> <p>In writing, 35.9% of the students are at writing proficiency. 32% are at a level 2 and 32% are at level 1 as of April 2016. This is down from 64.9% level 1 in September 2015 demonstrating significant gains.</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows:</p> <p>In grade K, 62.9% of students were writing at proficiency.  In grade 1, 63.3% of students were writing at proficiency.  In grade 2, 28.5% of students were writing at proficiency.  In grade 3, 8% of students were writing at proficiency.  In grade 4, 50% of students were writing at proficiency.  In grade 5, 11.7% of students were writing at proficiency.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



				<p>Reading – SWD’s</p> <p>In grade K, 83.3% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 22% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 45.8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 14% of IEP students were at proficiency.</p>	
3-8 Math Growth Percentile	Yellow	37.6	38.6	<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>Modifications and enhancements to the math curriculum maps for grades 3-5 show evidence of the following: emphasis on Common Core focus standards for math; integration of Metamorphosis consultants. 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</p>	N/A



				<p>that we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target.</p> <p>Math Curriculum: Terc Investigations Assessment: Number Sense and Operations</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows:</p> <p>In grade K, 79.3% of students were at proficiency. In grade 1, 60% of students were at proficiency. In grade 2, 39.4% of students were at proficiency. In grade 3, 12.5% of students were at proficiency. In grade 4, 17.6% of students were at proficiency. In grade 5, 29.4% of students were at proficiency.</p> <p>Overall, 45.9% of students in K-5 are at proficiency.</p>	
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 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 is on track towards meeting both state and Renewal benchmarks on level 1 and 2 indicators, through increase in AIS and ELT programs in ELA and Math.</p> <p>ELA</p>	N/A



				<p>Curriculum: Teachers College Reading and Writing Units. Assessment: IRLA</p> <p>In grade K, 82.8% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 1, 51.7% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 2, 51.4% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 3, 69.6% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 4, 50% of students are reading at proficiency. In grade 5, 58.8% of students are reading at proficiency.</p> <p>As of May 2016, 60.9% of students are reading at proficiency and 37.1% can apply CCSS to grade level texts.</p> <p>Math Curriculum: Terc Investigations Assessment: Number Sense and Operations</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows: In grade K, 79.3% of students were at proficiency. In grade 1, 60% of students were at proficiency. In grade 2, 39.4% of students were at proficiency. In grade 3, 12.5% of students were at proficiency. In grade 4, 17.6% of students were at proficiency. In grade 5, 29.4% of students were at proficiency.</p> <p>Overall, 45.9% of students in K-5 are at proficiency.</p>	
School Survey – Safety	Yellow	4.32	4.36	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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school engaged in identifying at-risk students.</li> <li>• Identified students have an attendance liaison, as the school held 20 attendance committee meetings by April.</li> <li>• Teachers engaged in a minimum of 3 PDs in SOAR through P2L.</li> <li>• The school implemented a system with criteria to tier the students either 1, 2, or 3.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<b>LEVEL 2 Indicators</b>					
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: Rigorous Instruction	Yellow	3.08	3.12	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	N/A



				<p>target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>Teachers have planned and implemented rigorous Teachers College CCLS-aligned units of study and performance tasks that have improved rigorous instruction. Demonstrable improvement has been identified in the number of completed units. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers engaged in creating 2 units of study in ELA.</li> <li>• Rubrics for these units were provided to 100% of parents, aligned to the first 2 writing units of study</li> <li>• The school hosted several parent workshops around unit expectations, including the use of rubrics.</li> <li>• Students engaged in 2 ELA unit tasks using student facing rubrics</li> <li>• Teachers engaged in a minimum of 3 PD opportunities around effective co-teaching models and use of rubrics models .</li> </ul>	
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 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	N/A



				<p>we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>Partnership with Community Based Organization (CBO) Pathways to Leadership is in place and all staff has been hired for the 2015-2016 school year. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school engaged in identifying at-risk students.</li> <li>• Identified students have an attendance liaison. The school held at 20 attendance committee meetings by April.</li> <li>• Created a monthly school-wide attendance comparison</li> <li>• Teachers will have engaged in a minimum of 3 PDs in SOAR through P2L.</li> <li>• By April 2016, our average attendance percentage was above 93.0%.</li> <li>• The school implemented a system with criteria to tier the students either 1, 2, or 3 levels.</li> </ul>	
Performance Index on State ELA Exam	Yellow	39	41	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	N/A



