



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Gates Chili 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 13

 Preparation 13

 Recruitment and Placement 13

 Induction and Mentoring..... 14

 Evaluation 15

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 16

 Performance Management 19

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals 20

 Other 21

 Issues of Equity..... 22

 Sustainability..... 22

Section VIII – Methodology 23

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Kimberle Ward	Carol Stehm
Phone	(585) 247-5050	585-247-5050
Email	Kimberle_Ward@gateschili.org	carol_stehm@gateschili.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: March 20, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Genesee Finger Lakes	Monroe 2 – Orleans 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
4183	1208	590	102	499	1817

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
0	16	8	5	67	4

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
96	5

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
359	0	0	12	10

Need Status
Average Need District

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: March 20, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	47	13	9	32
3(2012-13)	27	0	15	20
4(2011-12)	61	10	0	53
4(2012-13)	25	5	0	15
5(2011-12)	63	9	0	50
5(2012-13)	26	3	0	20
6(2011-12)	61	19	0	43
6(2012-13)	36	0	0	23
7(2011-12)	63	13	n<5	52
7(2012-13)	37	5	n<5	23
8(2011-12)	60	11	0	44
8(2012-13)	39	3	n<5	26
District Wide (2011-12)	59	13	3	45
District Wide (2012-13)	32	3	4	24

Student Performance: 2011-12&2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	48	16	27	38
3(2012-13)	25	3	14	17
4(2011-12)	69	19	29	64
4(2012-13)	27	3	11	24
5(2011-12)	73	30	80	61
5(2012-13)	28	0	0	20
6(2011-12)	60	19	43	44
6(2012-13)	34	2	13	21
7(2011-12)	72	29	n<5	63
7(2012-13)	27	5	0	15
8(2011-12)	66	27	50	54
8(2012-13)	30	2	n<5	22

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

District Wide(2011-12)	65	24	46	54
District Wide(2012-13)	28	3	8	16

Student Performance: 2011-12& 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	88	50	40	85
4(2012-13)	91	68	67	85
8(2011-12)	87	61	67	85
8(2012-13)	88	59	60	84
District Wide (2011-12)	88	57	55	85
District Wide (2012-13)	90	63	65	84

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	90	35	57	3
Integrated Algebra	84	23	58	2
Geometry	71	14	25	2
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	59	23	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	84	43	57	6
U.S. History and Government	93	68	68	20
Living Environment	90	38	67	11
Physical Setting/Physical Earth	81	39	55	10
Physical Setting/Chemistry	70	14	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physics	87	36	n<5	n<5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	88	39	85	43
SWD	65	3	52	3
ELL	5	60	n<5	n<5
ED	79	22	79	27

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	88	28	88	28
SWD	54	3	52	4

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

ELL	80	20	n<5	n<5
ED	84	16	83	15

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	3	-	-	-	-
	4	3	-	-	-	-
	5	6	1	0	2	3
	6	6	0	1	1	4
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	0	0	5
Mathematics	3	3	-	-	-	-
	4	3	-	-	-	-
	5	6	0	0	2	4
	6	6	0	0	2	4
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	0	1	4
Science	4	3	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	0	0	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	7	0	0	0	7
Mathematics	7	0	0	0	7

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	23	13	30	52	4	
General Education	19	-	-	-	-	
SWD	4	-	-	-	-	
First Grade						
All Students	15	0	20	40	40	
General Education	15	0	20	40	40	
SWD	0	-	-	-	-	

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

Second Grade					
All Students	11	0	27	55	18
General Education	10	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	15	13	27	33	27
General Education	14	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	9	11	0	33	56
General Education	8	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	8	13	0	88	0
General Education	6	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Sixth Grade					
All Students	8	13	25	38	25
General Education	7	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	5	40	0	40	20
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Eighth Grade					
All Students	5	0	0	100	0
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	8	25	0	13	63
General Education	5	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-

SWD	0	-	-	-	-
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	447	85	451	86
Students With Disabilities	82	68	73	63
Limited English Proficient	5	n<30	4	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	154	77	131	84

