

# Receivership

## Quarterly Report

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

School	School BEDS Code	District	Status (R/Y/G)	SIG/SIF/SCEP Cohort
D'Youville Porter Campus School #3	140600010003	Buffalo Public School District	Y	SIG Cohort 5
Superintendent	School Principal	Additional District Personnel Responsible for Program Oversight and Report Validation	Grade Configuration	Number of Students
Dr. Kriner Cash	Mrs. Sharon Brown	Cassandra Wright Associate Superintendent of School Leadership	Prek - 8	735

### 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*.

Reporting Timeline: November 1, 2015 – January 15, 2016

D'Youville Porter Campus, School #3's leadership team and the school community work collaboratively with their partner, WestEd, to implement professional development and instructional supports for teachers. As a transformation partner, West Ed works directly with School #3's leadership team and staff to provide research-based strategies shown to significantly impact student achievement. As a result of analyzing data, this partnership identified the following key instructional strategies to focus on for the entire school year to improve student achievement:

- **Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies:** The school continues to build upon teaching strategies that support the students' languages and cultures. WestEd continues to provide training to the leadership team and teachers on Reading to Learn strategies such as reading support in the various contents of Reading, Math, Social, Science, etc. The Reading to Learn (RtL) approach helps teachers to improve their practices of designing and implementing Common Core Standards-Based lessons. The approach helps students to understand difficult text and to think deeply about the reading.



- **Co-Teaching:** The school's leadership team and WestEd implemented a professional development plan that supports the co-teachers. The professional development that co-teachers participated in this quarter is better preparing them to enhance their lessons to meet the diverse needs of their students.
  - **Instructional Coaching:** The instructional coaches support teachers by scheduling pre-conferences to plan the lessons together and they model lessons. The coach will conduct post-conferences where the teacher and the coach reflect upon the lesson and identify instructional strategies that will meet the academic needs of the students. The instructional coach will provide training for teachers on how to further support students.
  - **Dual Language:** The school phased in its first Dual Language Program at the Pre-Kindergarten level. WestEd consultants provide ongoing technical assistance to the teachers in support of the continued development of the school's Dual Language Program.
  - **Facilitated Grade Level and Common Planning Meetings:** Administration and instructional coaches facilitate grade level and common planning meetings where content data are analyzed to identify areas in need of development. Teachers are in the process of revisiting year-long action plans to address the focus areas.
- The school's Community Engagement Team, which is comprised of administration, teachers, parents, students, and a school partner engaged in meetings during this quarter to revisit the Continuation Plan, and revise the quarterly reports. The team meets monthly to monitor the progress of the Continuation Plan. Discussions during the Community Engagement Team were centered on receivership guidelines. The minutes from the Community Engagement Team Meeting are shared with the school community.
- The Community Engagement Team will continue to collaborate with the faculty, staff, parents, students, and WestEd to monitor the progress toward meeting the Level 1 and 2 Indicators. The Continuation Plan will be monitored on an ongoing basis to determine if the professional development and instructional strategies implemented are having a positive impact on students.

**Attention** – This document is intended to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to [OISR@NYSSED.gov](mailto:OISR@NYSSED.gov). It is a self-assessment of the implementation and outcome of key strategies related to Receivership, and as such should not be considered a formal evaluation on the part of the New York State Education Department. This document also serves as the Progress Review Report for schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) or School Innovation Fund (SIF) funds. Additionally, this document serves as the quarterly reporting instrument for schools with School Comprehensive Education Plans (SCEP). The Quarterly Report in its entirety must be posted on the district web-site.