			<p>we are seeing positive trends towards meeting the target. Data to evaluate this indicator will be available August 31, 2016.</p> <p>IRLA data, rigor of student work tasks, improvements in teachers’ instructional practices, and student learning products indicate progress towards realizing demonstrable improvement.</p> <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>Modifications and enhancements to the ELA curriculum maps for grades 3-5 show evidence of the following: emphasis on Common Core focus standards for ELA; scaffolds included for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities (SWDs); integration of Teacher’s College writing units; embedded strategic independent reading time.</p> <p>ELA</p> <p>Curriculum: Teachers College Reading and Writing Units.</p> <p>Assessment: IRLA</p> <p>In grade K, 82.8% of students are reading at proficiency.</p> <p>In grade 1, 51.7% of students are reading at proficiency.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>In grade 2, 51.4% of students are reading at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 69.6% of students are reading at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of students are reading at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 58.8% of students are reading at proficiency.</p> <p>As of May 2016, 60.9% of students are reading at proficiency and 37.1% can apply CCSS to grade level texts.</p> <p>In writing, 35.9% of the students are at writing proficiency. 32% are at a level 2 and 32% are at level 1 as of April 2016. This is down from 64.9% level 1 in September 2015 demonstrating significant gains.</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows:</p> <p>In grade K, 62.9% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 63.3% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 28.5% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 8% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of students were writing at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 11.7% of students were writing at proficiency.</p> <p>Reading – SWD’s</p> <p>In grade K, 83.3% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 22% of IEP students were at proficiency.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



				<p>In grade 3, 45.8% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 50% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 14% of IEP students were at proficiency.</p>	
Performance Index on State Math Exam	Yellow	56	58	<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>Rigor of student work tasks, improvements in teachers’ instructional practices, and student learning products indicate progress towards realizing demonstrable improvement.</p> <p>Math                  Curriculum: Terc Investigations                  Assessment: Number Sense and Operations</p> <p>By grade, the April 2016 data shows:</p> <p>In grade K, 79.3% of students were at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 60% of students were at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 39.4% of students were at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 12.5% of students were at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 17.6% of students were at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 29.4% of students were at proficiency.</p> <p>Overall, 45.9% of students in K-5 are at proficiency.</p> <p>Math – SWD’s</p>	N/A



				<p>In grade K, 50% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 1, 33.3% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 2, 22.2% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 3, 0% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 4, 0% of IEP students were at proficiency.                  In grade 5, 28.6% of IEP students were at proficiency.</p>	
Provide 200 Hours of Extended Learning Time	Green	N/A	Implement	<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>School's schedule has the required Expanded Learning Time hours embedded within the school's schedule. All students have been scheduled to meet the mandates.</p> <p>As of May 2016, 60.9% of students are reading at proficiency and 37.1% can apply CCSS to grade level texts.</p> <p>In writing, 35.9% of the students are at writing proficiency. 32% are at a level 2 and 32% are at level 1 as of April 2016. This is down from 64.9% level 1 in September 2015 demonstrating significant gains.</p>	N/A



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

## Part II – 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. 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
1. <b>Rigorous Instruction</b> <b>Goals:</b> By June 2016, teachers will have planned and implemented rigorous Teachers College CCLS-aligned units of study and performance tasks to improve rigorous instruction as measured by 6 completed units in ELA.  <b>Key Strategies:</b> Ensure multiple entry points to instruction and support the needs of students with disabilities, English	Yellow	In the framework area of Rigorous instruction, the school has focused on the following work throughout SY 15-16  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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers engaged in creating 2 units of study in ELA.</li> <li>Rubrics for these units were provided to 100% of parents, aligned to the first 2 writing units of study</li> <li>The school hosted 3 parent workshops around unit expectations, including the use of rubrics</li> <li>Students engaged in 2 ELA unit tasks using student facing rubrics</li> </ul>	N/A



<p>Language Learners, and other high needs students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrators will provide professional development on effective co-teaching models, such as station teaching and parallel teaching, which serve to reduce class size and provide targeted needs-based instruction.</li> <li>2. Teacher teams will create lesson plans incorporating purposeful co-teaching models.</li> <li>3. Teachers will create lesson plans incorporating UDL Universal Design for Learning strategies which include flexible means of representation, expression, and engagement.</li> <li>4. Administration will regularly review lesson plans for evidence of multiple entry points.</li> </ol> <p>Develop teacher practice in the use of UDL strategies. Teachers will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet in teams during professional development time to develop a repertoire of UDL strategies for consistent implementation across the school.</li> </ol>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers engaged in a minimum of 3 PD opportunities around effective co-teaching models and use of rubrics models</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--