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 – Multiracial 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 – Students With Disabilities Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – 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 (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers (12-13)	# of Teachers (13-14)
Gates Chili School District	Dr. Mark Davey	2009-2013	Original	4,183	-	6P, 7AP	-	349	-
	Carol Stehm	2013-2014	New (Interim)	-	4,080	-	6P, 7AP	-	356
	Kimberle Ward	2014 - present	New (Present)						

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

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers* (12-13)	# of Teachers* (13-14)
Nail Armstrong ES	Lisa McGary	2010-14	Con	K-5	551	523	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	39	40
Florence Brasser ES	Tim Young	2010-14	Con	K-5	273	279	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	28	29
Walt Disney ES	Elaine Damelio	2010-14	Con	K-5	411	412	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	38	40
Paul Road ES	Peter Hens	2006 - 14	Con	K-5	537	530	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	1P, 0AP (1STLE TOSA)	42	43
Gates Chili MS	Gerald Iuppa	2003 - 13	Orig	6-8	992	958	1P, 3AP	1P, 3AP	84	85
	Lisa Buckshaw	2013-14	Other New							
Gates Chili HS	Tim Clasgens	2007 - 14	Con	9-12	1419	1378	1P, 4AP	1P, 4 AP	118	119

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/gates-chili-appr-plan.pdf
Most current version as of: December 17, 2012

Performance Evaluation Rubrics	
Teacher	Principal
NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric	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	78	53	-	29
Effective	22	34	-	71
Developing	0	11	-	0
Ineffective	0	2	-	0

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

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	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	May 28, 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 Lee Collins, Project Assistant	August 16, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	November 21, 2013
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	April 17, 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	July 28, 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
5545-13-0014	\$549,700	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 enhanced their induction program to include multiple years of support to new teachers and increase the amount of training and level of expectations of mentors. The district established a mentoring program for new administrators.</i>
4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>Through the evaluation system the district created a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices. The district’s teachers received training on the NYSUT rubric and Student Learning Objectives. The district’s administrators participated in professional development activities to increase administrators understanding of the NYSUT rubric and the multi-dimensional rubric and to calibrate supervision evaluation practices.</i>
5. Professional Development/Growth- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>The district has taken steps to offer more opportunities to learn about Common Core Learning Standards, differentiated instruction, poverty, diversity and data driven instruction. Administrators were provided more opportunities to be involved with professional development.</i>
6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>The district created a Teacher Improvement Plan targeted on specific standards with rigorous action steps using highly effective teachers as mentors. The district also created a detailed improvement plan for administrators that could be used as needed.</i>
7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>With the creation of the four Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) positions, the district provided opportunities for more teachers to take on leadership roles within buildings and across the district.</i>

Program Goals (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I: To enhance the district's opportunities to offer teachers and leaders	Professional Development and Mentoring participation for teachers and leaders will	The district met the professional development target by having 843

<p>professional development so more teachers and leaders are being evaluated as highly effective on the NYSUT Rubric or the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.</p>	<p>increase compared to the number of people participating in 2011-2012.</p> <p>More teachers will assume the role of a Teacher Leader, Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) or Professional Development Leader as compared to 2011-2012.</p> <p>More teachers and leaders will be rated as highly effective on their evaluation rubric.</p>	<p>participants. The district expanded the professional development offerings and, as a result, participation in the professional development opportunities increased.</p> <p>Twelve mentors were assigned to new teachers, and three mentors were assigned to new administrators</p> <p>The district has 55 teacher leaders, five TOSA's and 55 Professional Development Leaders</p> <p>Thirty-six percent of the district's teachers were rated Highly Effective Teachers.</p>
<p>Goal II: To provide opportunities for four teachers to serve as Teachers on Special Assignment to support Elementary Principals and to provide Professional Development to teachers.</p>	<p>Teachers on special assignment will develop and implement professional development opportunities for staff during the 2013-14 school year on Common Core Learning Standards, differentiated instruction and poverty.</p>	<p>Teachers on Special Assignment facilitated workshops, staff meetings and professional development offerings.</p> <p>My Learning Plan course descriptions, presentation documents and teacher survey data were submitted to NYSED as evidence.</p>