**Part I – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators**

**LEVEL 1 – Indicators**

Please list the school's Level 1 indicators below and discuss each with respect to the type, nature and analysis (as applicable) undertaken during the current reporting quarter, as well as necessary course-corrections. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out
Priority School make yearly progress		N/A	N/A	School 3 is making progress to meet targets as evident by the year-long professional development plan with West Ed along with the work that was completed on the Superintendent's Conference Day and during grade level meetings when teachers analyzed student data and identified focus standards. The teachers started discourses surrounding those focus standards to identify instructional strategies. The administrative team conducted non-evaluative classroom observations; every classroom was visited, and the team provided feedback to the teachers (See attached). The goal of the learning walk was to norm the administrative team's expectations and findings in an effort to provide the entire school community with calibrated evidence. During the learning walk, it was noted that there is improvement in the area of student engagement. However, teachers need continued support in the area of differentiated instruction. With the assistance of WestEd, the school's leadership team is confident that the school will be on target. West Ed provides ongoing Reading to Learn and math support throughout the school year.
3-8 ELA All Students level 2 & above		34%	36%	*Please view attached Smartsheet Calendar that identifies the dates that professional development is occurring. School 3 teachers in grades 3-6 administered the Journeys Unit 1 Assessment, also known as the ELA District Benchmark Assessment, in the month of November and Journeys Unit 2 Assessment in the month of December. The third grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 10 different standards. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 70.21% of students scored between 0%-64% and 29.79% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining third graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 73.32% scored between 0%-64% and 26.86% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 10 standards, School 3 students scored higher than the rest of the district on 6 of those standards, they scored within 5% points for 3 standards and scored more than 5% points below the district in the writing portion of the assessment.



		<p>The third grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W3.1. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 75% of students scored between 0%-64% and 25% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining third graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 71.43% scored between 0%-64% and 28.57% scored between 65%-100%.</p>
		<p>The fourth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 11 different standards. Data from School 3's fourth grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 81.82% of students scored between 0%-64% and 18.18% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fourth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 72.77% scored between 0%-64% and 27.23% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 11 standards, School 3's students scored higher than the rest of the district on 4 of those standards, they scored within 5% points for 1 standard and scored more than 1.5% points above the district in the writing portion of the assessment.</p>
		<p>The fourth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W4.2. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 76.47% of students scored between 0%-64% and 23.53 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fourth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 78.11% scored between 0%-64% and 21.89% scored between 65%-100%.</p>
		<p>The fifth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 8 different standards. Data from School 3's fifth grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 85.07% of students scored between 0%-64% and 14.93% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fifth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 76.53% scored between 0%-64% and 23.47% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 8 standards, School 3 students scored higher than the rest of the district on 1 of those standards, they scored within 5% points for 1 standard.</p>
		<p>The fifth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W5.2. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 74.07% of students scored between 0%-64% and 25.93 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fifth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 62.10% scored between 0%-64% and 37.90% scored between 65%-100%.</p>
		<p>The sixth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 11 different standards. Data from School 3's sixth grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 88.23% of students scored between 0%-64% and 11.77% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining sixth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 63.55% scored between 0%-64% and 36.45% scored between 65%-100%. School 3 students scored 6.61% higher than the rest of the district on the writing portion of the assessment.</p>



				<p>The sixth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W6.1. Data from School 3's sixth grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 9.23% of students scored between 0%-64% and 90.77 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining sixth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 57.90% scored between 0%-64% and 42.10% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teacher at School #3 administered the EngageNY module 1 assessment. The seventh grade ELA Module 1 data assessed 9 different standards. Data from School 3's seventh grade Module 1 assessment displays that 73.91% of students scored between 0%-64% and 26.08% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining seventh graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 75.10% scored between 0%-64% and 24.90% scored between 65%-100%. School 3 students scored above the district in all 9 standards.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teacher at School #3 administered the EngageNY module 1 assessment. The eighth grade ELA Module 1 data assessed 12 different standards. Data from School 3's eighth grade Module 1 assessment displays that 82.28% of students scored between 0%-64% and 17.72% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining eighth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 66.97% scored between 0%-64% and 33.03% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to reading levels during the reading differentiation period. In addition, the Building Reading Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms. The school analyzed data to assist in scheduling the Building Reading Teacher to identify the students who are in need of the most intensive support.</p> <p>The Building Reader Teacher pushes into the monolingual fourth grade class during the differentiated period to provide additional support. The Reading teacher provides support to the students with the most intensive support. The co-teaching fourth grade class has two teachers where they provide differentiated support. The sixth grade students are departmentalized. Therefore, students have access to five teachers for additional literacy support.</p> <p>* Please see attached DBA data for school to district gap analysis.</p>
3-8 Math All Students Level 2 & above		28%	29%	<p>In Grade 3 Math there are 22 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 22 standards, 17 are Major Standards, 2 are Supporting Standards and 3 are Additional Standards. Thus far, Grade 3 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments</p>





