

# SED's Completed Work on Receivership

## Since the Receivership law was enacted, the Board of Regents and Department have:

Engaged in extensive discussion with the field regarding school receivership:

- Individual meetings with Key Stakeholders

- May 27, 2015 Key Stakeholder meeting in Albany to discuss draft regulations

- Individual conference calls with each district

- July 22-23, 2015 Receivership Conference with stakeholder teams from each district

Made extensive revisions to the regulations to reflect Stakeholder feedback.

100.19 as emergency action to  
implement

# Public Engagement by SED

The Department solicited comments and recommendations from key stakeholders. More than 100 participants provided their feedback on the draft express terms that were presented to the Board of Regents in May.

In response to public comment from stakeholders, the following are among the changes made to the receivership regulations:

- Clarifying reasons for districts to appeal designation of schools;
- Clarifying public hearing requirements and significantly expanding the role of the Community Engagement Teams;
- Clarifying the process by which Demonstrable Improvement decisions are made;
- Providing protections for superintendents who exercise receivership powers;
- Adding minimum qualifications for independent receivers; and
- Adding new provisions regarding the process by which a receiver may restaff a school or make other employment decisions.


# SED efforts to Enhance Public Involvement in Receivership Schools

# The Work Already Underway: Superintendent Receivership

Persistently Struggling and Struggling Schools were identified on July 16, 2015.

As required by state law, in order to use the powers of the Receiver, Superintendents must have a department approved plan (1003 (g) School Improvement Grant, School Innovation Fund or School Comprehensive Education Plan) in place for the 2015-16 school year.

Districts have:



# How Demonstrable Improvement is Determined

The Department has identified Level 1 and Level 2 indicators (See Appendix).

A minimum of five Level 1 and five Level 2 indicators will be selected for a school; a school with elementary-middle and secondary grades will have to select seven Level 1 and seven Level 2 indicators, indicators from both grade levels must be included.

The Demonstrable Improvement Index will generate a score from 0-100%.

Level 1 and Level 2 indicators will be weighted 50% in computing the Demonstrable Improvement Index.

Each indicator within Level 1 and Level 2 will be weighted equally.

If a school achieves an index of 67% or higher, the school has made demonstrable improvement. If a school achieves below 40%, it has not, unless the school can demonstrate it would have achieved 67% of its goals absent extenuating or extraordinary circumstances.

The Department will review the entirety of the record and after consulting with district and Community Engagement Team determine whether a school with an







# Conversion to Community Schools

## Process for Conversion

In order for the Independent Receiver to convert a Persistently Struggling school into a community school, he/she should implement the following process and meet the following minimum requirements:


*Partner* with families and relevant community agencies to integrate these partners into the community engagement team;

*Designate* a full-time person who reports to the Receiver and whose sole responsibility is to manage the development of the Community School framework for that school and subsequently ensure the maintenance and sustainability of the community school;

*Conduct* a comprehensive school and community needs assessment in such form and format and according to such timeline as may be prescribed by the Commissioner;

*Complete* a thorough analysis of the needs assessment results; and

*Incorporate* into the school improvement plan, short-term strategies to improve student learning while establishing the Community School.



# Implementation Challenges

Based on the statutory guidelines, 144 schools in 17 school districts were identified as Struggling Schools or Persistently Struggling Schools.

**124 were identified as Struggling Schools**

**20 were identified as Persistently Struggling Schools.**

The number of individuals and organizations ready, willing, and able to serve as independent receivers is unknown.

Despite the significant new responsibility, no additional resources were provided to the Department to handle the implementation related to Receivership.

Litigation regarding various aspects of receivership is likely and anticipated.

In the fall 2016 the Department staff must determine whether or not schools in Receivership have made Demonstrable Improvement, a sharply accelerated time line for making such high stakes decisions.

# Recommended Next Steps for the Legislature

The Department recommends that the Legislature consider the following changes to the Receivership law it enacted as

:

Provide adequate resources to the Department to support implementation of receivership related tasks;

Clarify for school districts what funding streams they should expect to receive to support work in Struggling Schools in 2016-17 and in Persistently Struggling Schools in 2017-18;

Provide funding for Struggling Schools; and

Consider revisions to timelines established in state law that create tensions between speedy implementation and quality of actions.



**Thank You.**

**Follow NYSED on Twitter:**

**@NYSEDNews**

# Appendix



# Level 1 Indicators

# The Level 1 Indicators

## Elementary and Middle:

Making Priority School Progress

Percent of Students at or above Level 2 in ELA

Percent of Students at or above Level 2 in math

Mean Student Growth Percentile in ELA

Mean Student Growth Percentile in math

Percent of Students at or Above Level 3 in Science

Serious Incidents (VADIR)

## High School:

Making Priority School Progress

4-year High School Graduation Rate

5-year High School Graduation

Percent of Students Graduating with Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation

Percent of 10<sup>th</sup> graders passing Math Regents

Percent of 11<sup>th</sup> graders passing ELA Regents

Serious Incidents (VADIR)

# Level 2 Indicators

Level 2 Indicators include:

Indicators for students subgroups (i.e., English language learners, low-income students, racial/ethnic groups and students with disabilities).

Implementing a Community School Model, expanded