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$549,700	\$146,550	\$403,832

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	Stipends for 4 TOSAs/Salaries for 4 substitutes	8	\$41,841	-	\$104,917	\$227,312
40	Professional Development	5	\$3,778	-	-	\$49,449
15	TOSAs	8	-	\$94,751	-	-

40	Learning Centered Initiatives Professional Development	All Admin & TOSA's	-	\$3,500	\$10,993	-
45	Lap top purchases and other purchased materials	4	\$3,263	\$3,263	-	\$648
46	Travel Expenses for attendance at conferences	8	-	\$14,106	\$2,382	\$17,456
80	Employee Benefits	8	-	\$30,248	-	\$108,148
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$48,882	\$145,868	\$118,292	\$403,013

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 the 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 has effective or highly effective educators.
Summary: This component was not addressed by the 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.
Summary: The district met its Goal I: to enhance the district's opportunities to offer teachers and leaders professional development so more teachers and leaders are being evaluated as highly effective on the NYSUT Rubric or the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. "My Learning Plan" was used to help teachers reach the professional development and mentoring target. The district enhanced their induction program to include multiple years of support to new teachers and increase the amount of training and level of preparedness of mentors. The district also established a mentoring program for new administrators.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Teachers on Special Assignments	T – Mentor	Formal	APPR – TIP Coach	District	15	All Ineffective & Developing	\$199,668

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 the Year 1 Interim Report:

- Due to the late start of the grant, the district was not able to obtain three days of mentoring/training from Learner-Centered Initiatives. The district confirmed one day at the end of June and scheduled the other days for the next school year.

Evidence from the Site Visit:

- The superintendent reported the following: The district is using Title II funds: to train highly effective and effective teachers to mentor new teachers. This group will receive 15 hours of training, and there will be 25 teachers on the team.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district revamped the new teacher induction and mentorship programs and required new teachers to take three mandatory professional development classes before they become tenured.
- The district established a mentor program for new administrators.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district indicated that the 2013-2014 data shows that they have met the professional development target and had 843 participants. Offerings expanded and participation increased in the professional development opportunities.
- The district also met the mentoring target with twelve mentors assigned to new teachers and three mentors assigned to new administrators.

- The district submitted evidence of this professional development including My Learning Plan registrations, course descriptions, a sample mentoring journal and a copy of the new mentoring agreement for administrators.

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
<p>Summary: The district fully implemented an approved APPR plan that complied with Education Law §3012-c and the district was able to achieve their Goal I: to enhance the district's opportunities to offer teachers and leaders professional development so more teachers and leaders are highly effective on the NYSUT Rubric or the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.</p> <p>Through the evaluation system the district created a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices. The district's teachers received training on the NYSUT rubric and student learning objectives. District administrators participated in professional development activities to increase understanding of the NYSUT rubric and the multi-dimensional rubric.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Teachers on Special Assignments	T – Eval	Pos – All Pos - TIP	Coach APPR - TIP	District	15	All Teachers	4	\$199,668

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 the Year 1 Final Report:

- The four TOSAs worked closely with the elementary principal supervising them to assist with student management needs, the Response to Intervention (RTI) process, APPR pre and post assessment responsibilities within their assigned building and to calibrate supervision and evaluation practices.

Evidence from the Site Visit:

- The Superintendent reported that through meetings with teachers of different grade levels, and through the TOSAs close relationship with principals, the district has better informed and monitored professional development. Through these conversations, it was determined teachers need greater support with the CCLS shifts.
- A teacher leader reported that the principal informs the TOSA where teachers are struggling based on formal observations. The TOSA then provides support and guidance to help teachers with improvement. The principal was very aware of confidentiality of

teacher’s observations. The principal agreed to share general areas where teachers are in need of improvement.

- A teacher leader reported that she was able to collaborate with teachers to find more support for students.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- New teachers attended in-services and workshops and worked closely with their supervisors to understand the observation rubric.
- The district created a partnership with Learner Centered Initiatives and worked closely with BOCES to offer professional development to administrators.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Administrators, teacher leaders and teachers attended out of district conferences on CCLS shifts, educating students in poverty and differentiated instruction.
- The district increased the amount of teachers and leaders rated as highly effective on their evaluation rubric. They had a total of 36 highly effective teachers.

