



**New York State Education Department**

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

**Binghamton City School District**

**Table of Contents**

**Contents**

District Contact Information ..... 3

Section I – District Description..... 3

Section II – Academic Performance ..... 4

Section III – District Schools Profile ..... 11

Section IV – APPR Profile ..... 12

Section V – Monitoring History ..... 13

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile ..... 13

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis ..... 16

    Preparation ..... 16

    Recruitment and Placement ..... 16

    Induction and Mentoring..... 16

    Evaluation ..... 18

    Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth ..... 19

    Performance Management ..... 20

    Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals ..... 21

    Other ..... 23

    Issues of Equity ..... 23

    Sustainability..... 23

Section VIII – Methodology ..... 24

## District Contact Information

	<b>Superintendent</b>	<b>STLE Grant Manager</b>
<b>Name</b>	Dr. Marion H. Martinez	Tonia Thompson
<b>Phone</b>	(607) 762-8100 x318	(607) 762-8110
<b>Email</b>	browns@binghamtonschools.org	thomsot@binghamtonschools.org

## Section I – District Description

**Source:** All district description data comes from the Binghamton City School District 2012-13 School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

**Most current information as of:** May 1, 2014

<b>District Location</b>	
<b>Region</b>	<b>BOCES</b>
Southern Tier East	Broome-Delaware-Tioga BOCES

<b>District Designations (i.e. DTSDE School, TIF Recipient, etc.)</b>
Focus District, DTSDE

<b>Student Demographics</b>					
<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch</b>	<b>Eligible for Reduced Lunch</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient</b>	<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>
5,651	3,287 (58%)	479 (8%)	237 (4%)	808 (14%)	4,305 (76%)

<b>Racial/Ethnic Origin</b>					
<b>American Indian or Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Multiracial</b>
21 (0%)	1,357 (24%)	723 (13%)	192 (3%)	32,929 (52%)	429 (8%)

<b>Attendance/Suspension Rates</b>	
<b>Annual Attendance Rate</b>	<b>Student Suspensions</b>
91%	18%

<b>Teacher Qualifications</b>				
<b># Teachers</b>	<b>Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate</b>	<b>Percent Teaching Out of Certification</b>	<b>Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience</b>	<b>Turnover Rate all Teachers</b>
558	1%	2%	25%	15%

<b>Need Status</b>
High Need - Urban/Suburban

## Section II – Academic Performance

**Source:** All academic performance data comes from the Binghamton City School District 2012-2013 School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

**Most current information as of:** May 1, 2014

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12 &amp; 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>% Proficient All</b>	<b>% Proficient SWD</b>	<b>% Proficient ELL</b>	<b>% Proficient ED</b>
3 (2012)	48	11	29	43
3 (2013)	15	0	3	11
4 (2012)	39	9	8	31
4 (2013)	12	0	0	8
5 (2012)	42	9	17	32
5(2013)	12	0	0	9
6 (2012)	46	8	10	38
6 (2013)	21	1	0	12
7 (2012)	41	5	11	31
7 (2013)	21	2	0	12
8 (2012)	39	6	0	26
8 (2013)	19	2	0	12
<b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12 &amp; 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>% Proficient All</b>	<b>% Proficient SWD</b>	<b>% Proficient ELL</b>	<b>% Proficient ED</b>
3 (2012)	46	19	19	39
3 (2013)	13	2	3	10
4 (2012)	47	17	18	40

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

4 (2013)	12	2	5	8
5 (2012)	46	13	11	39
5(2013)	11	0	0	6
6 (2012)	48	14	13	39
6 (2013)	11	0	0	4
7 (2012)	55	17	11	46
7 (2013)	14	2	0	6
8 (2012)	50	15	10	39
8 (2013)	14	2	0	6
<b>District-wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>District-wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12 &amp; 2012-13 Science Examination</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	<b>% Proficient All</b>	<b>% Proficient SWD</b>	<b>% Proficient ELL</b>	<b>% Proficient ED</b>
4 (2012)	78	63	57	74
4 (2013)	80	50	50	77
8 (2012)	66	33	38	58
8 (2013)	68	52	11	61
<b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>69</b>