		<p>assessed 15 standards. Of the 15 standards assessed 10 were Major Standards, 1 was a Supporting Standard, 3 were Additional Standards and 1 was a Post-Second Grade Standard. Compared to the district, School #3 out-performed the district on 13% of the standards assessed. School #3 was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 47% of the standards assessed. School #3 performed below the district on 40% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 92.5% of the students scored a Level 1, 2.5% scored a Level 2, 2% scored a Level 3 and 2% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 4 Math there are 23 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 23 standards, 13 are Major Standards, 3 are Supporting Standards and 7 are Additional Standards. Thus far, Grade 4 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments assessed 7 standards. Of the 7 standards assessed 5 were Major Standards and 2 were Additional Standards. Compared to the district, School #3 out-performed the district on 71% of the standards assessed. School #3 performed below the district on 29% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 81 % of the students scored a Level 1, 5.5% scored a Level 2, 6.5% scored a Level 3 and 7% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 5 Math there are 23 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 23 standards, 17 are Major Standards, 2 are Supporting Standards and 4 are Additional Standards. Thus far, Grade 5 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments assessed 12 standards. Of the 12 standards assessed 9 were Major Standards, 2 were Supporting Standards and 1 was an Additional Standard. Compared to the district, School #3 below the district on 100% of the standards assessed. School #3 did demonstrate growth (average 2%) on repeat standards from DBA #1 to DBA #2.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments, 96% of the students scored a Level 1, 3% scored a Level 2, 1% scored a Level 3 and 0% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 6 Math there are 24 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 24 standards, 17 are Major Standards, 4 are Supporting Standards and 3 are Additional Standards. Thus far, Grade 6 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments assessed 10 standards. Of the 10 standards assessed 7 were Major Standards and 3 were Additional Standards. Compared to the district, School #3 out-performed the district on 10% of</p>
--	--	--



			<p>the standards assessed. School #3 was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 40% of the standards assessed. School #3 performed below the district on 50% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 97% of the students scored a Level 1, 4% scored a Level 2, 0% scored a Level 3 and 0% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 7 Math there are 21 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 22 standards, 11 are Major Standards, 6 are Supporting Standards and 4 are Additional Standards. Thus far, Grade 7 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments assessed 7 standards. Of the 7 standards assessed 5 were Major Standards, 4 were Additional Standards and 1 was a Post 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Standard. Compared to the district, School #3 out-performed the district on 59% of the standards assessed. School #3 was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 26% of the standards assessed. School #3 performed below the district on 15% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 93.5% of the students scored a Level 1, 1% scored a Level 2, 3% scored a Level 3 and 2.5% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 8 Math there are 22 Common Core Standards (Pre NYS Assessment). Of these 22 standards, 17 are Major Standards, 4 are Supporting Standards and 1 is an Additional Standard. Thus far, Grade 8 has administered 2 District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). These assessments assessed 7 standards. Of the 7 standards assessed all 7 were Major Standards. Compared to the district, School #3 out-performed the district on 62% of the standards assessed. School #3 was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 8% of the standards assessed. School #3 performed below the district on 30% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 90% of the students scored a Level 1, 5% scored a Level 2, 4% scored a Level 3 and 1% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>Teachers' lessons are written to ensure effective implementation of Common Core Math. Administration observes classes weekly to insure implementation of Common Core Standards. Grade level meetings focus on D'Youville Porter Campus School #3's "Big Rock", Student Engagement. Student engagement includes: Higher Order Questions and Writing across the curriculum. Grade level meetings address recommendations from the school review with District Overview. Through grade level Professional development, teachers build pedagogical skills and material aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards in order to increase rigor in learning.</p>
--	--	--	---



				Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to math levels during the math differentiation period. In addition, the Building Math Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms; The 6 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade math scores declined from last year. Therefore, the building math coach meets with the math teacher to plan lessons. The coach models and shadows lessons in classes.
3-8 ELA All Students MGP		46.08%	47.08%	* Please see attached DBA data for school to district gap analysis.  The Office of Shared Accountability (OSA) is unable to calculate the Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) for 3-8 ELA at this point. School 3 is unable to obtain all the metrics used to calculate MGP.  Although we are unable to obtain current MGP data School #3 has employed a variety of strategies to address trends that were highlighted from our state test scores. These strategies are outlined in the goals and recommendation from the School Review with District Oversight Report to reflect the school's priorities. To effectively implement the school's vision and mission statements that are outlined in the School Improvement Grant, the school will focus on providing differentiated professional development for teachers. The differentiated professional development will focus on the "School-wide Teacher Big Rock", <i>Student Engagement</i> , which is achieved via: Higher Order Questions, Differentiated Common Core Aligned Lessons, and Writing Across the Curriculum.
3-8 Math All Students MGP		42.5%	43.5%	Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to reading levels during the reading differentiation period. In addition, the Building Reading Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms. Analyzed school data was utilized to determine the Building Reading Teacher's schedule; the teacher was assigned students who are in need of the most intensive support.  OSA is unable to calculate the Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) for 3-8 Math at this point. School 3 is unable to obtain all the metrics used to calculate MGP.  Although we were unable to gather current MGP data teachers' lessons are written to ensure effective implementation of Common Core Math. Administration observes classes weekly to insure implementation of Common Core Standards. Grade level meetings focus on School #3's "Big Rock", Student Engagement, Higher Order Questions, and Writing across the curriculum. Grade level meetings address recommendations from the School review with District Overview. Through grade level professional development, teachers build pedagogical skills and material aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards in order to increase rigor in learning.