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leadership based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and administrators have opportunities to engage in professional development.
<p>Summary: The district met the Goal I: to enhance the district's opportunities to offer teachers and leaders professional development so more teachers and leaders are being evaluated as highly effective on the NYSUT Rubric or the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric, and Goal II: to provide opportunities for four teachers to serve as TOSA’s to support elementary principals and to provide professional development to teachers.</p> <p>The district took steps to expand current offerings to include more opportunities to learn about CCLS, differentiated instruction, teaching students in poverty, diversity and data driven instruction. Administrators were provided more opportunities to be involved with professional development.</p> <p>Multiple levels of support were offered in the area of CCLS, teacher and administrator led staff meetings and department workshops, BOCES coaching and mentoring, attendance at State and National conferences and individual and group work with national consultants Giselle Martin Kniep and Cheryl Dobbertin. Staff participated in professional development on differentiated instruction with Cheryl Dobbertin. Staff also participated in collegial circles around the book <i>A Framework for Understanding Poverty, Teaching with Poverty in Mind</i> which was developed by TOSA’s and staff. Two TOSA’s became certified trainers for Ruby Payne’s <i>Framework for Understanding Poverty</i>.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Consultant from Learner Centered Initiatives	T – PD External	Group	APPR – Other	FP – DS	40	All Teache	5 Days during	\$49,449.02

			CC – Math, CC – ELA			rs	summer	
Pay for travel and conference expenses	T – PD External	Group	APPR – Other CC – Math, CC – ELA	FP – DS	46	42	Throughout School Year	\$17,091.70

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 the Year 1 Final Report:

- The four TOSAs and other teacher leaders from across the district attended one or more of the professional development opportunities offered during year 1 and are now providing, or preparing to provide, “turnkey” professional development to teachers in the district.

Evidence from the Site Visit:

- The grant manager indicated that TOSAs provided support for teachers on student management, discipline, interventions and planning meetings. TOSSA traveled in and out of classrooms to support teachers. The district indicated it will need more TOSAs at the elementary level and after the grant.
- A teacher leader indicated that through their own professional development experience in differentiated instruction they were able to identify those teachers who would benefit most from this training.
- A teacher leader indicated that informal observations identified the following needs: classroom management, implementing CCLS in ELA and teaching for understanding. The districts was then able to design a professional development program that addresses these critical needs with differentiated instruction at the forefront and then scaffolding these concepts to reach all levels of learners.
- A teacher leader worked with teachers who refer students to RTI to analyze current and future strategies. The ELA TOSA provided support in tiers I-III, helping to guide and determine intervention strategies, worked with psychologist to determine appropriate interventions, modeled instruction for teachers, set up classrooms to better support interventions, provided resources to teachers and talked to outside professionals to better help teachers.
- A principal indicated that teachers reviewed one student a month to look at that student’s work to assess progress during faculty meetings. TOSAs provided the administration with written feedback based on collegial circle discussions, non-evaluative observations and teachers using evidence as part of their APPR plan.
- The superintendent indicated the demographic of the district changed dramatically over the last ten years. In years past, the poverty rate was around 20%. This year, poverty rate was over 50%. This has caused a shift in test scores, and teachers have been struggling to help support this increase of poverty students.

