



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Canisteo-Greenwood Central 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 7

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 7

Section V – Monitoring History 8

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 9

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 12

 Preparation 13

 Recruitment and Placement 13

 Induction and Mentoring..... 13

 Evaluation 14

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 15

 Performance Management 17

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 17

 Other 18

 Issues of Equity..... 18

 Sustainability..... 18

Section VIII – Methodology 19

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dr. Jeffrey A. Matteson	Karen J. Mead
Phone	(607) 698-4225 ext. 2403	(607) 698-4225 ext. 1410
Email	jmatteson@cgsd.org	kmead@cgsd.org

Section I – District Description

Source: All district description data comes from the Canisteo-Greenwood Central School District 2012-13 New York State School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Southern Tier Central	Schuyler-Steuben-Chemung-Tioga-Allegany BOCES

District Designations (i.e. DTSDE School, TIF Recipient, etc.)
Focus District

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
956	357	93	-	137	491

Racial/Ethnic Origin					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
0%	1%	1%	1%	97%	1%

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
95%	4%

Teacher Qualifications				
# Teachers	Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate	Percent Teaching Out of Certification	Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience	Turnover Rate all Teachers
90	0	1%	29%	11%

Need Status
High Need/Resource Capacity Rural

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Canisteo-Greenwood Central School District 2012-13 New York State School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	50	0	None tested	47
3(2012-13)	23	13	None tested	13
4(2011-12)	49	17	None tested	39
4(2012-13)	28	0	None tested	18
5(2011-12)	48	0	None tested	29
5(2012-13)	17	0	None tested	9
6(2011-12)	29	0	None tested	18
6(2012-13)	23	0	None tested	13
7(2011-12)	36	7	None tested	21
7(2012-13)	23	0	None tested	11
8(2011-12)	33	0	None tested	19
8(2012-13)	29	0	None tested	18
District Wide (2011-12)	40	7	None tested	28
District Wide (2012-13)	32	1	None tested	13

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	43	20	None tested	37
3(2012-13)	30	13	None tested	17
4(2011-12)	59	17	None tested	51
4(2012-13)	25	0	None tested	24
5(2011-12)	54	0	None tested	43
5(2012-13)	20	8	None tested	15

Canisteo-Greenwood Central School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

6(2011-12)	42	17	None tested	26
6(2012-13)	4	0	None tested	5
7(2011-12)	57	14	None tested	45
7(2012-13)	18	0	None tested	7
8(2011-12)	38	0	None tested	22
8(2012-13)	10	0	None tested	3
District Wide (2011-12)	49	12	None tested	38
District Wide (2012-13)	24	3	None tested	26

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	88	82	None tested	88
4(2012-13)	89	46	None tested	85
8(2011-12)	56	22	None tested	42
8(2012-13)	69	53	None tested	54
District Wide (2011-12)	84	55	None tested	67
District Wide (2012-13)	80	50	None tested	70

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	53	10	14	0
Integrated Algebra	71	17	28	0
Geometry	81	9	-	-
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	62	11	-	-
Global History and Geography	66	20	11	6
U.S. History and Government	85	54	20	10
Living Environment	82	32	36	7
Physical Setting/Physical Earth	62	11	-	-
Physical Setting/Chemistry	73	5	-	-
Physical Setting/Physics	92	17	0	0

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	85	41	88	36
SWD	47	18	33	8
ELL	None tested	None tested	None tested	None tested
ED	90	35	83	37

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	90	15	90	15
SWD	65	12	65	12
ELL	None tested	None tested	None tested	None tested
ED	97	10	97	10

2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Grades 3-8						
	Grade	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	4	1	-	-	-	-
	8	1	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	4	1	-	-	-	-
	8	1	-	-	-	-
Science	4	1	-	-	-	-
	8	1	-	-	-	-

2011-12 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Secondary Level					
	n Tested	Number of students scoring at Level:			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	1	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	1	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	86	88	65	95
Students With Disabilities	17	n<30	10	n<30
Limited English Proficient	0	n<30	0	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	31	94	30	90