		<p>Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to math levels during the math differentiation period. In addition, the Building Math Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms. The school analyzed data to assist in scheduling to identify the students who are in need of the most intensive support.</p>
<p>Grades 4 &amp; 8 Science All Students Level 3 &amp; above</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>33%</p> <p>School 3's fourth grade students were administered a science assessment in the month of January. Data from the fourth grade science assessment displays that 40% of students scored between 0%-60%; 22.86% of students scored between 60%-70%; 11.43% of students scored between 70%-80%; 8.57% of students scored between 80%-90% and 17.14% of students scored between 90%-100%.</p> <p>School 3's eighth grade students were administered a science assessment in the month of January. Data from the eighth grade science assessment displays that 69.09% of students scored between 0%-60%; 20.00% of students scored between 60%-70%; 7.27% of students scored between 70%-80%; 3.64% of students scored between 80%-90% and 0% of students scored between 90%-100%.</p>
<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 with impact.</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>	

**LEVEL 2 Indicators**

Please list the school's Level 2 indicators below and discuss each with respect to the type, nature and analysis (as applicable) undertaken during the current reporting quarter, as well as necessary course-corrections. Indicate the current status of each indicator in terms of the likelihood of meeting the established targets for realizing Demonstrable Improvement.

Identify Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Base-line	Target	Analysis / Report Out
<p>3-8 ELA Hispanic Students Level 2 &amp; above</p>	<p></p>	<p>29%</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>Hispanic Population is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>65% of the student population is Hispanic</li> <li>40% of the 65% have been identified as Limited English Proficient</li> </ul> <p>All Hispanic students receive the same core instruction in all content areas. The English Language Arts block of instruction is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The English as New Language teacher pushes into the classroom to collaborate with the classroom teacher using one of the co-teaching models in an effort to deliver differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. The data is used to drive instruction, and flexible grouping is utilized to meet the varied academic needs of the students.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers meet during grade level and common planning twice a week to engage in discourse surrounding data and student work.</li> <li>The school analyzed data to assist in scheduling to identify the students who are in need of the most intensive support.</li> <li>Research based strategies such as Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol offers all learners a differentiated approach (visual, auditory, tactile, etc.) to learning contents. The overarching strategies build background knowledge and promote student engagement.</li> </ul> <p>School 3 teachers in grades 3-6 administered the Journeys Unit 1 Assessment, also known as the ELA District Benchmark Assessment, in the month of November. Journey's Unit 2 Assessment was administered in the month of December.</p> <p>The third grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 10 different standards. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 70% of students scored between 0%-64% and 30% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining third graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 78.49% scored between 0%-64% and 21.51% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 10 standards, School 3 students scored higher than the rest of the district on 5 of those standards, they scored within 5% points for 4 standards and scored 5% points below the district in the writing portion of the assessment.</p> <p>The third grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W3.1. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 78.85% of students scored between 0%-64% and 21.15% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining third graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 79.07% scored between 0%-64% and 20.93% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>The fourth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 11 different standards. Data from School 3's fourth grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 90.7% of students scored between 0%-64% and 9.3% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fourth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 79.16% scored between 0%-64% and 20.84% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 11 standards, School 3 students scored higher than the rest of the district on 3 of those standards, they scored within 5% points for 3 standards and scored more than 1.8% points above the district in the writing portion of the assessment.</p> <p>The fourth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W4.2. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 96.97% of students scored between 0%-64% and 3.03 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fourth</p>
--	--	--	---



