



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Syracuse City School District

Table of Contents

Contents

District Contact Information 3

Section I – District Description..... 3

Section II – Academic Performance 4

List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13 9

Section III – District Schools Profile 11

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 12

Section V – Monitoring History 13

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 14

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 18

 Preparation 18

 Recruitment and Placement 19

 Induction and Mentoring..... 21

 Evaluation 21

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 24

 Evidence from Syracuse Year 1 Final STLE Report: 25

 Evidence from Syracuse Year 2 Final STLE Report: 25

 Performance Management 25

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 27

 Other 27

 Issues of Equity..... 27

 Sustainability..... 28

Section VIII – Methodology 30

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Sharon Contreras	Jeremy Grant-Skinner
Phone	(315) 435-4161	(315) 435-4171
Email	scontreas@scsd.us	jgrant-skinner@scsd.us

Section I – District Description

Source: All district description data comes from the Syracuse City School District 2012-2013 New York State School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

Most current information as of: May 11, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Central	Onondaga-Cortland-Madison BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
19,763	14,115	1146	2678	4083	15,245

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
1	50	13	7	25	4

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
92%	20%

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
1541	0	1	28	21

Need Status
Large City

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Syracuse City 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)	27	10	7	23
3(2012-13)	9	0	3	6
4(2011-12)	28	5	8	23
4(2012-13)	9	3	1	7
5(2011-12)	24	4	1	18
5(2012-13)	8	1	2	5
6(2011-12)	25	6	3	21
6(2012-13)	8	1	0	4
7(2011-12)	21	2	2	16
7(2012-13)	8	1	0	5
8(2011-12)	20	1	1	15
8(2012-13)	10	1	1	6
District Wide (2011-12)	24	5	4	19
District Wide (2012-13)	9	1	1	5

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	29	10	13	25
3(2012-13)	8	1	1	4
4(2011-12)	35	12	18	31
4(2012-13)	11	4	2	9
5(2011-12)	28	8	6	23
5(2012-13)	6	1	2	4
6(2011-12)	23	7	6	20
6(2012-13)	7	1	0	4
7(2011-12)	24	7	6	19
7(2012-13)	5	0	0	3
8(2011-12)	21	4	10	17
8(2012-13)	3	0	0	1
District Wide (2011-12)	27	8	10	23
District Wide (2012-13)	7	1	1	4

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	68	45	37	65
4(2012-13)	67	45	36	65
8(2011-12)	34	11	5	28
8(2012-13)	31	10	6	25
District Wide (2011-12)	52	29	21	48
District Wide (2012-13)	50	28	21	47

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	55	8	30	4
Integrated Algebra	53	3	32	1
Geometry	39	5	15	0
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	30	6	13	4
Global History and Geography	42	6	20	3
U.S. History and Government	62	17	34	7
Living Environment	53	10	32	1
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	51	11	26	2
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	47	7	0	0
Physical Setting/ Physics	53	13	n<5	n<5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	56	15	56	13
SWD	36	5	30	2
ELL	26	1	33	1
ED	57	12	58	10

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	60	3	64	4
SWD	30	1	32	2
ELL	56	0	65	3
ED	60	2	66	2

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

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	10	0	1	4	5
	4	23	3	10	4	6
	5	19	3	2	12	2
	6	28	1	6	7	14
	7	18	0	2	1	15
	8	21	0	1	2	18
Mathematics	3	10	0	3	3	4
	4	23	0	9	11	3
	5	19	1	3	10	5
	6	28	1	4	8	15
	7	18	3	1	5	9
	8	21	2	0	8	11
Science	4	23	4	1	6	12
	8	21	1	3	2	15

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	40	2	3	3	32
Mathematics	40	0	1	11	28

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	262	17	40	37	6
General Education	236	16	39	39	6
SWD	26	23	54	19	4
First Grade					
All Students	249	12	45	24	18
General Education	218	11	43	27	19
SWD	31	23	61	6	10
Second Grade					
All Students	198	21	27	38	14