	<p>2. Engage in peer inter-visitations to observe UDL practices and provide feedback.</p> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b>                  Classroom Implementation of Curricula/Writing Strategies                  Planning and Refinement of Written CCLS-aligned Curricula to Provide Access to All Students                  Professional Development: Academics                  Professional Development: Educating All Students</p>			
2.	<p><b>Supportive Environment Goals:</b>                  By June 2016, there will be an increase in attendance to an average of 93.6% by addressing key elements that reduce chronic absenteeism and fully implementing a community school model in collaboration with P2L.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b>                  Engage students and families:</p>	Green	<p>In the framework area, Supportative Environment the school has focused on the following work throughout SY 15-16.</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"> <li>• The school engaged in identifying at-risk students.</li> <li>• Identified students have an attendance liaison. The school will have held at 12</li> </ul>	N/A



<p>1. Create a formal school-wide attendance policy.</p> <p>2. Provide PD to school staff on the attendance policy to ensure it is widely known.</p> <p>3. Provide all parents with the attendance policy and refer to it in all conversations related to attendance.</p> <p>4. Provide personalized early outreach during the first month of school by identifying all chronically absent or potentially chronically absent students and reaching out to families in order to provide early intervention.</p> <p>Monitor attendance data:</p> <p>1. Meet regularly with the attendance team to analyze student attendance data.</p> <p>2. Provide families with monthly RISAs so that they can monitor their child’s attendance.</p> <p>3. Review attendance records for accuracy and make corrections, when necessary.</p> <p>4. Monitor monthly school-wide attendance and compare with</p>		<p>attendance committee meetings by mid-year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created a monthly school-wide attendance comparison.</li> <li>• Teachers will have engaged in a minimum of 3 PDs in SOAR through P2L..</li> <li>• The school implemented a system with criteria to tier the students either 1, 2, or 3</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>attendance for the same month in previous years.</p> <p><b>Renewal School Priority Areas:</b> Attendance Systems &amp; Structures</p>			
3.	<p><b>Collaborative Teachers</b></p> <p><b>Goals:</b> By June 2016, collaboration in using assessment to offer more targeted and consistent support for student learning will result in improved teacher practice in 3C: Engaging Students in Learning, and 3D: Using Assessment in Instruction, as evidenced by a 15% increase in the number of teachers rated effective in these areas.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b> During instructional work time and common planning time, teachers will:</p> <p>1. Analyze student work using rubrics and the TC Learning Progression.</p>	Yellow	<p>In the framework area, Collaborative Teachers, the school has focused on the following work throughout SY 15-16.</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"> <li>• During SY 15-16, teachers will be engaged in professional learning communities.</li> <li>• The schools created an online blog/webpage created by teachers to share their ELA and math toolkits.</li> <li>• Teachers engaged in a calibration exercise to norm ratings, using TC rubrics once common understanding was developed.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schoolwide PBIS is in place to ensure that interventions are in place to meet students' needs, and to ensure a healthy learning environment is present throughout the school.</li> </ul>	N/A



<p>2. Identify student strengths and high leverage next steps</p> <p>3. Share best practices and intervention strategies and use student work products to reflect on the effectiveness of the strategies.</p> <p>4. Create targeted data-informed action plans for students.</p> <p>5. Evaluate student progress towards meeting pre-determined benchmarks.</p> <p>Ensure instruction is rigorous:</p> <p>1. Teachers will collaboratively plan instructional units that include higher order thinking skills, as defined by Depth of Knowledge and Habits of Mind.</p> <p>2. Teachers will utilize co-teaching models that support student learning goals</p> <p>3. Teachers will engage in inter-visitations and provide peer feedback on observed rigor.</p> <p>4. Teachers will utilize common assessments and rubrics to identify student performance levels and evaluate progress.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emotional Literacy by Mark Bracket is in place to support students’ emotional needs through reading, writing, and literacy.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--



<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Effective School Leadership</b></p> <p><b>Goals:</b></p> <p>By June 2016, K-5 classroom teachers will have implemented a school-wide system for determining students’ incoming performance levels and growth over time by administering a mathematics baseline, midline, and post assessment in number sense and operations, as measured by reported test scores for 100% of enrolled students at the time of each assessment period, as captured in our online platform.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a comprehensive number sense and operations assessment for students in grades K-5</li> <li>2. We will administer the assessment as a baseline, midline, and end of year assessment</li> <li>3. Administration will create an online platform to capture student performance.</li> </ol>	<p>Green</p>	<p>In the framework area, Effective School Leadership, the school has focused on the following work throughout SY 15-16.</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"> <li>• Teachers administered the mathematics baseline comprehensive assessment and created the skills checklist.</li> <li>• Teachers utilize the online platform developed by the school to report their students’ math assessment scores. The school developed an online platform for collecting test scores.</li> <li>• All students completed the midline assessment.</li> <li>• 90% of students who took the baseline assessment prior to October met the first benchmark goal set in the backwards planner, as evidenced by classwork and end of unit assessments.</li> <li>• For those students who did not meet their first benchmark set in the backwards planner, the school developed action plans with specific instructional strategies, assessment, and timeline for completion.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
-----------	---	--------------	--	------------