		<p>graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 69.33% scored between 0%-64% and 30.67% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>The fifth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 8 different standards. Data from School 3's fifth grade Journey's Unit 1 assessment displays that 86.95% of students scored between 0%-64% and 13.05% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fifth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 83.38% scored between 0%-64% and 16.62% scored between 65%-100%. Of those 8 standards, School 3 students scored higher than the rest of the district on 6 of those standards.</p> <p>The fifth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W5.2. Data from School 3's third grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 88.64% of students scored between 0%-64% and 11.36 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining fifth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 67.29% scored between 0%-64% and 32.71% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>The sixth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 1 assessed 11 different standards. Data from School 3's sixth grade Journeys Unit 1 assessment displays that 86.96% of students scored between 0%-64% and 13.04% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining sixth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 74.18% scored between 0%-64% and 25.82% scored between 65%-100%. School 3 students scored 10.12% higher than the rest of the district on the writing portion of the assessment.</p> <p>The sixth grade ELA DBA for Journey's Unit 2 assessed students writing performance focusing on W6.1. Data from School 3's sixth grade Journeys Unit 2 writing assessment displays that 12.20% of students scored between 0%-64% and 87.80 % scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining sixth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 51.83% scored between 0%-64% and 48.17% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teacher at School #3 administered the EngageNY module 1 assessment. The seventh grade ELA Module 1 data assessed 9 different standards. Data from School 3's seventh grade Module 1 assessment displays that 73.81% of students scored between 0%-64% and 26.19% scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining seventh graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 71.77% scored between 0%-64% and 28.23% scored between 65%-100%. School 3 students scored above the district in 8 standards.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA teacher at School #3 administered the EngageNY module 1 assessment. The eighth grade ELA Module 1 data assessed 12 different standards. Data from School 3's eighth grade Module 1 assessment displays that 83.02% of students scored between 0%-64% and 16.98%</p>
--	--	---



				<p>scored between 65%-100%. Of the remaining eighth graders in the Buffalo Public School District, 77.55% scored between 0%-64% and 22.45% scored between 65%-100%.</p> <p>* Please see attached DBA data for school to district gap analysis for all grade levels.</p> <p>OSA is unable to produce data for 3-8 ELA Economically Disadvantaged. Illuminate, the data system BPS utilizes communicates with Infinite Campus to pull information for subgroups. Socioeconomic status is not one of the filters. All resources have been exhausted in trying to gain access to this information. School #3 was informed that this problem should be rectified in time for the next Quarterly Report.</p>
3-8 ELA ED Students Level 2 & above				<p>Although we are unable to obtain current MGP data School #3 has employed a variety of strategies to address trends that were highlighted from our state test scores. These strategies are outlined in the goals and recommendation from the DTSDE Report to reflect the school's priorities. To effectively implement the school's vision and mission statements that are outlined in the School Improvement Grant, the school will focus on providing differentiated professional development for teachers. The differentiated professional development will focus on the "School-wide Teacher Big Rock", <i>Student Engagement</i>, which is achieved via: Higher Order Questions, Differentiated Common Core Aligned Lessons, and Writing Across the Curriculum.</p>
		31%	32%	<p>Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to reading levels during the reading differentiation period. In addition, the Building Reading Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms. Analyzed school data was utilized to determine the Building Reading Teacher's schedule; the teacher was assigned students who are in need of the most intensive support.</p>
3-8 Math Hispanic Students Level 2 & above		23%	24%	<p>In Grade 3 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup out-performed the district on 20% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 40% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 40% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 91 % of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 6% scored a Level 2, 3% scored a Level 3 and 0% scored a Level 4.</p>



		<p>In Grade 4 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup out-performed the district on 71% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 29% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 85.2% of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 5.5% scored a Level 2, 9.3% scored a Level 3 and 0% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 5 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 40% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 60% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 99% of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 1% scored a Level 2, 0% scored a Level 3 and 0% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 6 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup out-performed the district on 30% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 50% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 20% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 96% of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 1% scored a Level 2, 1% scored a Level 3 and 2% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 7 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup out-performed the district on 62% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 24% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 14% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 98% of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 0% scored a Level 2, 1% scored a Level 3 and 1% scored a Level 4.</p> <p>In Grade 8 Math, School #3's Hispanic subgroup out-performed the district on 54% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup was within +/- 5 percentage points of the district on 23% of the standards assessed. School #3's Hispanic subgroup performed below the district on 23% of the standards assessed.</p> <p>Between the 2 administered assessments (average), 94.5% of the Hispanic subgroup scored a Level 1, 2.5% scored a Level 2, 1.5% scored a Level 3 and 1.5% scored a Level 4.</p>
--	--	--