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

General Education	174	21	26	37	16
SWD	24	21	33	42	4
Third Grade					
All Students	210	26	44	23	7
General Education	178	24	41	27	8
SWD	32	38	59	0	3
Fourth Grade					
All Students	188	24	29	37	10
General Education	169	24	28	36	11
SWD	19	21	32	47	0
Fifth Grade					
All Students	205	28	27	35	10
General Education	177	27	25	36	11
SWD	28	32	36	29	4
Sixth Grade					
All Students	225	41	20	27	12
General Education	183	40	19	27	14
SWD	42	45	29	26	0
Seventh Grade					
All Students	189	38	27	29	6
General Education	155	40	26	27	7
SWD	34	29	32	35	3
Eighth Grade					
All Students	185	31	30	31	8
General Education	160	28	29	33	9
SWD	25	48	36	16	0
Ninth Grade					
All Students	266	26	41	24	7
General Education	233	27	38	24	7
SWD	33	15	61	24	5
Tenth Grade					
All Students	209	28	40	24	7
General Education	189	29	40	23	7
SWD	20	20	40	35	5
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	120	25	44	27	4
General Education	117	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	133	23	44	26	8
General Education	121	19	45	27	8
SWD	12	67	25	8	0

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2009 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	1549	51	1646	57
Students With Disabilities	338	35	322	42
Limited English Proficient	180	27	151	29
Economically Disadvantaged	1090	50	1005	62

List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2011-12

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

- Secondary- Level ELA – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary- Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – All Students
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Economically Disadvantaged
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – All Students
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Limited English Proficient
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Economically Disadvantaged
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – All Students
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Black or African American
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – White
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Students With Disabilities
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Limited English Proficient
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Economically Disadvantaged

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

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – American Indian or Alaska Native
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Multiracial
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Multiracial
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science - Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level ELA – All Students

- Secondary-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level ELA – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Secondary-Level ELA – White
- Secondary-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary-Level ELA – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – All Students
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Multiracial
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Students With Disabilities
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Economically Disadvantaged
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – All Students
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Black or African American
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – White
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Multiracial
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Students With Disabilities
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Limited English Proficient
- 4-Year-Graduation Rate – Economically Disadvantaged
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – All Students
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Black or African American
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Students With Disabilities
- 5-Year-Graduation Rate – Limited English Proficient
- 5-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

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers (2012-13)	# of Teachers (2013-14)
Bellevue ES	Joanne Harlow	2012-13	Original	K-5	484	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	44	44
	Angela Draper	2013-14	Other New	K-5	484	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	44	44
Clary Magnet MS	Pamela Odom	2012-14	Con	6-8	432	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	48	48
Corcoran HS	Leo Cosgrove	2012-14	Con	9-12	1426	1 P, 3 AP	1 P, 3 AP	94	94
Danforth Magnet MS	Patricia Clark	2012-13	Original	6-8	454	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	50	50
	Ronardo Reeves	2013-14	Other New	6-8	454	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	50	50
Delaware ES	Milagros Escalera	2012-14	Con	K-5	543	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	51	51
Dr King Magnet ES	Sheadric Barbra	2012-14	Con	K-5	598	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	64	64
Dr Weeks ES	Dare Dutter	2012-13	Original	K-5	729	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	58	58
	Joshua Bornstein	2013-14	Other New	K-5	729	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	58	58
Edward Smith K-8 School	Samuel Barber	2012-14	Con	K-8	750	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	74	74
Elmcrest School	Debra Mastropaolo	2012-14	Con	K-6	-	1 P	1 P	17	17
Expeditionary Learning MS	Rebecca Groat	2012-14	Con	6-8	137	1 P	1 P	19	19
Fowler HS	James Palumbo	2012-14	Con	9-12	1321	1 P, 4 AP	1 P, 4 AP	93	93
Franklin Magnet ES	Ann Sherwood	2012-14	Con	K-5	685	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	58	58
Frazer K-8 School	Eva Williams	2012-13	Original	K-8	928	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	78	78
	Matthew Carpenter	2013-14	Other New	K-8	928	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	78	78
Grant MS	Dean DeSantis	2012-13	Original	6-8	648	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	68	68
	Andrew Taylor	2013-14	Other New	6-8	648	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	68	68
H.W. Smith K-8 School	Sharon Birnkrant	2012-14	Con	K-8	852	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	70	70
Henninger HS	Robert DiFlorio	2012-14	Con	9-12	1771	1 P, 5 AP	1 P, 5 AP	111	111
Hughes Magnet ES	Theresa Haley	2012-14	Con	1-5	338	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	45	45
Huntington K-8 School	Marc Parillo	2012-13	Original	K-8	919	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	78	78
	Joanne Harlow	2013-14	Other New	K-8	919	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	78	78
Institute of Technology HS	Matthew Williams	2012-14	Con	9-12	438	1 P	1 P	38	38
Johnson Vocational Center	John Dittmann	2012-14	Con	9-12	-	1 P	1 P	30	30
Lemoynes ES	Laura Vieira-	2012-14	Con	K-5	458	1 P, 1	1 P, 1	41	41