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2011-12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA-All Students • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA-White • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA-Students with Disabilities • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA-Economically Disadvantaged • Elementary/Middle-Level Math-All Students • Elementary/Middle-Level Math-White

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary/Middle-Level Math-Students with Disabilities Elementary/Middle-Level Math- Economically Disadvantaged Secondary-Level ELA - White Secondary-Level Math - White
List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary/Middle-Level ELA - Students with Disabilities Secondary-Level Math - White

Section III – District Schools Profile

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

Most current information as of: April 4, 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)
Canisteo-Greenwood CSD	Jeffrey Matteson	2012-13	Original	985		2 P, 1 AP		97	
	Jeremy Palotti	2013-14	New		985		3 P		98

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers (2012-13)	# of Teachers (2013-14)
Canisteo-Greenwood ES	Colleen Brownell	7/1/09	Con	PK-4	410	410	1 P	1 P	37	37
Canisteo-Greenwood MS	Paul Cone	10/9/12 AP 7/1/13	Con	5-7	207	207	1 AP	1 P	23	23
Canisteo-Greenwood HS	Michael Wright	8/18/03 AP 7/1/04	Con	8-12	368	368	1 P	1 P	38	38

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
Current APPR Plan: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/canisteo-greenwood-appr-plan.pdf Most current version as of: May 16, 2014

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
Teacher	Principal
Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Teacher Evaluation (2012-13)				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State-provided growth or other comparable measures	Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth	Other measures of teaching effectiveness
Highly-Effective	30	35	36	30
Effective	61	53	51	61
Developing	6	9	10	6
Ineffective	3	3	3	3

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

*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; Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	May 9, 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; April Marsh, Project Assistant; Megan Collins, Project Assistant	August 23, 2013

2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; Megan Collins, Project Assistant	January 29, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	March 13, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	Robert Husain, Project Assistant	August 15, 2014

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile

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

General Grant Information			
STLE #	Funding Amount	Implementation Dates	Individual or Consortium
5545-13-0005	\$115,125	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. Preparation – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and IHEs and/or other eligible partner: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>
2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>
3. Induction and Mentoring – 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 created career ladder positions to serve as Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers to build district internal coaching.</i>
4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>The district had 4 APPR Reviewers on the career ladder whose responsibilities were to conduct Professional Development on Marzano’s Domains and to coach individuals and teams.</i>
5. Professional Development/Growth- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>Canisteo-Greenwood used grant funds to successfully implement Professional Development for School Improvement (PDSI) leaders, Instructional coaches and APPR Reviewers.</i>
6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>

7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *The Canisteo-Greenwood CSD established the positions of Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers.*

Program Goals (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)	Targets (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
<p>Goal I: Build common foundation in common Core Instructional Shifts</p>	<p>Establish common understanding of CCLS/IS among all K-12 content faculty, reaching Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) stages of change level 4 by June 2014</p> <p>By June 2013/14, 90% of classroom walkthroughs will demonstrate evidence of the effective implementation of the following items:</p> <p>Learning Goals (LG) Q1: The learning goal is visible and stated Q2: The goal is stated in student friendly wording and notes what student will be able to do Q5: When asked, students can identify and understand their learning objective</p> <p>CCLS/Instructional Shifts (CCLS) Q20: Questions and tasks ask students to think about what they have read or heard and then ask them to draw evidence from their ideas Q21: Sequences of questions cause students to delve deeper to make nontrivial inferences beyond what is</p>	<p>In March 2014 ,core faculty common understanding of Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)/Instructional shifts (IS)CBAM level has moved up to level 4 (refinement)</p> <p>In March 2014 observable Classroom CCLS behaviors Walkthrough:</p> <p><u>Learning Goals (LG)</u> Q1: The learning goal is visible and stated 93%³⁶ Q2: The goal is stated in student friendly wording and notes what student will be able to do 93% ³³ Q5: When asked, students can identify and understand their learning objective 80%⁴¹</p> <p><u>CCLS/Instructional Shifts (CCLS)</u> Q20: Questions and tasks ask students to think about what they have read or heard and then ask them to draw evidence from their ideas 91% ⁴⁹ Q21: Sequences of questions cause students to delve deeper to make nontrivial inferences beyond what is explicitly stated in the text evidence of higher order</p>

	<p>explicitly stated in the text (evidence of higher order questioning techniques)</p> <p>Assessment(AS) Q29: Rubrics are available and identify key components required for task Q31: Evidence of staff collection of student data (data walls, spread sheets, formative assessment) Q36: Lesson closure includes teacher restating objective and conducting a short formative assessment</p>	<p>questioning techniques) 77%^43</p> <p><u>Assessment(AS)</u> Q29: Rubrics are available and identify key components required for task 48%^25 Q31: Evidence of staff collection of student data (data walls, spread sheets, formative assessment) 48%^33 Q36: Lesson closure includes teacher restating objective and conducting a short formative assessment 57%^42</p>
<p>Goal II: Identify teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS & APPR</p>	<p>Build district internal coaching/training capacity by Identifying teacher leaders to fill: 4 Instructional Coach positions and 4 APPR Peer Reviewer positions</p>	<p>March 2014, new teacher leader positions: Created and facilitated <i>all</i> sessions of January Superintendent conference day. Provided Network Team Institute (NTI) turnkey sessions for k-12 PLC meetings. Facilitated workdays for K-12 ELA and Math to reflect/refine module implementation. Provided district administrators with NTI written summaries</p>

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$115,125	\$25,825	\$89,300

Canisteo-Greenwood Central School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)
15	Substitutes	-Numerous	\$5,400	\$5,400	\$7,300	\$39,200
40	PD Trainings	32	-	-	\$5,247	-
45	Follett Education	NS	\$16,168 (not broken out)	\$11,388	\$1,540 (general materials – not broken out)	\$1,646
45	Curriculum Associates	NS	-	\$205	-	-
45	VISA Amazon	NS	-	\$3,062	-	\$28
46	Solution Tree Conference	4	-	\$4,328	-	-
46	PDSI Meetings	3	-	\$257	\$904	-
46	NTI Training Conference Expenses	4	-	-	-	\$1,691
40	VISA	6	-	-	-	\$546
40	Parking Reimbursement	1	-	-	-	\$20
40	Regents Research Fund	6	-	-	-	\$701
40	PLC Associates, Inc.	NS	-	-	-	\$9,800
45	American Reading Company	NS	-	-	-	\$671
45	Dell Marketing	NS	-	-	-	\$1,200
45	TJM Promotions	NS	-	-	-	\$480
45	Pro Ed	NS	-	-	-	\$4,800
49	GST BOCES	-1	-	-	-	\$29,702
	Total Actual Expenditures	-	\$21,568	\$24,640	\$14,991	\$90,485

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 areas?

Preparation

Preparation	
Standard	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.
Summary: 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

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	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 have effective or highly effective educators.
Summary: 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

Induction and Mentoring	
Standard	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.
<p>Summary: The district used STLE funds to provide peer coaching in CCSS and APPR. These activities supported the district in attaining Goal II: identify teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS & APPR.</p> <p>The district has provided CCSS Professional Development to build capacity on: 1)Assessment: formative assessment of Learning goals, developing and using rubrics, CCLS Data collection, analysis and use, higher order questioning, Critiques & Modeling 2) ELA Module Workdays and 3) Math Module Workdays.</p> <p>Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers conducted classroom walkthroughs twice a year and analyzed and shared results.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	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 the evidence was collected.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The original intent of hiring the Instructional Coaches and Peer Reviews Spring (2013) and training over the summer (2013) was shifted off by the district until January (2014). This was due to not being able to verify HEDI ratings until the fall. As a result, the district reported that the September through January activities will continue to focus on building all staff capacity in establishing common skill sets to implement the adoption of ELA and Math modules as the official Canisteo-Greenwood CSD curriculum.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The newly identified Instructional Coaches and APPR peer reviewers facilitated all of the January 31 conference day sessions. Planned follow up activities include: NTI information turnkey at monthly Faculty meetings as well as on-going written pieces within the weekly bulletin.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district identified teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS and APPR. CGCSD hired 4 Instructional Coach positions (1 K-7 ELA, 1 8-12 ELA, 1 K-7 Math and 1 8-12 Math). In addition, teachers have benefitted greatly from the addition of 4 APPR Peer reviewers.
- Teachers were provided 1-to-1 and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) team coaching on Marzano Design Question implementation.
- The district facilitated workdays for K-12 ELA and Math to reflect/refine module implementation on Common Core modules.
- The Instructional Coaches provided NTI turnkey sessions for K-12 PLC meetings.
- The full Faculty Conference day program & evaluations held January 31, 2014: morning sessions were: Differentiated sessions on Research Based Practices; afternoon sessions were: Vertical Curriculum conversations.
- The presentation of the analysis of the end of year walkthrough data resulted in the creation of the 2014/15 professional development plan and APPR Marzano targeted Domains.
- A New Mentor Handbook is being created this summer (2014). It will emphasize the districts walkthrough practice to sustain STLE grant initiatives.

Evaluation

Evaluation	
Standard	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.
Summary: Four APPR Peer Reviewers are currently serving under the Career Ladder and responsibilities are to conduct Professional Development on Marzano’s Domains and to coach	

individuals and teams.

These activities are supporting the district in attaining its Goal II: identify teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS & APPR.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Stipends for 4 Instructional Coaches and 2 APPR Peer Reviewers	T-Eval	PD	APPR-other, CC-other	District	15		6	\$54,785

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 the evidence was collected.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- Staff received three days of Marzano professional development to understand observation system and APPR.
- Three rounds of walk throughs created a base line and allowed peer reviewers to create goals/targets.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Professional development workshop “Developing and using rubrics” held on: November 1, grades 6-12 - 19 attended and November 6, Special Ed/Response to Intervention (RTI) - 22 attended; November 7 K-5- 22 attended.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Teachers were provided 1-to-1 and PLC team coaching on Marzano Design Question implementation.
- The district facilitated workdays for K-12 ELA and Math to reflect/refine module implementation on Common Core modules.
- A presentation of the analysis of the End of Year (EOY) walkthrough data occurred resulting in the creation of the 2014/15 Professional Development Plan (PDP) and APPR Marzano targeted Domains.

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	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.
Summary: The District used grant funds to successfully implement Professional Development for School Improvement (PDSI) leaders, Instructional coaches and APPR Reviewers. These activities supported the district in attaining its Goal I: build common foundation in common Core	

Instructional Shifts.

PDSI leaders conducted district evidence based practice walkthroughs, analyzed results, identified needs and established/evaluated PDP. Focus was on capacity building professional development; established common understanding through districts.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Instructional Coaches CCLS Training	T-PD External T-PD Internal	Group, Group	DDI, CC-Other	NT-DS, District	46	32		15,900

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 the evidence was collected.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The PDSI Teacher Leader Team’s Analysis Highlights, enormous growth in some areas: student friendly Learning Goal’s, overall use of student learning goal’s, and Middle School data shows these areas are well posted & well used, every area showed some growth, improvement in all areas.
- The PDSI Teacher Leader team indicated double digit gains at the elementary levels; four cases where 90% goal has already been met and can see this with only a “snapshot” view of what they are doing, four areas that are on the cusp of success with 80% or better, and that some areas grew 50% or more.
- Canisteo-Greenwood CSD reported that their data supports that PD is helping and improving best teaching practices, continued gains in rubrics will be in the near future, and instructional shifts in the area of rigor is projected as the next area of growth for observation
- The district provided CCSS Professional Development on: close reads, text based evidence, evidence based discussions, evidence based writing, text complexity, argumentative writing and critique models

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The CGCSD indicated that the support from STLE 1 allowed the small rural district an opportunity to provide cohesive, rigorous professional development for all K-12 content teachers. As a result, they established a common foundation and understanding of: close reading, text dependent questions, evidence based discussions and argumentative writing & critique.
- The district was able to build internal capacity by sending Ambassadors to the Network Team Institute trainings. As a result, trusted well respected teachers have turn-keyed the materials and resources as well as the vision and mission of the Common Core. They

shared not only their experiences, but also perspectives and ideas from those they had the opportunity to network with.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
Summary: This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

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

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
Standard	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.
<p>Summary: The district used STLE funds to successfully provide teacher leaders and administrators with differentiated and on-going support through professional development activities. The activities supported the district in meeting its STLE Goal I- Build common foundation in common Core Instructional Shifts and Goal II – Identify teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS and APPR.</p> <p>The district created a total of four Instructional Coaches and four APPR reviewers. Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers were trained on Marzano’s Rubric and attended the Network Team Institute.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Stipends for 4 Instructional Coaches and 2 APPR Peer Reviewers	T-FT	STLE 1	Coach, DDI, APPR-Other, CC-Other	15	Stipend	6	\$54,785

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 the evidence was collected.

Evidence from site visit:

- Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers received training in Marzano observation to help conduct non evaluative peer reviews and attended the Network Team Institute to assist colleagues.
- Instructional Coaches participated in PLCs.
- Instructional Coaches and APPR Reviewers created action plan sheet and have done three rounds of walk throughs.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The newly identified Instructional Coaches and APPR peer reviewers facilitated all of the January 31 conference day sessions. Follow up activities included: NTI information turnkey at monthly faculty meetings as well as on-going written pieces within the weekly bulletin.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district identified teacher leaders to provide peer coaching in CCSS and APPR. The district hired 4 Instructional Coach positions (1 K-7 ELA, 1 8-12 ELA, 1 K-7 Math and 1 8-12 Math). In addition, teachers also benefitted greatly from the addition of 4 APPR Peer reviewers.
- The addition of a full time Instructional Coach provided teachers with access to more job embedded professional development through co-teaching and demonstration lessons.

Other

Other	
Standard	[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.
Summary: 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

Issues of Equity	
Standard	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. [Note: There is no coding of the Equity Component.]
Summary: This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
Summary: The district used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district. The Instructional Coach positions have been consolidated into one Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) position and, with the APPR Peer Reviewers, will continue on next year with support from STLE2.	

Short Description	Code	Type
TOSA Position and APPR Reviewers	Personnel	Grant

Evidence from Year 1 Interim Report:

- The initiative for sustainability is included in the districts leadership transition planning.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim report:

- The sustaining of STLE initiatives has been included in district budget discussions. The district has already aligned the Professional Development Plan, DCEP/SCEP and STLE2 grants to maximize impact.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The frameworks established through this grant will continue, including PDSI Stakeholders group who conducted evidence gathering walkthroughs twice a year, analyzed the data and identified district professional development goals. The Instructional Coach positions were consolidated into one TOSA position and with the APPR Peer Reviewers will continue on next year with support from STLE2.

Section VIII – Methodology

Overview of monitoring activities and 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 and/or monitoring of the grant.

Individuals interviewed

District Level

- Superintendent
- Grant Coordinator
- Business Official

Building Principals

- ES Principal
- MS Assistant Principal
- HS Principal

Professional Development for School Improvement Team (PDSI)

- HS Representative
- MS/Sped Representative
- MS Representative
- ES Representative
- RTI

Instructional Coaches & Peer Reviewers

- MS Peer Reviewer
- 8-12 ELA Coach and HS Peer Reviewer

- K-8 ELA Coach and Peer Reviewer
- Sped/RTI Peer Reviewer
- 8-12 Math Coach
- K-8 Math Coach

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

- Canisteo-Greenwood Site Visit Notes
- Canisteo-Greenwood Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Canisteo-Greenwood Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Canisteo-Greenwood Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Canisteo-Greenwood Year 2 Final STLE Report