				* Please see attached DBA data for school to district gap analysis for all grade levels.	
3-8 Math ED Students Level 2 & above				OSA is unable to calculate the Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) for 3-8 Math ED Students Level 2 & above at this point. School 3 is unable to obtain all the metrics used to calculate MGP.  Although we were unable to gather current MGP data teachers' lessons are written to ensure effective implementation of Common Core Math. Administration observes classes weekly to insure implementation of Common Core Standards. Grade level meetings focus on School #3's "Big Rock", Student Engagement, Higher Order Questions, and Writing across the curriculum. Grade level meetings address recommendations from the School review with District Overview. Through grade level professional development, teachers build pedagogical skills and material aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards in order to increase rigor in learning.	
		25%	26%	Classroom teachers are currently differentiating instruction according to math levels during the math differentiation period. In addition, the Building Math Teacher provides academic intervention services to targeted groups of students and classrooms. Due to the fact that there is only one Building Math Teacher the school analyzed data to assist in scheduling to identify the students who are in need of the most intensive support.	
Providing 200 Hours of Extended Day Learning Time (ELT)				The Extended Learning Time began on October 5, 2015. The after-school program is held on Mondays through Thursdays for two hours. The recruitment of students and teachers took place during the month of September 2015. The program is designed to include math and reading support along with extra-curricular activities for two hours after school. Students in need of Level 1 support are in need of the most intensive support; the students with this level of support will be targeted to attend the program.	
		N/A	N/A	In an effort to provide students with varied additional support that focuses on Common Core, the students will receive instructional support from the Common Core Addition Ready New York Common Core Learning Standards. The program is aligned to Common Core, and it is an extension to what the students learn during the school day.	
				Students were administered a pre-test at the onset of the program. A mid-year test will be provided along with an end of the year program.	
<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 with impact.	<b>Yellow</b>	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	<b>Red</b>	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.



## Part II – Key Strategies

### Key Strategies

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

List the Key Strategy from your approved Intervention Plan (SIG, SIF, SCEP or Out of Time).	Status of each strategy (R/Y/G)	
<p>1. <b>Student centered engaging instructional strategies:</b></p>		<p>Identify the evidence that supports your assessment of implementation/impact of key strategies, the connection to goals, and the likelihood of meeting targets set forth in the Intervention Plan.</p> <p><b>Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies:</b> Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies are instructionally relevant and developmentally appropriate. These strategies include student engagement strategies, higher order thinking questions, explicit instruction, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) strategies, and realia (providing students with real-world experiences). All teachers are given the opportunity to participate in supervised learning-walks with instructional coaches where they can observe teachers who display culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies during instruction. The purpose of this practice is for teachers to be able to experience first-hand what culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies look like and the planning that goes into the implementation of these strategies. In November, December and January Instructional Coaches have been participating in supportive classroom visits.</p> <p><b>Co-Teaching:</b> Effective co-teaching strategies allow for optimal learning of students. Co-teaching provides various methods for two teachers to work together in a classroom such as; one teach one support, parallel teaching, alternate teaching, station teaching, and team teaching. On November 23 – November 24 and December 16 – December 17, West Ed initiated guidance and support to teachers who participate in a co-teaching environment.</p> <p><b>Instructional Coaching:</b> Instructional Coaching provides various instructional supports for teaching and instruction throughout the building. The Instructional Coaches will continue to support teachers by scheduling pre-conferences,</p>