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

	Suarez					AP	AP		
Lincoln MS	Kevin Burns	2012-14	Con	6-8	565	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	56	56
McCarthy at Beard School	Maria Cimino	2012-14	Con	K-12	-	1 P	1 P	41	41
McKinley-Brighton Elem School	Colleen Levett	2012-13	Original	K-5	552	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	48	48
	Amanda Williams	2013-14	Other New	K-5	552	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	48	48
Meachem ES	Melissa Evans	2012-14	Con	K-5	453	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	41	41
Nottingham HS	David Maynard	2012-14	Con	9-12	1261	1 P, 3 AP	1 P, 3 AP	91	91
Porter Magnet ES	Amy Evans	2012-13	Original	K-6	518	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	43	43
	William Mecum	2013-14	Other New	K-6	518	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	43	43
Roberts K-8 School	Janet Kimatian	2012-14	Con	K-8	726	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	67	67
Salem Hyde ES	Patricia Floyd-Echols	2012-14	Con	K-5	496	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	44	44
Seymour Magnet ES	Thomas Coughlin	2012-13	Original	K-5	509	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	49	49
	Geovanti Steward	2013-14	Other New	K-5	509	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	49	49
Van Duyn ES	Yvonne Johnson	2012-13	Original	K-5	351	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	32	32
	Eva Williams	2013-14	Other New	K-5	351	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	32	32
Webster ES	Iverna Minor	2012-14	Con	K-5	606	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	48	48
Westside Academy at Blodgett MS	Alton Hicks	2012-14	Con	6-8	412	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	43	43

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
<p>Current APPR Plan: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/syracuse-appr-plan.pdf</p> <p>Most current version as of: February 10, 2014</p>

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
Teacher	Principal
Danielson's <i>Framework for Teaching</i> (2011 Revised Edition)	District Variance

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	34	328	0	480
Effective	817	592	297	888
Developing	456	286	783	32
Ineffective	93	194	320	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	0	-	0	-
Effective	10-20	20-30	0-10	20-30
Developing	0-10	-	10-20	-
Ineffective	0-10	-	0-10	-

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	May 5, 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; Meghan Lee Collins, Project Assistant April Marsh, Project Assistant; Rebecca Coyle,	September 9, 2013 (per notes)