- The superintendent stated that collegial circles with a focus on differentiated instruction (DI), and use of assessments to develop teacher's abilities, were implemented to better support the school community as the district moved forward with data driving instruction (DDI). Co-teaching was identified as an area by administrators and teachers in need of further development to help with the implementation of DI.
- The superintendent developed DI cadres with the assistance of Learner Centered Initiatives to work with teachers who volunteered to be a part of the cadres. Teachers worked five half days throughout the school year. Professional development and instructional practice based on strategies learned occurred, and then the teachers went back as a group to the district to discuss the positives and negatives of the learned strategies and how well they were able to implement them.
- The superintendent indicated that 300 teachers volunteered to work during the summer on curriculum planning. These teachers were not required to work through summer. TOSAs organized, planned and facilitated summer work which included supporting teachers and providing mini professional development sessions as needed. The superintendent indicated TOSA's were provided professional development to enhance knowledge and capability to turnkey training in educating district staff on the unique needs of students in poverty. This training helped teachers to better prepare their instructional practice to address and understand these students and the implications poverty has with student learning.
- Consultant Cheryl Dobbertin trained twenty-five volunteer K-12 teacher who would turnkey the training to build capacity of faculty in DI. During the summer these teacher volunteers assisted with the creation of the professional development plan for the school year, and helped to maintain the consistency of professional development messages being delivered.
- The superintendent indicated that many teachers signed up for voluntary professional development and principals saw a difference with staff attitude based on this support. Collegial circles allowed teachers to receive targeted support and feedback from other teachers on ways to improve. The two TOSA's who received professional development on teaching students in poverty turnkeyed the training to a small group of teachers who will then turnkey this training at building levels.
- The superintendent indicated that principals asked for TOSA's to come to their building to train faculty on the unique needs of students in poverty.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report and Status Call:

- The district had 843 participants in the professional development and mentoring programs. The offerings were expanded and participation increased.
- The district had 55 teacher leaders, five TOSAs, and 55 professional development leaders.
- Two TOSAs trained as turn-key trainers in the Ruby Payne Framework for Understanding Poverty.
- Over 40 staff members attended out of district conferences focused on the CCLS instructional shifts, differentiated instruction and/or teaching students in poverty.
- The capacity for TOSAs to offer turn-key training to their fellow colleagues in the Ruby Payne's Poverty and My Learning Plan increased. The number of teachers participating in these trainings also increased.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
Summary: The district created a teacher improvement plan targeted on specific standards with rigorous action steps, using highly effective teachers as mentors. The district also began the creation of a detailed improvement plan for administrators that can be used as needed. These activities supported the district in attaining its Goal I: to enhance the district's opportunities to offer teachers and leaders professional development so more teachers and leaders are evaluated as highly effective on the NYSUT Rubric or the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
Teachers on Special Assignment	T – PM	Develop	Coach, APPR TIP	Stipend	15	4	\$199,668

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 the Site Visit:

- The superintendent reported that TOSA's provide valuable information to administration regarding the needs of teachers within the district. Through meetings with teachers in different grade levels, and through the TOSAs close relationship with principals, professional development was better informed and monitored. Through these conversations it was determined that teachers need greater support with the CCLS instructional shifts.
- A teacher leader reported that she began to help teachers feel more comfortable with the APPR process, making it more manageable. The district still has work to do to prepare teachers, but professional development is in the works to provide more support and guidance with the APPR process. The teacher leaders shared Engage NY APPR information to allow for greater understating on evidence collection. The teacher leader collaborated with teachers to find more support for students.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teacher leaders were required to reapply for their position and trained on the NYSUT rubric and district expectations.
- The district created an improvement plan template for administrators.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Five professional development days with Learner Centered Initiatives focused on instructional leadership and CCLS implementation.

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: With the creation of the four TOSA positions, the district provided opportunities for more teachers to take on leadership roles within buildings and across the district. These activities helped to support the district in attaining its Goal II: to provide opportunities for four teachers to serve as teachers on special assignment to support elementary principals and to provide professional development to teachers.</p> <p>The district effectively used grant funds to provide opportunities for four teachers to serve as TOSA’s as a way of supporting elementary principals and providing professional development to teachers.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	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 the Year 1 Interim Report:

- The most difficult part of implementing the grant for the district was their late start date. The district TOSAs could not begin their positions until second semester which created disruption in several of the buildings. Pulling teachers out of the classroom and hiring long term substitutes half way through the year was difficult on teachers, students and administrators. Students had to transition to a new teacher, teachers had to transition to a new leadership presence in their building and administrators had to transition and mentor a new person as a teacher leader in their building.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- Four TOSAs were hired in January 2013 to provide additional support to elementary principals and the district at large.
- Developing TOSAs and teacher leaders as “experts” in the district who in turn provide professional development to teachers provides leadership experience and enhances the learning opportunities for all staff.
- The biggest challenge since March was the placement of two of the TOSAs. The elementary administrators they were placed with did not need the expected level of support. Due to this situation, the district redesigned their responsibilities to include more time at central office to assist with assessment training, implementation and scoring, and to prepare for summer curriculum and assessment projects.