<b>Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams</b>				
<b>Exam</b>	<b>All Students</b>		<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>
Comprehensive English	72	19	35	0
Integrated Algebra	62	7	17	1
Geometry	48	8	31	0
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	42	8	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	52	13	24	1
U.S. History and Government	71	31	44	16
Living Environment	67	22	41	0
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	41	5	21	3
Physical Setting/Chemistry	70	12	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physics	56	3	None Tested	None Tested

<b>Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction</b>				
	<b>2008 Cohort</b>		<b>2009 Cohort</b>	
	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>
<b>All</b>	73	26	70	22
<b>SWD</b>	26	4	28	4

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

<b>ELL</b>	40	0	0	0
<b>ED</b>	68	17	68	14

<b>Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction</b>				
	<b>2008 Cohort</b>		<b>2009 Cohort</b>	
	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>	<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>% Mastery</b>
<b>All</b>	78	10	73	11
<b>SWD</b>	30	1	32	1
<b>ELL</b>	60	0	57	0
<b>ED</b>	74	5	71	6

<b>2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Grades 3-8</b>						
	<b>Grade</b>	<b>n Tested</b>	<b>Number of students scoring at:</b>			
			<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>
English Language Arts	3	8	0	3	2	3
	4	11	0	1	2	8
	5	19	0	2	9	8
	6	15	1	3	2	9
	7	13	0	0	3	10
	8	13	0	0	0	13
Mathematics	3	8	0	0	6	2
	4	11	2	1	5	3
	5	19	2	0	12	5
	6	15	0	0	2	13
	7	13	0	0	8	5
	8	13	0	0	4	9
Science	4	11	3	0	3	5
	8	13	0	0	1	12

<b>2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Secondary Level</b>					
	<b>n Tested</b>	<b>Number of students scoring at:</b>			
		<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Level 4</b>
English Language Arts	10	0	1	0	9
Mathematics	10	0	1	2	7

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

<b>2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)</b>					
	<b>n Tested</b>	<b>Percent of students scoring in each performance level:</b>			
		<b>Beg.</b>	<b>Int.</b>	<b>Ad.</b>	<b>Prof.</b>
<b>Kindergarten</b>					
All Students	25	12	40	32	16
General Education	23	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
<b>First Grade</b>					
All Students	29	10	45	31	14
General Education	25	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
<b>Second Grade</b>					
All Students	30	0	23	73	3
General Education	27	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
<b>Third Grade</b>					
All Students	31	10	65	23	3
General Education	30	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Fourth Grade</b>					
All Students	22	14	18	55	14
General Education	21	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Fifth Grade</b>					
All Students	22	18	14	55	14
General Education	21	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Sixth Grade</b>					
All Students	14	7	7	71	14
General Education	9	0	0	78	22
SWD	5	20	20	60	0
<b>Seventh Grade</b>					
All Students	11	9	18	73	0
General Education	9	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
<b>Eighth Grade</b>					

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

All Students	10	20	30	20	30
General Education	9	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Ninth Grade</b>					
All Students	9	0	33	44	22
General Education	8	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Tenth Grade</b>					
All Students	8	25	25	50	0
General Education	6	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
<b>Eleventh Grade</b>					
All Students	6	50	17	17	17
General Education	5	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Twelfth Grade</b>					
All Students	5	20	60	20	0
General Education	5	20	60	20	0
SWD	0	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	437	63	468	66
Students With Disabilities	77	23*	88*	30
Limited English Proficient	5	n<30	4	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	238	53	214	63

\*Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30.

<b>List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2011-12</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA –White</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Limited English Proficient</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students</li> </ul>

- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students with Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level ELA – Students with Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – All Students
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – White
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Economically Disadvantaged
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – All Students
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Black or African American
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate –White
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Economically Disadvantaged
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – All Students
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Black or African American
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – White
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Economically Disadvantaged

**List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13**

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA –White
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Multiracial
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math– Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Multiracial
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient

- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level ELA – All Students
- Secondary-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level ELA– White
- Secondary-Level ELA– Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math - Students with Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math - Economically Disadvantaged
- Overall Graduation Rate – All Students
- Overall Graduation Rate - Black or African American
- Overall Graduation Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- Overall Graduation Rate – Students with Disabilities
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – All Students
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Black or African American
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Economically Disadvantaged
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – All Students
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Black or African American
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – White
- 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities

### Section III – District Schools Profile

**Source:** Information in the following table was provided by the district.

**Most current information as of: June 30, 2014**

District Name	Superintendent	Time of Service	Status	# of Students (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers (2012-13)	# of Teachers (2013-14)
Binghamton City School District	Peggy Wozniak, Ed.D.	2003-13	Original	5795	5846	10 P, 6 AP	10 P, 6 AP	499	499
	Marion H. Martinez, Ed.D.	2013-present	New						

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Stud (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teach 2012-13)	# of Teach (2013-14)
Benjamin Franklin ES	Joyce Westgate	2012-13	Orig	K-5	536	545	1 P	1 P	41	47
	Suzanne Thomas	2013-14	New							
Thomas Jefferson ES	Kristine Basso	2010-14	Con	K-5	355	325	1 P	1 P	25	29
Horace Mann ES	Peter Stewart	2006-14	Con	K-5	369	320	1 P	1 P	31	31
Theodore Roosevelt ES	David Chilson	2002-14	Con	K-5	467	466	1 P	1 P	40	38
Calvin Coolidge ES	Susan Hendery	2012-13	Orig	K-5	305	328	1 P	1 P	33	31
	Mary Kay Ryan	2013-14	New							
MacArthur ES	Maria McIver	2007-14	Con	K-5	481	504	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	40	38
Woodrow Wilson ES	Barbara McLean	2006-14	Con	K-5	457	439	1 P	1 P	38	38
East MS	Mike O'Branski	-2013	Orig	6-8	600	613	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	64	63
	Mary Surdey	2014	New							
West MS	Michael Holly	2006-14	Con	6-8	691	670	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	61	62
Binghamton HS	Roxie Oberg	2012-14	Con	9-12	1585	1585	1 P, 4 AP	1 P, 4 AP	126	122

## Section IV – APPR Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

<b>APPR Plan</b>
<b>Current APPR Plan:</b> <a href="http://nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/binghamton-appr-plan.pdf">http://nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/binghamton-appr-plan.pdf</a> <b>Most current version as of:</b> August 22, 2012

<b>Teacher Evaluation Rubric</b>	
<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Principal</b>
NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric, NYSTCE Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

<b>Teacher Evaluation (2012-13)</b>				
Presented as % by rating category	<b>Composite Rating</b>	<b>State-provided growth or other comparable measures</b>	<b>Locally- selected measures of student achievement or growth</b>	<b>Other measures of teaching effectiveness</b>
<b>Highly-Effective</b>	38	25	23	10
<b>Effective</b>	50	63	67	86
<b>Developing</b>	11	8	8	4
<b>Ineffective</b>	1	5	1	0

<b>Principal Evaluation (2012-13)</b>				
Presented as % by rating category	<b>Composite Rating</b>	<b>State-provided growth or other comparable measures</b>	<b>Locally- selected measures of student achievement or growth</b>	<b>Other measures of principal effectiveness</b>
<b>Highly-Effective</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Effective</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Developing</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Ineffective</b>	-	-	-	-

Fields with dashes have data suppressed in order to prevent reporting personally identifiable information.

## Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator Amy Cox, Project Assistant	May 8, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by July 15, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith Project Coordinator	August 8, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; Meghan Lee Collins, Project Assistant	November 14, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Status Update Call	Carrie Smith Project Coordinator	March 20, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submit by June 30, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	Robert Hussain, Project Assistant	August 15, 2014

## Section VI - STLE Grant Profile

Source: District STLE Grant Application, interim and year end final reports.

Grant Information			
STLE #	Funding Amount	Implementation Dates	Individual or Consortium
5545-13-0002	\$712,250	10/31/2012 - 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. <b>Preparation</b> – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and IHEs and/or other eligible partner:

<i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i>
2. <b>Recruitment and Placement</b> – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i>
3. <b>Induction and Mentoring</b> – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: <i>The district recruited four retired administrators to provide mentoring to five Administrative Residents based on the Multidimensional Principal Rubric. The district created Teacher Leader positions to provide support to new and early career teachers.</i>
4. <b>Evaluation</b> – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>Teacher Leaders provided APPR coaching support to all teachers within the district.</i>
5. <b>Professional Development/Growth</b> - Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>The district created Curriculum Specialists, and Administrative Intern positions to act as coaches to teachers to support the improvement of instruction and professional practice.</i>
6. <b>Performance Management</b> – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>Career Ladder positions were selected, in part by data driven criteria.</i>
7. <b>Career Ladder</b> – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>The district established the positions of teacher leaders and coaches, who received stipends for these additional responsibilities.</i>