		Project Coordinator; Tasha Anderson, Project Assistant	
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	November 1, 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 11, 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 13, 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
5545-13-0041	\$2,499,625	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
<p>1. Preparation – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and Institute of Higher Education (IHE) and/or other eligible partner: <i>The District partnered with Insight Education. They collaboratively developed comprehensive frameworks outlining teacher and principal expectations, developed new rubrics to evaluate teacher and principal performance, and supported the first year of full implementation of these systems.</i></p>
<p>2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>The District offered recruitment/transfer awards to teachers and select ancillary staff who accepted a new position at one of the district's seven (7) Innovation Zone schools (by mutual consent).</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>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>
<p>4. Evaluation – The new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>The District used grant funds to hire an Executive Director of Talent Management and a Director of Educator Effectiveness. They contracted with Insight Education to develop, refine, and evaluate the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), aligned with teacher and leader evaluation instruments.</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>The District contracted with Insight Education and Cross & Joftus for professional development, created peer observer</i></p>

positions, hired an Executive Director of Talent Management and a Director of Educator Effectiveness. Their various professional development activities have supported this effort.

6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: *The District is looking at rating scores to determine effectiveness. The District established an Executive Director of Talent Management position and a Director of Educator Effectiveness position.*

7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.*

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 design and implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and school leaders that accurately differentiates effectiveness and aligns more than historical evaluation data with student outcomes.</p>	<p>Develop District-specific frameworks for teaching practice and school leadership that, through refinement and collaboration, are accepted by union partners for use in all Syracuse City School District (SCSD) schools regardless of each school's grade configuration.</p> <p>Increase the number of administrators and peer observers who meet the District's highest standards for certification to conduct teacher observations by at least 25 percent through ongoing professional development and coaching while increasing the number of teachers who say Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) helps them improve by at least 10 percent.</p> <p>Decrease by at least 20 percent the number of teachers and principals whose professional practice rating is at least one level higher on the Highly Effective Developing Ineffective (HEDI) scale than their composite score and</p>	<p>Developed original and revised versions of frameworks/ rubrics that earned State approval; unions have accepted revised versions, except Danielson rubric still used in grades 6-12.</p> <p>All Elementary and K-8 school administrators and Peer Observers were required to be certified with more rigorous standards in the 2014-2015 school year, accounting for nearly 60% of administrators and Peer Observers</p> <p>TBD when State Growth scores are received for 2014-2015</p>

	<p>decrease by at least 10 percent the gap between the District's average percentage of students scoring proficient according to all State assessments and the average percentage of teachers rated effective or highly effective.</p>	
<p>Goal II – To design and implement systems for professional development and coaching for teachers and school leaders that will provide appropriate, intensive, and differentiated support based on examination of student achievement data and Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) evaluation data.</p>	<p>Provide monthly reports to all teacher and principal evaluators providing aggregated and disaggregated data to inform professional development.</p> <p>By the end of the 2013-14 school year, all teachers will have completed at least 6 hours of differentiated professional development based specifically on evaluation ratings.</p> <p>Embedded talent management coaches will provide at least 40 hours of 1-1 coaching on average to principals by the end of the 2013-14 school year.</p>	<p>Reports were made available beginning in the fall of 2014 in real time to all administrators on Teachscape, the District’s teacher evaluation platform</p> <p>All teachers with Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) completed Professional Development (PD) aligned with specific areas identified for growth; the number of optional PD hours completed by teachers in 2013-2014 set a district record</p> <p>Only 1 talent management coach was hired in 2013-2014; a second talent management coach will be hired in August 2014; with 1 talent management coach, the district afforded 1,440 hours of additional support for administrators during the school year</p>
<p>Goal III – To implement integrated and aligned performance management structures and supports with rigorous standards and performance-based accountability that use evaluation data to inform the development and equitable distribution of effective educators.</p>	<p>Restructure the former "Personnel" department to create an Office of Talent Management that integrates activities across the teacher and leader effectiveness continuum.</p> <p>Develop, by January 2014, and implement, by June 2014, at least 3 strategic policies for</p>	<p>Office of Talent Management was established and 25% of non-managerial staff were transitioned to strategic/non-transactional duties in recruitment, selection, evaluation, and performance management</p> <p>3 policies created: - Policy of</p>