Evidence from the Site Visit:

- The superintendent indicated that implementing a career ladder allowed for capacity building district wide. TOSAs were able to provide turnkey training, with the biggest impact with implementing instructional strategies for low income students as well as the CCLS instructional shifts.
- The superintendent also indicated that the TOSAs served as an assistant to the elementary principals. All TOSAs were certified administrators, though they could not do formal observations/suspensions, they took part in instructional leadership, ran grade level meetings, and had a particular specialty in either DI, teaching students in poverty, or reading/ELA.
- A principal indicated that having a career ladder allowed the elementary school to actually focus on student achievement, sharing the administrative workload thus allowing for more time for classroom observations.
- A teacher leader stated that the TOSA at the elementary level was similar to an assistant principal and they helped to build instructional capacity through event planning, leadership teams, overseeing the RTI process, organizing and managing paperwork, working with teachers on creating intervention plans and monitoring progress towards reaching goals and making determinations of further need, helping with discipline in day to day behavior incidents as well as working with students on long term behavior goals in order to keep out of trouble when they are not able to find success with PBIS system, and one-on-one mentoring, lunches and small group work with students.
- A teacher leader also indicated that they saw a 30% decrease in student referrals to the office because teachers were taking more responsibility with classroom management.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- TOSAs and teacher leaders have led and supported various professional development offerings and facilitated curriculum writing projects in core content areas to align district work to the CCLS and to create common assessments.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Four TOSAs were selected for the career ladder. One TOSA was assigned to each of the four elementary buildings to support the principal and long term substitutes were hired to replace each TOSA in the classroom.

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: The district provided professional development training on instructional strategies to increase student learning outcomes for students in poverty. The district supported two TOSAs trained as turn-key trainers in the Ruby Payne Framework for Understanding Poverty and over 40 staff members attended this opportunity.	

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 the Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teachers and administrators participated in professional development on differentiated instruction provided by a consultant, Cheryl Dobbertin, and on diversity and equity from the School Improvement Network.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Two TOSAs trained as turn-key trainers in the Ruby Payne Framework for Understanding Poverty.
- Over 40 staff members attended out of district conferences focused on instructional shifts of CCLS, differentiated instruction and/or teaching students in poverty.

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 district indicated that it is exploring sustainability options including a short term plan to use STLE 3 Funds for the 2014-15 school year. Other options include Title grants and/or adding to general fund.	

Short Description	Code	Type
Teacher on Special Assignment – Career Ladder	Personnel	Shift

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 the Site Visit:

- The district was searching for a new superintendent. During the interview process, candidates were being asked their thoughts and plans to continue STLE programs and initiatives. The interim superintendent communicated with the Board of Education on the importance of STLE funded positions.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district responded “Yes” to the question “Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/ stipend after the grant period?” in the Career Ladder Section.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report and Status Call:

- Within the last year the Board of Education had a reorganization study completed by Harris Beach Solutions. The study recommended the district either maintain the TOSA positions or create elementary assistant principals positions. Funding for the TOSA positions will remain in place for the 2014-15 school year through the STLE 3 grant. Beyond next school year, monies will be incorporated in the district budget. The continuation of these positions will also allow the TOSAs to continue to provide professional development for the district.
- All TOSA’s were required to either have, or be working toward a school building leader or school district leader certification. This will allow the district to keep the same personnel whether it is a teaching or administrative position in 2015-16.

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

- Interim Superintendent
- Coordinator of Programs and Professional Development
- Director of Technology, Assessment and Data.

Building Level

- 2 Elementary Principals who supervise a TOSA
- 4 TOSAs

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Year 1 Final STLE Report

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