		<p>modeling, and shadowing lessons. The coaches will conduct post-conferences where the teacher and the coach reflect upon the lesson and identify instructional strategies that will meet the academic needs of the students. The Instructional Coach provided Professional Development (PD) for teachers on how to integrate the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) shifts, district provided curricula, and unit and lesson plans to improve instruction on a weekly basis for the remainder of the school year.</p> <p><b>Dual Language:</b> On November 10 and December 4, School 3 pre-kindergarten teachers participated in on-site job-imbedded professional development, provided by WestEd. In support of the continued development of the school's Dual Language Program, the professional development was provided to align English and Spanish curriculum materials across classrooms to mirror instruction between the classes.</p> <p>Professional Learning Opportunities will be provided to staff on SIOP strategies and other strategies for supporting all students, including English Language Learners. Provide side-by-side coaching to teachers on the use of strategies for English Language Learners. See attached addendum for specific dates for professional development dates.</p> <p><b>Facilitated Grade Level, and Common Planning Meetings:</b>                  Administration, instructional coach, and the building reading teacher began facilitating grade level and common planning time in September 2015 where NYS ELA, Math, Science, NYSESLAT, and common formative assessment data are analyzed to identify areas in need of development. Teachers are in the process of creating year-long action plans to address the areas in need of focus for ELA. During grade levels, teachers will continue to use the data to monitor student progress through District Benchmark Assessments (DBA). Teachers will use the DDI and lesson plan protocol process to review student work and identify specific skills with which students are struggling. Teachers will identify differentiated learning goals, and provide timely feedback to students.</p>
--	--	--



	<p><b>2. Professional Development:</b></p> <p><b>Curriculum Mapping and Backward Planning:</b> Curriculum Mapping and Backward Planning will align instructional topics across content areas and will better prepare teachers in their instructional planning throughout the school year. Teachers began this process in September 2015, during grade level meetings, and they will continue to edit and revise this document over the course of the school year.</p> <p><b>CCLS Mathematics and ELA Implementation</b> The focus of professional development for the 2015-16 school year will be to enhance teachers' content and pedagogical mathematics knowledge by routinely engaging in collaborative lesson design through which they will apply the principals of Reading to Learning (RtL) to math. This will include engaging teachers in guided collaborative practice in applying strategies for supporting mathematical discourse in the classroom to support students' math and literacy achievement. Professional development will support student achievement in math and literacy by enhancing teachers' professional practice around integrating effective literacy and discourse-based instruction into the mathematics classroom. The professional development began on October 21, 2015.</p> <p>ELA CCLS implementation focused on integrated multiple grade levels From November 5, 2015- January 29, 2016. The following dates concentrated on ELA across grade levels with our educational provider, West Ed. During this time teachers were guided through lesson tuning and development as a grade level. The lesson focused on the CCLS and the skill of the specific lesson being taught. The PD occurred on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 7, 2015</li> <li>• November 19 &amp; 20, 2015</li> <li>• December 17 &amp; 18, 2015</li> <li>• January 19 &amp; 20, 2016</li> </ul> <p>Math CCLS implementation focused on integrated multiple grade levels from November 5, 2015- January 29, 2016. The dates below concentrated on math</p>
--	---



		<p>lessons across grade levels with West Ed. During this time teachers were guided through lesson tuning and development as a grade level.</p> <p>The lessons then focused on the CCLS and the skill being taught. The PD occurred on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 6 &amp; 7, 2015</li> <li>• December 2 &amp; 3, 2015</li> <li>• January 11 &amp; 12, 2016</li> </ul> <p>A full day of professional development for CCLS for math and ELA was conducted on November 7, 2015.</p>
<p>3. Parent and Community Involvement:</p>		<p>WestEd delivered the following at D'Youville Porter Campus, School #3, during this quarter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) - administrative orientation and planning – Continuation from Year One</li> <li>• Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) - teacher orientation and training – Continuation from Year One</li> <li>• On-site coaching and technical assistance for teachers as they prepare for Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) meetings 1, 2 &amp; 3</li> <li>• Provide tools and resources, including electronic templates for action planning and Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) meeting facilitation</li> <li>• Two leadership development sessions for school site Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) leadership implementation team in the Fall (following APTT #1) and Spring (following APTT #3)</li> <li>• Participation and support during Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) meetings 1, 2 &amp; 3 in classrooms selected by the principal and APTT Champion includes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Observations</li> <li>○ Feedback</li> <li>○ Debriefing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support principal in planning teacher debriefing sessions after each round of Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) meetings</li> </ul>





<p><b>Green</b>                  Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy with impact.</p>	<p><b>Yellow</b>                  Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>	<p><b>Red</b>                  Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>
<p>In addition, the school has held the following events to create parental involvement in our school community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Down to the Core Night took place on Wednesday, Dec 9, 2015. The night focused on math and ELA for all grade levels. Over 86 families attended. Students participated in ELA and math station activities</li> <li>• PTO Meetings: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 Wednesday, December 16, 2015 and Thursday, January 21, 2016. This welcomes families to become involved in their child's school community</li> <li>• Winter Concert Tuesday, December 22, 2015</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-create a strategic family outreach plan to ensure high family meeting attendance</li> <li>• Provide the school principal and the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) champion with coaching support and instruments that will assist in measuring and evaluating implementation progress                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Family survey</li> <li>○ Teacher survey</li> <li>○ Student data graphs</li> <li>○ Family attendance templates</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support school principal with planning facilitation of a family focus group at the end of the school year.</li> </ul>		