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

	<p>decision-making based on evaluation results for both teachers and principals.</p> <p>Reduce the number of teachers previously rated Ineffective in the District's 10 lowest-performing schools by at least 10 percent or increase the number of teachers previously rated Effective or Highly Effective in the District's 10 lowest-performing schools by at least 10 percent.</p>	<p>default tenure and retention decisions for probationary teaches</p> <p>- Policy for placing teachers into positions in turnaround and transformation schools only by mutual consent</p> <p>- Policy for linking prior year evaluation results to required professional development in Teacher Improvement Plans.</p> <p>TBD when State Growth scores are received for 2014-2015</p>
--	---	--

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$2,499,625	\$813,743	\$1,942,577

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives <i>(This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)</i>	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported <i>(10/31/12 – 3/1/13)</i>	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F <i>(10/31/12 – 6/30/13)</i>	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported <i>(7/1/13 – 12/31/13)</i>	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F <i>(7/1/13 – 6/30/14)</i>
16	Director/Supervisor of Educator Effectiveness	1	-	-	\$46,667	\$68,542
15	Peer Observers	5	-	-	\$160,525	\$192,943
15	Evaluation: Provide initial PD on Leadership Framework	-	-	-	-	-
15	Performance Management: Hire Executive Director	1	\$4,444	\$45,513	\$65,625	\$130,729
15	Extensions of Service - PD on Instruct framework	2	-	\$600	-	-
15	Recruitment Stipends	169	-	-	\$160,525	\$162,825
40	Evaluation: Contract for evaluation development and related PD	-	\$500,000	\$500,000	-	-
40	Insight Education - APPR Support	-	-	-	\$200,000	\$941,307
40	Cross & Jofus - Teacher Frameworks	-	-	-	-	\$185,785
46	Travel - Teacher recruitment	-	-	-	\$433	\$433
80	Employee Benefits	-	-	\$7,072	\$113,771	\$171,203
90	Indirect Cost	-	-	\$3,383	\$21,979	\$35,274

	Total Actual Expenditures		\$504,444	\$557,048	\$769,525	\$1,889,041
--	----------------------------------	--	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------

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.
<p>Summary: The District has met this standard by contracting with partner organizations to lay the groundwork for the Strengthening Teacher Leader Effectiveness (STLE) project activities. The activities the District engaged in to prepare for subsequent project activities helped support all of its STLE goals, in particular Goal III: to implement integrated and aligned performance management structures and supports with rigorous standards and performance-based accountability that use evaluation data to inform the development and equitable distribution of effective educators.</p> <p>The Syracuse CSD worked with Insight Education to prepare leaders with Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) calibration, school reviews and to better shape the professional development that would be offered. Insight Education supported the district in implementing APPR, helped to develop teacher and leader frameworks (rubrics were develop to align with Common Core Learning Standards), conducted professional development for observers and those being observed and monthly calibration sessions for principals.</p> <p>Additionally, the District contracted with Cross & Jofus to train leaders to better select teachers, provide accurate observations, and to better prepare for role of a leader within the school district. They provided coaching for the district’s talent management team in order to build internal capacity to support continued work once the grant funding has ended. They supported a strategic recruitment campaign to recruit the best teachers and leaders and helped the District to determine the best ways to support district level staff who oversees building level leaders.</p>	

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

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district contracted with Insight Education Group to develop, refine, and evaluate the implementation of new Common Core State Standards (CCSS)-aligned teacher and principal evaluation instruments and to provide and support ongoing training on these evaluation instruments.
- Based on the work of the Leadership Framework and Building Leader Evaluation task forces, Syracuse provided initial training to leaders, directors, and observers on the Leadership Framework, which was developed to cultivate strong leaders in the same way that the Teaching and Learning Framework is driving continuous improvement in teacher practice.