<b>Program Goals (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)</b>	<b>Targets (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)</b>	<b>Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)</b>
Goal I: To create/strengthen a framework of teacher leadership that realizes support for other teachers in their understanding and implementation of effective teaching strategies and common core.	<p>2 Curriculum Specialist positions filled in February 2013, with each candidate completing training in Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and Modules.</p> <p>By the end of the 2013-14 school year all teachers who earned an ineffective or developing score will participate in the Teacher-Mentor program.</p> <p>By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, each Administrative Resident will demonstrate building-wide</p>	<p>The district filled 2 Curriculum Specialist positions. Both Curriculum Specialists have received training by Broome-Tioga BOCES.</p> <p>14 staff who earned an ineffective or developing APPR rating participated in Teacher-Mentor program.</p> <p>Four Administrative Residents were identified and provided building-wide leadership in support of building Principal.</p>

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

	leadership around a specific initiative agreed upon between the resident and Principal.	
Goal II: Create/strengthen a framework for administrator leadership development	All administrators participating in Administrator Mentor Program will identify one or more areas in the Multidimensional Principal Rubric and participate in Mentor around effective strategies to realize the necessary skills to become effective.	Three Administrative Mentors were identified to support new and existing Principals.

<b>Total Grant Award</b>		<b>Year 1 Allocation</b>		<b>Year 2 Allocation</b>		
<b>\$712,250</b>		<b>\$158,615</b>		<b>\$594,287</b>		
<b>Budget Code</b>	<b>Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)</b>	<b># In Position/ # Served</b>	<b>Year 1 Interim Report – Actual Exp. (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)</b>	<b>Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)</b>	<b>Year 2 Interim Report – Actual Exp. (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)</b>	<b>*Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)</b>
15	Hire 2 Curriculum Specialists	2	\$33,000	-	\$31,715	\$113,874
15	Teacher Mentor-Mentees	32	\$20,000	-	\$4,211	\$106,500
15	Mentor Teacher Coordinator	1	\$3,500	-	\$1,000	\$7,500
	Define the components of an Administrator Mentor based on the Principal APPR plan		\$3,500	-	-	-
15	Administrative Residents	4	-	-	-	\$12,000
15	Administrative Mentors	-	-	-	-	\$12,000
15	Principals meeting with mentors	3	-	-	\$2,272	-
	Compensation for existing Curriculum Specialists (Teacher Leaders)	9	\$13,000	-	-	\$22,800
15	Teacher Extra Hours	133	-	\$23,216.95	-	\$92,119.86
15	Substitute Teacher	48	-	\$500	-	\$29,940
80	Retirement	-	-	\$8,877	-	\$41,833
80	Social Security	-	-	\$5,736	-	\$19,694
80	Worker's Compensation	-	-	\$750	-	\$2,574
80	Health Insurance	-	-	\$26,000	-	\$26,570
90	Indirect Costs	-	-	\$1,629	-	\$7,243
46	Travel Expenses (Restorative Conference, Project lead The Way)	-	-	-	-	\$4,264.97
40	Purchases Services (Educators for Social Responsibility, First Colony Co, etc.)	-	-	-	-	\$39,999.23
45	Supplies and Materials (ACSD, Barnes and Noble, etc.)	-	-	-	-	\$33,715.87
	<b>Total Actual Expenditures</b>		<b>\$82,500</b>	<b>\$117,963</b>	<b>\$39,199</b>	<b>\$572,625</b>

## Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

**Source:** STLE file compiled by the New York State Education Department

*Guiding questions to direct the review:*

*I. Does the school district have a comprehensive systems approach to the recruitment, development, support, retention and equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders?*

*II. Is the grant impacting high need students and shortage subject area?*

### **Preparation**

<b>Preparation</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district is engaging in activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district’s career ladder. This can include encouraging and/or enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional certifications.
<b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
N/A							

### **Recruitment and Placement**

<b>Recruitment and Placement</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools has effective or highly effective educators.
<b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Compensation	Budget Code	# Recruit/ Transfer	Total Amount
N/A								

### **Induction and Mentoring**

<b>Induction and Mentoring</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes.
<b>Summary:</b> The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career teachers received	

mentoring support. Teacher Leaders provided mentoring to new and early career teachers on topics based on individual teacher need, APPR, CCLS, and Data Driven Instruction (DDI). These activities supported the district in attaining its STLE Goal I: to create/strengthen a framework of teacher leadership that realizes support for other teachers in their understanding and implementation of effective teaching strategies sand common core.