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

<p><b>Community Engagement Team (CET)</b>                  Please provide information regarding the type, nature, frequency and outcomes of meetings held by the entire Community Engagement Team and/or sub-committees charged with addressing specific components of the Community Engagement Plan. Describe goals and outcomes of meetings and committee work in terms of Community Engagement Plan implementation, school support and dissemination of information.</p>	
<p>Status</p>	<p>Analysis / Report Out</p>



(R/Y/G)	<p><b>Community Engagement Team Meetings:</b>          During this quarter, the Community Engagement Team has held three meetings. The November 24, 2015 meeting addressed the following agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed, revised, and updated the last quarterly report in teams</li> <li>• On December 15, 2015, a meeting took place between the Principal, Associate Superintendent, and the Building Delegate to discuss matters regarding receivership</li> <li>• Discussed updates that were made at the November 24<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding the quarterly report</li> <li>• Rescheduled the January meeting to January 11, 2016</li> </ul> <p>Meeting conducted on January 11, 2016 addressed the following agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teams discussed and read over the quarterly report</li> <li>• Teams of participants made changes and suggestions related to</li> </ul> <p>This section of the Community Engagement Team's overall all rating of green is due to the team meeting all of the aforementioned criteria for the Community Engagement Team.</p> <p><b>Changes in Team Membership:</b></p> <p>During this quarter, some team membership changes occurred. During the summer, an elected teacher member was promoted to an Assistant Principal. As a result, an alternate teacher member filled the vacant position. At the recommendation of the Buffalo Teacher Federation's, some of the school's Building Committee members were added to the team. This change resulted in two additional teacher members. Lastly, additional positions within the building increased the size of the staff. As a result, two additional teacher members were added. It was recommended from the BTF union that the building delegates be added to the team.</p> <p>The changes in membership above allowed for the opportunity for additional administrator leadership representation on the team. Additionally, the addition of three teachers increased teacher representation in making contributions from the teachers' perspectives.</p> <p>This section of the Community Engagement Team's overall all rating of green is due to the team meeting all of the aforementioned criteria for the Community Engagement Team.</p>
	<p><b><u>Powers of the Receiver</u></b></p> <p>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.</p>
Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis / Report Out
	<p>The district has finished negotiations for changes in the collective bargaining agreement for 20 of the schools identified as Struggling or Persistently Struggling. For the schools that have not been included in the most recent decisions of the Commissioner regarding the district proposals to alter the</p>



Buffalo Teacher's Federation (BTF) contract, we have sent dates for negotiation to the BTF to begin the process - the goal is to have all Receivership schools included in the Commissioner's decisions regarding the proposals altering the BTF collective bargaining agreement.

The Commissioner has approved the Receiver's ability to:

- Involuntarily transfer teachers from any Receivership school
- Deny the voluntary transfer of any teacher (to increase the stability of the faculty)
- Change the Start time of a school building
- Change the period length or time allotment in the school building to allow for additional common planning time
- Mandate Professional Development of teachers and administrators at all Receivership schools
- Ability to fill summer school and extra-curricular activity positions with the most qualified teacher, not simply by seniority
- Ability to interview teachers and fill transfers with the most qualified teacher
- The ability to hold faculty meetings twice per month

Receivership schools are in the process of analyzing the approved proposals and working/discussing with their CET's to decide what changes are going to take place that allow use of the enhanced Receivership "powers". Principals will begin to gather data to support teacher transfers and identify additional Professional Development that will be mandated at their individual schools.

Lastly, voluntary teacher transfers are due to the Human Resources office by March 23rd. After that date, the Receivership Principals will be notified of teachers from their schools' that have requested a transfer. After discussion with the Receiver, they will decide if a teacher will be allowed to transfer.

Increased use of the additional Receivership powers - approved by the Commissioner will be discussed and examined by each schools Administrative team, along with the CET, Associate of School Leadership, and the Superintendent as Receiver.

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



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

**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 V – Attestation**

**ATTESTATION:** By signing below, I certify that the information in this quarterly report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Receiver (Print): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_