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The Director of Professional Development indicated that Insight Education effectively provided professional development (PD) tied to the rubric.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Revision of the Teaching and Learning Framework and Leadership Framework.

Recruitment and Placement

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools have effective or highly effective educators.
<p>Summary: The District successfully used grant funds to support this standard. The activities related to this standard supported Goal III: to implement integrated and aligned performance management structures and supports with rigorous standards and performance-based accountability that use evaluation data to inform the development and equitable distribution of effective educators.</p> <p>The District offered recruitment/transfer awards to teachers and select ancillary staff who accepted a new position at one of the district's seven (7) Innovation Zone schools by mutual consent. This was designed to provide incentive for effective staff members, who were not already placed in an Innovation Zone school, to move into one. The rationale for including this in the STLE grant was that this incentive, even if relatively small, could increase the number of effective staff members working in the district's lowest-performing schools.</p> <p>The district demonstrated effort to equitably distribute staff who have demonstrated high levels of performance or evidence-based potential to meet and exceed high performance standards. It is noted that at this time, the district has committed only to provide the recruitment/transfer award for one year at the time the staff member joins the Innovation Zone school (either from another SCSD school or from outside the district).</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Compensation	Budget Code	# Recruit/ Transfer	Total Amount
Recruit-Supervisor of Educator Effectiveness				District	Salary	16	Recruit	\$68,542
Recruit-Executive Director			Grant	District	Salary	15	Recruit	\$130,729
Recruitment Award	Teacher	Recruit	Recruit	District	Stipend	15	Recruit	\$162,825

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- A standard recruitment/ transfer award amount was determined based on budget availability and expected number of awards.
- The district offered recruitment/transfer awards to teachers and select ancillary staff who accepted a new position at one of the district's seven (7) Innovation Zone schools by mutual consent.
- The district committed to equitably distributing staff who have demonstrated high levels of performance or evidence-based potential to meet and exceed high performance standards.

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The work of Cross & Joftus, with whom the district contracted, helped with recruitment efforts of Talent Management Director and Recruitment Director. The activities helped the district to develop a strategic plan to recruit and develop educators.
- The Project Coordinator indicated that the district has redesigned the interview process to choose better teachers and leaders and grant funding has helped them to recruit the best educators.
- The Project Coordinator indicated that the district has been able to recruit high quality teachers and leaders.
- The Director of Recruitment indicated that new hires have been strong educators in the schools where they have been placed.
- The Director of Recruitment indicated the primary focus is on recruiting to attract E/HE teachers and that the work with Cross & Joftus and Teacher Match to determine the best and strongest teachers and leaders has been beneficial.
- Through conversations with district personnel and representatives from Cross & Joftus and Insight Education, it is apparent these partnerships have had a positive impact within the school community. Cross & Joftus has helped to focus and improve all areas of the district's recruitment efforts. These improvements have allowed for more defined ways in which to recruit Highly Effective educators, especially in high need areas.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- New staff in the Office of Talent Management, funded by the STLE 1 grant, continued to explore, adopt, and implement new ideas for supporting and leveraging talent through

new systems for recruitment (new recruitment brand and website), selection (new use of online assessment in the application process), career pathways (development of new roles for teacher and principal leaders), and more.

- It has remained a challenge to recruit individuals with the skills to support the district’s strategic work around strengthening teacher and leader effectiveness. The district experienced turnover with staff within the office with primary responsibility for this work, which was a challenge to communicating about the work as effectively as the district would like.

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

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

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: Establishing and recruiting grant funded peer observer positions, an Executive Director of Talent Management position, an Executive Director of Talent Management position and a Director of Educator Effectiveness position was an indication of the district’s efforts to strengthen teacher and leader effectiveness. Goal I: to design and implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system for teachers and school leaders that accurately differentiates effectiveness and aligns more than historical evaluation data with student outcomes, and the related targets was a major focus of the grant activities.</p> <p>Funds were used to contract with Insight Education Group to develop, refine, and evaluate the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), aligned with teacher and leaders evaluation instruments and to provide and support ongoing training on these evaluation instruments. There were indications that teachers and leaders had an increased level of knowledge regarding the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) process, as a result of these activities. The district has followed through on its target to develop district-specific frameworks for teaching practice and school leadership that, through refinement and collaboration, are accepted by union partners for use in all Syracuse CSD schools regardless of each school's grade configuration.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
6 Peer Observers funded, completing over 600 observations	T-Eval	Pos-All,	APPR	FP-DS, District	15	600		\$192,943

		PD					
Employee benefits for Peer Observers					80		\$171,203.00
10 monthly calibration sessions	T-Eval	Pos-All	APPR	FP-DS, District	90	600	\$34,131.00

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interview:

- The Project Coordinator indicated that funds were used to contract with Insight Education Group to develop, refine, and evaluate the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), aligned with teacher and leader evaluation instruments and to provide and support ongoing training on these evaluation instruments. Teachscape has helped to manage data to monitor all evaluations. It identifies relative strengths and weaknesses based on the teacher framework. Based on this information, principals are better able to work with teachers to help with areas in need of improvement. Principals received a monthly report based on school data, to better shape professional development (PD) that is offered at the school level. This data also helped in the development of Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs).
- The Project Coordinator indicated that there are many experts within the organization who can provide targeted support and that positive feedback was received from principals, indicating that rubric specific training has helped to improve observations.
- The Director of Professional Development indicated that administrators were looking at "tree maps" to determine areas of need based on observation outcomes.
- The Director of Educator Effectiveness indicated that she/he works with Insight Education and administrators to calibrate leaders and presented regarding Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) changes, implementation, and APPR process to better prepare to implement APPR.
- A principal indicated that teachers received PD in what the district is looking for in terms of observations, so there is a better understanding of the ratings they received.
- A principal indicated that teachers and leaders have an increased level of knowledge regarding the APPR process.
- Building administrators reported that the partnership with Insight Education has allowed for targeted professional development with implementing Common Core Learning Standards. Building administrators also felt the training provided to them by Insight Education has given them the tools necessary to complete effective teacher evaluations.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Hiring the Executive Director of Talent Management and the Director of Educator Effectiveness was extremely important to the implementation of STLE grant activities and the sustainability of reforms initiated with support from this grant. For these roles, the district recruited a national expert in teacher and leader effectiveness strategies,

systems, and policies and a state APPR expert with experience in the largest district in the state.

- With Insight Education as a partner, Syracuse CSD developed comprehensive frameworks outlining what is expected for teachers and principals, developed new rubrics to evaluate teacher and principal performance, and supported the first year of full implementation of these systems through comprehensive training and ongoing professional development of observers, including administrators and Master Educators (Peer Observers).
- In the last few months during Period 1, Insight Education supported the District's work in revising both the teacher and principal professional practice frameworks; the revised Teaching and Learning Framework was approved by NYSED. The Teaching and Learning Framework and teacher rubric are fully aligned to the Common Core.
- In the 2012-13 school year, this work supported district and school administrators, as well as Master Educators, in their completing meaningful observations of teachers to enable teachers' and principals' continuous improvement. The district remarked that rolling out these new tools with regular support for practitioners was a significant accomplishment.
- In order to identify a highly qualified candidate ready to support the district's work around teacher and principal evaluations at a high level, the district executed an extensive search. The Director of Educator Effectiveness position remained vacant until a great candidate was identified. This means there was a significant gap in personnel/capacity for this last quarter.
- The district communicated with the Syracuse Teachers Association (STA) and an approved amendment is allowing the district to bring back Peer Observers for the 2013-14 school year – a big win for teachers and the STA, as well as the district.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Completion of Year 2 of an innovative Peer Observer program.
- Alignment of Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) and Principal Improvement Plans (PIPs) – and associated professional development (PD) – with evaluation results.
- Syracuse CSD's Peer Observer program was continued, with content experts serving as Peer Observers who completed 2 observations with feedback of all non-tenured teachers and 1 observation with feedback of all tenured teachers.
- The district worked with teachers and leaders to refine the instructional and leadership practice frameworks for the district and school leaders engaged in monthly calibration sessions with support from Insight Education.
- 6 Peer Observers funded, completing over 600 observations.
- The district developed new templates for TIPs and created a cross-walk between the annual professional development offerings and the components of instructional practice competencies, allowing teachers and principals to identify PD activities that aligned with areas identified for growth.
- Reports were made available beginning in the fall of 2014 in real time to all administrators on Teachscape, the district's teacher evaluation platform.
- All teachers with TIPs completed PD aligned with specific areas identified for growth; the number of optional PD hours completed by teachers in 2013-2014 set a district record.