Five administrators participated in an Administrator Mentor Program. Administrators identified one or more areas in the Multi-dimensional Principal Rubric and worked with a mentor around effective strategies to realize the necessary skills to increase their effectiveness as an administrator.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Teachers meeting with mentors and providing support on APPR process	T-Mentor	Group	APPR-Other, Grant	District	15	69	\$87,412
Principals meeting with mentors	P-Mentor	Group	APPR-Other, Grant	District	15	3	\$16,500

**Supporting Evidence:**

*Please note that evidence is progressively collected throughout the STLE grant program period. Evidence seen below will reflect the status of grant activities at the time evidence is collected.*

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The program was delayed in putting together the necessary components to ensure a successful Administrative Mentor program due to the large number of new initiatives associated with the Regents Reform Agenda (APPR and CCLS).

Evidence from Site Visit:

- A first year principal reported that without the support of her mentor, she would not have been able to effectively manage the logistical difficulties associated with the unexpected detection of asbestos within her school. With the mentor’s support, the first year principal was able to effectively redistribute her students and teachers to five different schools within the district.
- First year principal expressed her appreciation for mentor support as she helped teachers through the “grieving process”. Teachers were forced to throw away books, supplies and materials, which had been collected through the years due to asbestos contamination.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The Teacher Leaders provided more frequent, monthly informal mentoring to new/early career teachers.
- The STLE grant coordinator indicated informal feedback of the mentoring process has been very favorable. New/early career teachers have expressed a great deal of appreciation for the mentoring support.

- Four mentors provided five administrators with mentoring centered on elements of the Multidimensional Principal Rubric administrators had identified as needing further development.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Early career teachers are meeting with mentors, about an hour each month; before & after school.
- 69 mentors/mentees were funded for support.
- 3 Administrative Mentors identified - 2 elementary and 1 middle school
- A Mentor Coordinator who oversees and helps administrate the teacher mentoring program was established.

*Evaluation*

<b>Evaluation</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district is fully implementing an APPR plan that complies with Education Law §3012-c and is approved by the commissioner. Through the evaluation system the district has a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices.
<p><b>Summary:</b> Teacher Leaders have all received professional development in DDI, APPR Student Achievement and Growth Measures. Additionally, the district met its STLE Goal I: to create/strengthen a framework of teacher leadership that realizes support for other teachers in their understanding and implementation of effective teaching strategies and common core. Measurable Outcome #2-By the end of the 2013-14 school year all teachers who earned an ineffective or developing score will participate in the Teacher-Mentor program.</p> <p>Teacher Leaders provided all teachers with coaching through the implementation of Effective Teaching Training which is aligned with the APPR adopted Pearson rubric.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
N/A								

**Supporting Evidence:**

*Please note that evidence is progressively collected throughout the STLE grant program period. Evidence seen below will reflect the status of grant activities at the time evidence is collected.*

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Providing additional time and compensation to Teacher Leaders for their work around APPR has allowed for district educators to gain a comprehensive understanding of the APPR process.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teacher Leaders participated with two area school districts (Vestal & Johnson City) in the development of both pre/post assessments associated with APPR.

- Teacher Leaders provided coaching to teachers through the implementation of Effective Teaching Training. This training is aligned with the NYSTCE Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching Rubric, adopted within APPR.
- The STLE grant manager reported that, through coaching and Administrator Walkthroughs, teachers are receiving timelier feedback on their teaching practices.
- 80% of the district’s teachers mentoring program needs were identified as a part of the APPR process. Based on these needs, mentors were able to target specific areas where mentees needed additional support and guidance.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 100% of staff who earned an ineffective or developing APPR rating participated in Teacher-Mentor program.
- All administrators participating in Administrator Mentor Program identified one or more areas in the Multidimensional Principal Rubric and participated in mentoring around effective strategies to realize the necessary skills to become effective.
- The Teacher Leaders have grown in their capacity and ability to sustain understanding of the Common Core Learning Standards, related content and the district’s Annual Professional Performance Review.

***Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth***

<b>Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.
<p><b>Summary:</b> Teacher Leaders will act as instructional coaches to teachers to support improvement of instructional and professional practice. Evidence suggests that the district undertook grant funded activities to meet its STLE Goal I: to create/strengthen a framework of teacher leadership that realizes support for other teachers in their understanding and implementation of effective teaching strategies and common core.</p> <p>Teacher Leaders participated with two area school districts (Vestal &amp; Johnson City) in the development of both pre and post assessments associated with APPR, as well as assessments to be used with Data Driven Inquiry. The pre and post assessments have been loaded into eDoctrina. Teacher Leaders provided professional development and assistance to teachers in order for greater awareness of ways in which to use the software program.</p> <p>Through STLE funded stipends, 200 district teachers were provided Focus on Effective Teaching professional development during the summer of 2013. STLE funding also provided stipends to these teachers to allow for release time and continued Focus on Effective Teaching professional development during the 2013-14 school year.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Typ	Purpose	Provider	Budget	#	Frequenc	Total
-------------------	------	-----	---------	----------	--------	---	----------	-------

Binghamton City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

		e			Code	Served	y	Amount
Materials for Lead trainers to turn-key how to create strong relationships with students and create student leaders and provide direction on Tier 1 Academic Intervention and Behavior	Material	Books/Create	SWD, ELL, SpecEd	District	45			\$34,963
Network Team Training on Common Core	T-PD External	Group	CC-other	NT-DS	46	6		\$3,703

**Supporting Evidence:**

*Please note that evidence is progressively collected throughout the STLE grant program period. Evidence seen below will reflect the status of grant activities at the time evidence is collected.*

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The additional change in plans that occurred was the re-scheduling of Administrator PD from this reporting school year to the Summer of 2013. This was due to a delay in starting the overall STLE program.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The Teacher Leaders have provided educators with professional development in the use of eDoctrina which has allowed for teachers to create more effective student assessments.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- Teacher Leaders have provided professional development to teachers in Data Driven Instruction and Common Core learning shifts. The superintendent reported that all professional development sessions have been well attended and has provided teachers with valuable information they have then transferred to improving their instructional strategies.
- Through the support of Teacher Leaders, teachers are analyzing student data every six days while Principals analyzed student data three times per year. The superintendent noted that the support provided by Teacher Leaders allowed for the district to maintain its focus on increasing both student achievement and student engagement.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district indicated that they provided quality professional development to Teacher Leaders, strengthening their ability to turn-key information and their responsibilities in their current positions.
- Anticipated end of the professional development was not possible due to the lack of days available after the last day of school (June 26<sup>th</sup>), which occurred as a result of snow day usage.

***Performance Management***

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and

employment decisions.
<p><b>Summary:</b> Eligibility criteria for curriculum specialists and teacher mentors were selected based on summative APPR ratings. To qualify for career ladder positions, teachers with Highly Effective and Effective ratings were eligible applicants.</p> <p>Teacher mentors provided one hour per month of formal coaching support to teachers on Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPS). Mentors also met more informally with teachers on TIPS to continue the support provided through the formal meetings.</p> <p>Binghamton’s career ladder is structured in such a way that provides those teachers with a strong understanding of the foundations of effective teaching and the Common Core curriculum the opportunity to apply for the position of Curriculum Specialists. Additionally, six teachers were selected as Administrative Residents based on their past practices and current understanding of effective teaching.</p>

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Administrative Residents in buildings	T-PM	Develop	APPR-Other, Parent	\$2000	15	6	\$12,000

**Supporting Evidence:**

*Please note that evidence is progressively collected throughout the STLE grant program period. Evidence seen below will reflect the status of grant activities at the time evidence is collected.*

Evidence from Year 1 Interim Report:

- Curriculum Specialists and teacher mentors were selected based on summative APPR ratings.
- Administrative Residents were chosen based on their past practices and current understanding of effective teaching.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teacher Leaders have provided coaching through the implementation of Effective Teaching Training. This training is aligned with the NYSTCE Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching Rubric, adopted within APPR.
- Through coaching and Administrator Walkthroughs, teachers received more timely feedback on their teaching practices.

***Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals***

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
<b>Standard</b>	Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions.
<b>Summary:</b> Efforts toward meeting this standard supported the district in meeting its Goal I: to	

create/strengthen a framework of teacher leadership that realizes support for other teachers in their understanding and implementation of effective teaching strategies and Common Core. Also, efforts toward meeting this standard addressed Goal II: create/strengthen a framework for administrator leadership development.