<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Strong Family-Community Ties</b>  <b>Goals:</b>                  By June 2016, 10% of PS15 families will have utilized school resources to meet family needs, as evidenced by sign-in sheets. PS15 will partner with P2L to further open lines of communication, create parent spaces, and use flexible scheduling to make additional resources available to families, and create opportunities for families to connect to the school community.</p> <p><b>Key Strategies:</b>                  Make more resources available to parents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work with our community school partner, P2L, to design a welcoming lobby that includes access to computers, a printer and parent information.</li> <li>2. Provide parents with access to school library Media Center through designated parent use hours.</li> <li>3. Create parent logins and personalize computers with links to</li> </ol>	<p>Green</p>	<p>In the framework area, Strong Family-Community Ties, the school has focused on the following work throughout SY 15-16.</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"> <li>• The Library Media Center is parent-ready with hours established and posted.</li> <li>• Parent survey are administered. The school is partnered with Learning Leaders, which provides supports for the parent community.</li> <li>• Class parents are established for 4 classes.</li> <li>• Three “Coffee and Conversations” are in progress.</li> <li>• Teachers offered a minimum of one workshop and engaged with 100% of parents at least twice regarding students’ academic progress.</li> <li>• Resources are available for parents.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
-----------	---	--------------	--	------------



<p>resources such as NYC Schools Accounts.</p> <p>4. Ensure access by creating multilingual signage to raise awareness of available resources, such as the Library Media Center.</p> <p>Create more opportunities for open dialogue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Engage in monthly “Coffee and Conversation” sessions where parents can join the school leaders, community school partner leaders, and other parents to informally discuss happenings at the school, experiences, concerns, and provide overall feedback.</li><li>2. Create class parents in order to provide parents with an opportunity to network and develop a greater connection to the school community.</li><li>3. During parent engagement time, teachers will engage in conversations with parents and offer grade specific workshops that empower parents to support children at home (i.e. Are you smarter than a second grader?).</li></ol>			
--	--	--	--



<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 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><b>Superintendent-Approved CET Recommendations:</b> This school has to think innovatively about "Supportive Environment" domain of Great Schools Framework.</p> <p><b>Goals/Outcome of CET meetings:</b> <b>CET meets monthly around school and district goals and meetings have resulted in the formation of a parent engagement committee that is working to strengthen structures already in place including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library-Media Center is accessible to parents and used to support parents with resume development, study space, etc.</li> <li>• Parent engagement meetings occur regularly to familiarize parents with current units of study in ELA and mathematics, rubric expectations and student progress towards expectations.</li> <li>• As part of the district driven Socio-Economic Integration Pilot Program Grant, PS 15 community members work in</li> </ul>	<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>partnership with the district team to develop a parent resources center for District 1 families.</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. 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</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principal is working to build the instructional and leadership capacity of across all grade level teams through the use of data and the observation of instructional practice</li> </ul>



bargaining agreements. Listed below are any other efforts to utilize the powers of the School Receiver:

- As part of the Socio-Economic Integration Pilot Program grant, members of the PS 15 community are working with the District 1 community to develop a family resources center, pilot a School-wide Enrichment Model and address the needs of the identified student population.

to improve mathematics instruction and student performance.

<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>	<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 – Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) Plan Required Components (As applicable)**

<b>2016-17 School Year Plan</b>			
<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		
3.	Instruction by Highly Qualified Teachers		
4.	High Quality and On-going Professional Development		
5.	Strategies to Attract High Quality Highly Qualified Teachers to High Needs Schools		
6.	Strategies to Increase Parental Involvement		
7.	Transition Plans to Assist Pre-school Children from Early Childhood Programs to the Elementary School Program		
8.	Measures to Include Teachers in Decisions Regarding the Use of Academic Assessment Data to Inform Instruction		
9.	Activities to Ensure the Students Who Experience Difficulty Attaining Proficiency Receive Effective and Timely Additional Assistance		
10.	Coordination and Integration of Federal, State and Local Services and Programs -		



**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. Please note, 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, under separate attachment, 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

<b>District Name</b>	
<b>School Name</b>	
<b>Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone (    )</b>
<b>E-Mail Address</b>	
<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 <b>(in blue ink)</b>	Title of Chief School/Administrative Officer
Typed Name:	Date: