



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Cheektowaga 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 8

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 9

Section V – Monitoring History 10

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 11

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 14

 Preparation 14

 Recruitment and Placement 15

 Induction and Mentoring..... 16

 Evaluation 17

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 18

 Performance Management 20

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

 Other 23

 Issues of Equity..... 23

 Sustainability..... 24

Section VIII – Methodology 25

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dennis Kane	Maureen George
Phone	(716) 686-3606	(716) 686-3645
Email	dkane@ccsd-k12.org	mgeorge@ccsd-k12.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: March 3, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Western	Erie 1 BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
2139	981	272	49	329	1256

Racial/Ethnic Origin					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
1	31	4	5	55	3

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
93	6

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
185	0	0	13	15

Need Status
Average Need/Resource Capacity

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Cheektowaga 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)	49	8	n<5	45
3(2012-13)	25	0	20	18
4(2011-12)	43	0	0	39
4(2012-13)	19	0	n<5	19
5(2011-12)	45	4	n<5	35
5(2012-13)	17	0	0	16
6(2011-12)	49	5	n<5	36
6(2012-13)	24	0	n<5	15
7(2011-12)	42	10	None tested	33
7(2012-13)	21	0	n<5	13
8(2011-12)	38	4	n<5	29
8(2012-13)	26	3	n<5	20
District Wide (2011-12)	44	5	0*	36
District Wide (2012-13)	22	1	8	17

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	60	8	n<5	55
3(2012-13)	22	0	0	17
4(2011-12)	58	4	25	55
4(2012-13)	30	0	n<5	27
5(2011-12)	43	4	n<5	34

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

5(2012-13)	8	0	0	6
6(2011-12)	49	19	n<5	41
6(2012-13)	15	3	n<5	9
7(2011-12)	48	10	None tested	42
7(2012-13)	13	0	n<5	5
8(2011-12)	46	13	n<5	36
8(2012-13)	14	0	n<5	11
District Wide (2011-12)	51	10	25*	44
District Wide (2012-13)	16	1	0	12

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	89	62	63	89
4(2012-13)	95	56	n<5	97
8(2011-12)	51	21	n<5	46
8(2012-13)	65	37	n<5	56
District Wide(2011-12)	77	40	63*	67
District Wide (2012-13)	78	44	Not available (n<5)	74

*Reflects 4th grade only: No other grades had five or more ELLs take the assessment.

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	76	20	40	3
Integrated Algebra	76	12	42	0
Geometry	89	28	n<5	n<5
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	51	7	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	73	32	30	3
U.S. History and Government	87	48	59	21
Living Environment	70	16	27	2
Physical Setting/Physical Earth	73	28	33	0
Physical Setting/Chemistry	68	9	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physics	93	27	n<5	n<5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	86	32	85	24
SWD	59	5	44	15

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

ELL	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
ED	83	13	84	15

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	89	21	88	17
SWD	64	5	33	0
ELL	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
ED	85	6	89	11

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	3	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	4	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	5	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	6	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	7	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Mathematics	3	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	4	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	5	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	6	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
	7	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Science	4	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5

2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Secondary Level					
	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	4	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Mathematics	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5

2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)					
	n Tested	Percent of students scoring in each performance level:			
		Beg.	Int.	Ad.	Prof.
Kindergarten					
All Students	9	0	22	44	33

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

General Education	9	0	22	44	33
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
First Grade					
All Students	9	11	22	44	22
General Education	9	11	22	44	22
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
Second Grade					
All Students	5	20	40	40	0
General Education	5	20	40	40	0
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
Third Grade					
All Students	6	0	67	0	33
General Education	5	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Fourth Grade					
All Students	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
Fifth Grade					
All Students	8	25	0	13	63
General Education	7	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Sixth Grade					
All Students	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Seventh Grade					
All Students	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	3	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
Eighth Grade					
All Students	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	0	0	0	0	0
Ninth Grade					
All Students	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Tenth Grade					
All Students	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	0	0	0	0	0

Eleventh Grade					
All Students	2	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
General Education	1	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
SWD	0	0	0	0	0

Group	2007 Cohort 5 Year		2008 Cohort 4 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	202	84	177	81
Students With Disabilities	24	n<30	22	n<30
Limited English Proficient	2	n<30	4	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	79	81	83	77

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 – Black or African American • 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 – Black or African American • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities • 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 – Students With Disabilities • Secondary- Level ELA – Black or African American • Graduation Rate-5 Years – Black or African American

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White

- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- 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 – White
- 4- Year Graduation Rate – Black or African American
- 4- Year Graduation Rate – Economically Disadvantaged

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 (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers (12-13)	# of Teachers (13-14)
Cheektowaga Central SD	Dennis Kane	2010-2014	Con	2218	2206	4 P, 3 AP	5 P, 3 AP	177	167

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grade s Served	# of Student s (12-13)	# of Student s (13-14)	# of Admi n (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teache rs (12-13)	# of Teacher s (13-14)
Union East ES	Gretchen Sukdolak	2009-13	Original	PK-4	792	789	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	58	57
	Brian Bridges	2013-14	New							
Cheektowaga MS	Brian Bridges	2007-13	Original	5-8	646	622	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	55	44
	Gretchen Sukdolak	2013-14	New							
Cheektowaga HS	Susan Cain	2007-13	Original	9-12	683	681	1P, 1AP	1P, 1 AP	49	49
	Scott Zipp	2014	New							
Pine Hill Education Center	Steven Wright	2011-14	Con	6-12 (2012-13)	75	101	1 P	1 P	15	17
				K-12 (2013-14)						

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/cheektowaga-appr-plan.pdf
Most current version as of: August 31, 2012

Performance Evaluation Rubrics	
Teacher	Principal
Danielson's <i>Framework for Teaching</i> (2011 Revised Edition)	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	58	47	59	99
Effective	41	42	36	0
Developing	1	10	4	1
Ineffective	0	1	1	0

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; Amy Cox, Project Assistant	April 15, 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	September 12, 2013

2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	January 23, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 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 4, 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
5545-13-0008	\$274,144	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
<p>1. Preparation – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and IHEs and/or other eligible partner: <i>The District contracted with Institute of Higher Education, University of Kansas to provide instructional coaching and professional development. The University of Kansas Instructional Coaching Group provided 9 training days for instructional coaching program components including content planning; coaching protocol; data analysis; and video recording for reflection of practice.</i></p>
<p>2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component is not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>
<p>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>Teacher Leaders acted as instructional coaches to teachers to support improvement of teaching practice. Teacher Leaders were well positioned to support new and early career educators to improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes. Instructional Coaches supported teachers with implementing the Common Core standards through content planning, by helping to unpack the standards and build curricular consistency, coaching teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflecting on outcomes through the use of data inquiry.</i></p>
<p>4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>Instructional Coaches turnkey trained on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers. Individual and small group coaching resulted in the use of data to determine curriculum and instruction; supported the Danielson Framework for Teaching through content planning, by helping to unpack the standards and build curricular consistency; and coached teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflect on outcomes through the use of data inquiry.</i></p>
<p>5. Professional Development/Growth- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>Teachers and principals had</i></p>

opportunities to engage in professional development. Instructional Coaches turnkey trained on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers. The Instructional Coaches supported teachers with implementing the Common Core standards through content planning, by helping them to unpack the standards and build curricular consistency. They coached teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflect on outcomes through the use of data inquiry. Additionally, the coaches led multiple book studies with over 65 teachers.

6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: *The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions. The Instructional Coaches participated in Data Inquiry Training to learn the process of reviewing data, leading conversations about data, and data driven instruction. Instructional Coaches turnkey trained on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.*

7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities had the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions. Three teachers served as Instruction Coaches as .6 Full-Time Equivalent of their day; they taught for .4.*

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
<p>Goal I: To provide teachers with a toolbox of strategies to meet the changing needs of the learners in the district, particularly high-needs students.</p>	<p>Three Instructional Coaches to coach and model all teaching, as well as work closely with the staff to develop Common Core Learning Standards curriculum: ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, Non-core subjects.</p> <p>Instructional Coaches will turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provide individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers. Individuals/small group coaching results in at least a 10% increase in use of data to determine curriculum and instruction.</p> <p>Instructional Coaches will develop a Professional Development curriculum map</p>	<p>The district currently has three instructional coaches.</p> <p>The district experienced a 20% increase in teachers using data analysis.</p> <p>The district developed a professional development center and offered a professional development Tech survey.</p>

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

	based on building needs and build an Educator Resource Room to include a professional library and a learning community site.	
Goal II: To provide leaders with the skills necessary to make data-driven decisions and lead teachers through the process of using data to improve instruction and achievement.	<p>In-district professional development will be provided for all staff during in-service days, and department meetings based on Bambrick-Santoyo's Driven By Data & EngageNY resources.</p> <p>Building leaders will work with coaches to provide turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provide individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.</p> <p>Individuals/small group coaching results in at least a 10% increase in use of data to determine curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>27 department and curriculum leaders, instructional coaches and administrators were trained in data analysis protocol. Future follow up training was planned.</p> <p>230 of the district's teachers participated in ongoing 'just in time' data analysis meetings.</p>

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$274,144	\$74,366	\$200,517

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)
40	In-district Professional Development Workshop for Instructional Coaching Model	230 Teachers, 13 Administrators	\$5,537	\$5,537		
45	Purchased Jim Knight's Unmistakable Impact for district staff	205 Books	\$7,933	\$7,933	-	-
15	Selection of program participants	-		\$22,990	-	\$95,675
45	Purchased technology for program participants [iPad minis, keyboards, ear buds]	16 of each	-	\$6,039	-	-
45	Purchased books and materials for training. Teach to's 100 Behavior Lesson Plan Books, Time to Teach	100 books	-	\$1,900	-	\$415

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

	books, Mindset					
40	Training days with Instructional Coaching Group	16 Instructional Coaches, 11 Administrators			\$14,900	\$33,220
40	Team Training and Program Development with Instructional Coaching Group [9/30]	16 Instructional Coaches	-	-	\$3,600	-
15	Substitutes	16	-	-	\$1,600	-
45	Purchased laptops for 3 instructional coaches	3			\$1,953	
40	Partner training and program development with Ann Hoffman [ICG-12/4]	16 Instructional Coaches	-	-	\$3,600	-
45	Purchased Go Pro Cameras & Flip Cameras	3 Go Pro, 10 Flips	-	-	\$3,101	\$300
45	Purchased binders, locking file totes for confidential documents	-	-	-	\$305	-
45	Purchased memory cards for flip cameras & rechargeable batteries	-	-	-	\$452	\$20
45	Purchased Making Hope Happen Books	12 books	-	-	\$141	-
45	Inquiry	-	-	-	-	\$297
45	24 Spin Zone Spinners 5 16" Tabletop Dry Erase White Spinning	-	-	-	-	\$190
45	Wheels	-	-	-	-	\$350
80	Benefits for Coaches	-	-	-	-	\$62,763
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$13,470	\$74,199	\$29,653	\$193,230

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: The District contracted with Institute of Higher Education, University of Kansas to provide instructional coaching and professional development. The activities associated with	

preparation helped the district achieve its STLE Goal I: To provide teachers with a toolbox of strategies to meet the changing needs of the learners in the district, particularly high-needs students. The University of Kansas Instructional Coaching Group provided nine training days for instructional coaching program components including content planning; coaching protocol; data analysis; video recording for reflection of practice.

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 Final Report Year 1:

- Six training sessions with Jim Knight and Ann Hoffman were provided. Participants learned numerous coaching skills, practiced selected communication skills, and analyzed best practices implemented by coaches across the country.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The district’s Instructional Coaches worked with the Instructional Coaching Group from the University of Kansas. All of the training sessions were facilitated by the University of Kansas. The training included engaging instruction, involving thinking prompts, effective questions, cooperative learning, stories and authentic learning, and data analysis work with administrators. In-service coaches worked on enrollment of teachers into the program and continued program set up for documentation and data collection.
- The Coaches participated in training on July 9th, August 6th, September 30th and December 4th

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- The teachers were provided support with the Common Core Learning Standards by facilitating content planning, unpacking standards, and building curricular consistency across the district.
- The University of Kansas Instructional Coaching Group provided nine training days for instructional coaching program components including content planning, coaching protocol, and data analysis, and video recording for reflection of practice.
- Sixty teachers (out of 200) worked voluntarily with an Instructional Coach; 30 teachers attended content planning sessions; 20 teachers attended the Flipped Classroom professional development; and 60 teachers participated in book clubs.

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 has effective or highly effective educators.

Summary: This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	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 grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators have mentoring. Teacher Leaders acted as instructional coaches to teachers to support improvement of teaching practice. The activities associated with mentoring assisted the district in meeting its Goal II: to provide leaders with the skills necessary to make data-driven decisions and lead teachers through the process of using data to improve instruction and achievement.</p> <p>Teacher Leaders were well positioned to support new and early career educators to improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes. Instructional Coaches supported teachers with implementing the Common Core standards through content planning, by helping them to unpack the standards and build curricular consistency. They coached teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflect on outcomes through the use of data inquiry.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
The Instructional Coaches worked for .6 of their day as coaches providing 60 teachers with support in content planning, instructional strategies, Data-Driven Instruction, Charlotte Danielson Frameworks and other aspects of instruction. Professional Development was provided in various areas of need and interest.	T-Mentor	Group	CC-Other, DDI	District	15	170	\$95,495

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 Final Report Year 1:

- Sixteen teachers participated in the Instructional Coaching training program.
- In the August 6th training program there were: 12 administrators and the topics that were covered were the -role of administrators in the coaching program, data inquiry team training, and the development of observation forms and coaching checklists.
- September 30th there was a meeting with the instructional coaching group and the topics that were covered included engaging instruction, involving thinking prompts, effective questions, cooperative learning, stories and authentic learning, and data analysis work with administrators.

- Six training sessions were provided with Jim Knight and Ann Hoffman. Participants learned numerous coaching skills and practiced selected communication skills; and analyzed best practices implemented by coaches across the country.
- On December 14th, Jim Knight from the Instructional Coaching Group presented information about coaching and partnership learning. At this workshop, all staff members district wide received copies of Unmistakable Impact which will become the basis for professional development in other district over the next few years.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The Instructional Coaches supported 35 teachers who were seeking support in content planning, classroom management, and literacy instruction.
- Help was given to teachers to implement instructional strategies such as differentiation, formative assessment, and increasing student engagement. Instructional Coaches modeled continuous improvement thereby improving teachers own learning through reflecting thoughtfully, receiving feedback, and attempting new approaches.
- Three teachers were selected to serve as 'in-service' coaches in Year 2 for .6 of their work day and also coordinated and aligned the current mentoring program.

Evidence from Site Visit Notes:

- Mentees met with coaches every Monday. Professional development discussions occurred based on discussions and observations during instructional coaching. Three instructional coaches worked with “Jr Colleagues” Program in its infancy. Coaches reported that they used instructional coaching training.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2/ Final Update Status Call Notes:

- Sixty teachers out of 200 worked voluntarily with an Instructional Coach. Three .6 Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Coach positions were created.
- A key accomplishment indicated by the district was writing the curriculum and training materials for the mentor program and training 10 teachers to be mentors.
- The final call notes indicated that 10 new mentors trained with ongoing training after planning. Teachers were impressed and felt the training was more focused and beneficial than mentor training in the past.

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: The district met its Goal II: to provide leaders with the skills necessary to make data-driven decisions and lead teachers through the process of using data to improve instruction and achievement.	
Building leaders and Instructional Coaches provided turnkey training on data analysis to	

grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.

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 the evidence was collected.

Evidence from Final Report Year 1:

- In the August 6th training program there were: 12 administrators and the topics that were covered were the -role of administrators in coaching program, data inquiry team training, and the development of observation forms and coaching checklists.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The district supported the Danielson Framework for Teaching by content planning, by helping to unpack the standards and by building curricular consistency.
- The district coached teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflect on outcomes through the use of data inquiry.
- The Instructional Coaches provided turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.
- The building leaders worked with coaches to provide turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.
- The Instructional Coaches led conversations to engage teachers in analyzing and using data to improve instruction.
- The district provided Go Pro cameras for coaches to use for taping lessons and purchased 10 flip cameras for teachers to tape and review lessons.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- All department and curriculum leaders, instructional coaches and administrators were trained in data analysis protocol. Follow up training was scheduled to take place in the summer of 2014.
- 100% of teachers participated in ongoing ‘just in time’ data analysis meetings.
- The district experienced a 20% increase in teachers using data analysis.
- Over 60 teachers worked with coaches on high impact instructional strategies, content planning and using data to assist with meeting short and long term goals.

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.
<p>Summary: The district met its Goal I: to provide teachers with a toolbox of strategies to meet the changing needs of the learners in the district, particularly high-needs students and STLE Goal II: to provide leaders with the skills necessary to make data-driven decisions and lead teachers through the process of using data to improve instruction and achievement.</p> <p>The district used grant funds to successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. Teachers and principals had opportunities to engage in professional development. Instructional Coaches turnkey trained on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Instructional Coaching training- The University of Kansas Instructional Coaching Group provided 9 training days for instructional coaching program components including content planning; coaching protocol; data analysis; video recording for reflection of practice	T-PD	External	Coach, Data-Driven Instruction, Grant	IHE-Partner	40	3	9 days	\$34,320

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 Final Report Year 1:

- In-district professional development was provided for all staff during in-service days, and department meetings were held based on Bambrick-Santoyo's Driven by Data & EngageNY resources.
- Six training sessions were provided with Jim Knight and Ann Hoffman. Participants learned numerous coaching skills; practiced selected communication skills; and analyzed best practices implemented by coaches across the country.
- In November 2013 professional development was provided for teachers in the areas of content planning, involving guiding questions and learning maps. An Introduction of "Teach Like A Champion" strategies also took place in department and team meetings.
- On December 14th, Jim Knight from the Instructional Coaching Group presented information about coaching and partnership learning. At this workshop, all staff members district wide received copies of Unmistakable Impact which will become the basis for professional development in the district over the next few years.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The Instructional Coaches supported teachers with implementing the common core standards through content planning, and by helping them to unpack the standards and build curricular consistency.
- The Instructional Coaches coached teachers to implement instructional strategies and reflect on outcomes through the use of data inquiry.
- Additionally, it was indicated that coaches led multiple book studies with over 65 teachers. The books supported the district goals to improve instruction and classroom engagement.
- The Instructional Coaches developed a professional development curriculum map based on building needs and built an Educator Resource Room to include a professional library and a learning community site.
- The in-district professional development provided for all staff during in-service days, and department meetings was based on Bambrick-Santoyo's Driven By Data & EngageNY resources.
- The district participated in three summer training days with the Instructional Coaching Group.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- The district developed a professional development center and offered a professional development tech survey.
- The coaching team worked hard to provide teachers support with Data-Driven Instruction, Common Core Learning Standards alignment and implementation of the district's new Annual Professional Performance Review evaluation system. Building administrators identified the coaching program to be the linchpin to bridging instructional leadership and professional learning.
- The team has created multiple learning opportunities for their educators, including: book clubs (K-12 participation), teacher led workshops (flipped classroom, iPad training, literacy strategies) and mentor training.
- Thirty teachers attended content planning sessions, 20 teachers attended the flipped classroom professional development, and 60 teachers participated in book clubs.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
<p>Summary: The district has achieved its Goal II: to provide leaders with the skills necessary to make data-driven decisions and lead teachers through the process of using data to improve instruction and achievement.</p> <p>The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions. Instructional Coaches provided turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	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 Final Report Year 1:

- A district staff development workshop was held to support data analysis led by District Coaches.
- The district completed Data analysis forms.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The Instructional Coaches participated in data inquiry training to learn the process of reviewing data, leading conversations about data, and data driven instruction.
- Go Pro cameras were purchased for coaches to use for taping lessons and purchased 10 flip cameras for teachers to tape and review lessons
- The Instructional Coaches provided turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provide individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.
- The building leaders worked with coaches to provide turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.
- The teachers were assisted with implementing instructional strategies such as differentiation, formative assessment, and increasing student engagement; and model continuous improvement by improving their own learning through reflecting, thoughtfully receiving feedback, and attempting new approaches.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- The coaching team has worked hard to provide teachers support with Data-Driven Instruction, Common Core Learning Standards alignment and implementation and our new Annual Professional Performance Review evaluation system.
- 100% of the district’s teachers participated in ongoing ‘just in time’ data analysis meetings.

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.
Summary: The district is effectively using grant funds to ensure that 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. In-district professional development was provided for all staff during in-service days and department meetings based on Bambrick-Santoyo's Driven By Data & EngageNY resources.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Stipends and salaries for three Instructional Coaches	T-FT	STLE1	Coach, Data-Driven Instruction, Grant	15	Stipend	3	\$95,495

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 Final Report Year 1:

- The informational meeting was held to distribute applications to interested teachers.
- The initial 16 teachers participated in all training sessions and completed the book studies and planning sessions.

Evidence from Interim Report Year 2:

- The selection of coaches and finalized training dates and trainers with the Instructional Coaching Group was held.
- March 27 and 28 were training sessions one and two which included a coaching overview and content planning/formative assessments. Sixteen teachers & five administrators began the training program.
- April 9 and 10 were training sessions three and four which included engaging instruction and communication. Sixteen teachers and five administrators participated.
- May 13th was a Leadership workshop with 16 teachers and five administrators.
- June 25th covered classroom management. Fourteen teachers and five administrators participated, while two of the teachers left the district for administrative positions.
- On July 9th teachers practiced reviewing classroom videos and the reflective conversation. Introduction of a book study with Teach Like A Champion by Doug Lemov also occurred.
- On July 25th the training began the development of the coaching program for Cheektowaga Central School District. The participants created specific implementation and communication plans. Fourteen teachers and five administrators participated. The coaching partners met with Ann Hoffman from the Instructional Coaching Group to share videos of lessons and review coaching process. In-service coaches met with Ann Hoffman for program support and development. Introduction of 'Teachers as Readers' book study program with an open house in the Professional Learning Lab occurred.
- Three teachers were selected to serve as 'in-service' coaches in Year 2 for .6 of their work day. These teachers provided support through one-on-one coaching to any teacher who volunteered. They also supported the district with professional development to improve instruction overall and implement Common Core Learning Standards, common

assessments and all other curriculum improvement projects. They also coordinated and aligned the current mentoring program.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- The district indicated that a key accomplishment was writing the curriculum and training materials for the mentor program and training 10 teachers to be mentors.
- The district has three instructional coaches.
- The district will continue with four part-time coaches. Three teachers will work as .6 Full-Time Equivalent coaches and one teacher will work as a .4 Full-Time Equivalent coach. The three teachers are the current coaches and in the 2014-2015 school year, they will mentor the fourth coach so that in the districts third year of the program, they will have a veteran coach working in the program with two new coaches.

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 the 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 STEM, ELL, bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: Evidence suggests that the district is undertaking grant funded activities to meet its STLE Goal I- To provide teachers with a toolbox of strategies to meet the changing needs of the learners in the district, particularly high-needs students.	

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 Interim Report Year 2:

- The three Instructional Coaches coached and modeled all teaching, and worked closely with the staff to develop Common Core Learning Standards curriculum in ELA, math, science, social studies, and non-core subjects.

- The Instructional Coaches provided turnkey training on data analysis to grade/departments and provided individual or small group coaching to developing and ineffective teachers.
- The Instructional Coaches developed a professional development curriculum map based on building needs and built an educator resource room to include a professional library and a learning community site.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- Over 60 teachers worked with coaches on high impact instructional strategies, content planning and using data to assist with meeting short and long term goals. The team created multiple learning opportunities for their educators, including book clubs, teacher led workshops, (flipped classroom, iPad training, and literacy strategies) and mentor training.
- The Three Instructional Coaches developed a professional development center and offered a professional development Tech survey.

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 has used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district. Funding for the program will come from general funds, Title IIA for stipends, and the newly awarded Math Science Partnership Grant.	

Short Description	Code	Type
The district will continue with four part-time coaches. Three teachers will work as .6 Full-Time Equivalent coaches and one teacher will work as a .4 Full-Time Equivalent coach	Personnel	Grant

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 Interim Report Year 2:

- The district is committed to sustaining the instructional coaching program by reallocating district funds and utilizing Title II A funds to partially fund the program. Additionally, the district is submitting a Request for Proposal for the Mathematics and Science Grant with the intent of funding an instructional coach to provide professional development to support the implementation of common core math modules.

Evidence from Final Report Year 2:

- The district will continue with four part-time coaches. Three teachers will work as .6 Full-Time Equivalent coaches and one teacher will work as a .4 Full-Time Equivalent coach. The three teachers are the current coaches and in the 2014-2015 school year, they will mentor the fourth coach so that in the district’s third year of the program, they will

have a veteran coach working in the program with two new coaches. Funding for the program will come from general funds, Title IIA for stipends, and the newly awarded Math Science Partnership Grant.

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
- Director of Learning
- Trainer University of Kansas

High School

- Principal

Pine Hill Education Center

- Principal

Cheektowaga Middle School

- Principal
- Teacher Leader
- Mentee

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

- Cheektowaga Site Visit Notes
- Cheektowaga Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Cheektowaga Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Cheektowaga Year 2 Final STLE Report
- Cheektowaga Year 2 Final Update Status Call Notes