Teacher Leaders were recruited and selected based upon data driven criteria connected to the teacher evaluation system index of meeting or exceeding standards. The district created a total of 28 teacher leader positions. 40 mentors provided support to early career teachers as well as teachers who earned an ineffective or developing APPR rating. Two Curriculum Specialists were providing support to district educators with the implementation of Common Core as well as Data Drive Instruction. Six Administrative Residents were assigned to work in four elementary buildings in order to provide support to teachers in Common Core, APPR and Data Driven Inquiry.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Teacher Mentor	T-FT	STLE1	APPR-Other, Coach,	15	40 mentors x \$500 stipend; 80 staff x \$37.5 x 28 hrs. for training	80	\$106,500
Curriculum Specialist	T-TOSA	STLE1	Coach, turnkey	15	\$55,000	2	\$110,000
Teacher Mentor Coordinator	T-FT	STLE1	APPR-Other, Grant	15	\$37.5/hr.	1	\$7500

**Supporting Evidence:**

*Please note that evidence is progressively collected throughout the STLE grant program period. Evidence seen below will reflect the status of grant activities at the time evidence is collected.*

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Communicated the need and hired the Teacher Mentor Coordinator.
- Hired the Administrative Residents, who began and will continue to work at the elementary sites.
- Interviewed and hired two new qualified staff as Curriculum Specialists to support the middle schools.
- Providing additional time and compensation to Teacher Leaders allowed for the staff to increase their understanding of the APPR process.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Teacher Leaders have grown in their capacity and ability to sustain understanding of the Common Core Standards, related content, and the district’s Annual Professional Performance Review.
- The funding from STLE 1 helped to build a continuum of understanding and support for staff pre-kindergarten through grade 12. One of the most significant outcomes has been a

shift from shared decision making teams, to shared leadership teams. All activities were originally aligned to a district strategic plan, but upon reflection after Year 1, a missing component was the need for teachers and leaders to work to better improve student achievement. This work started toward the end of STLE 1 and will continue through the STLE 3 grant.

***Other***

<b>Other</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	[Note: There is no standard for “Other”.] The district uses grant funds for activities and/or positions that do not directly align with the seven TLE components.
<b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	Compensation	Total Amount
N/A						

***Issues of Equity***

<b>Issues of Equity</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM), English Language Learners (ELL), bilingual and/or special education.
<b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

***Sustainability***

<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
<b>Summary:</b> The district has taken steps to ensure programmatic sustainability beyond the life of the grant by securing additional funding. The funding support is being driven through Title 1 and Foundation aid. The position of Curriculum Specialists will be maintained.	

Short Description	Code	Type
Curriculum Specialists (2)	Personnel	SF

**Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:**

- The two positions (Curriculum Specialists) originally supported by the grant will continue using the support of both Foundation aid and Title I. Activities related to other key positions will continue using the funds from STLE 3, Title 1 and Race To The Top (RTTT) funding.

- The funding from STLE 1 helped to build a continuum of understanding and support for staff PK through 12. One of the most significant outcomes has been a shift from shared decision making teams, to shared leadership teams. All activities were originally aligned to a district strategic plan, but upon reflection after Year 1, a missing component was the need for teachers and leaders to better be able to collectively improve student achievement. This work started toward the end of STLE 1 and will continue through the STLE 3 grant.

## **Section VIII – Methodology**

Overview of site visit including a description of individuals interviewed, description of classroom observations including amount of time, student population and any protocol or rubrics used to conduct the observations.

### Individuals interviewed

#### *District Level*

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent (Grant Coordinator)
- Assistant Grant Coordinator
- Director of Personnel
- Teacher-Mentor Coordinator

#### *Principals*

- Year 1 Principal
- Interim Principal
- Michael Holly, Principal

#### *Others*

- Curriculum Specialist
- Curriculum Liaison
- Administrative Mentor
- Administrative Resident

### Description of classroom observations (including amount of time, student population and rubrics used to conduct observations)

- N/A

### Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Binghamton City School District Year 1 FS-10-F Report
- Binghamton City School District Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Binghamton City School District Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Binghamton City School District Site Visit Notes
- Binghamton City School District Year 2 Interim STLE Report

- Binghamton City School District Year 2 Final STLE Report