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 used STLE funds effectively to meet this standard. Progress toward meeting Goal II: to design and implement systems for professional development and coaching for teachers and school leaders that will provide appropriate, intensive, and differentiated support based on examination of student achievement data and Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) evaluation data was made.</p> <p>Contracting with Insight Education and Cross & Joftus, creation of peer observer positions, hiring of an Executive Director of Talent Management and a Director of Educator Effectiveness, and their various professional development activities supported this effort.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
The district developed new templates for Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) and created a cross-walk between the annual professional development offerings and the components of instructional practice competencies, allowing teachers and principals to identify PD activities that aligned with areas identified for growth Talent Management Coordinator role was created and filled with a high-quality teacher quality expert, affording 1,440 hours of additional support to school leaders over the school year	T-PD	External	APPR, Coach	FP-DS, District	40			\$1,127,092

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The Project Coordinator indicated that Instructional Frameworks rubric training for teachers- 3 hour training was funded by the STLE grant.
- The Director of Professional Development indicated that the number of teachers taking professional development (PD) increased over the last year and teachers are better prepared to implement Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPR).

- The Director of Professional Development indicated that there has been a shift in culture—more teachers are taking the optional PD offered. Also, teachers have a better understanding of how PD will improve them as professional and improve instruction.
- The Talent Management Director indicated that the district was able to raise the expectations of what is needed in order to deliver high quality observations and that PD has fostered school level discussion regarding APPR. She/he is working on a formal process in order to better deliver information to stakeholders to lead to better preparation and delivery of APPR.
- An administrator indicated that she/he is receiving monthly PD on increasing academic rigors, increasing support for CCLS implementation and practice of instructional rounds. It is helping to find ways to better support teachers.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- With Insight Education as a partner, Syracuse CSD has developed comprehensive frameworks outlining what is expected for teachers and principals, developed new rubrics to evaluate teacher and principal performance, and supported the first year of full implementation of these systems through comprehensive training and ongoing professional development of observers, including administrators and Master Educators (Peer Observers).

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district developed new templates for Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) and created a cross-walk between the annual professional development offerings and the components of instructional practice competencies, allowing teachers and principals to identify PD activities that aligned with areas identified for growth.
- Talent Management Coordinator role was created and filled with a high-quality teacher quality expert, affording 1,440 hours of additional support to school leaders over the school year.
- The district incorporated talent management coaching and guidance into monthly Leadership Academies for principals, including facilitation by external talent experts.
- All teachers with TIPs completed PD aligned with specific areas identified for growth; the number of optional PD hours completed by teachers in 2013-2014 set a district record.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
Summary: The district worked toward achieving this standard. Administrators were looking at rating scores to determine effectiveness. There were discussions with principals on an ongoing basis for their perspective based on observing teachers implementing professional development (PD) strategies. Teachers are improving in the areas of focus, including lesson planning. Non-evaluative data and job embedded PD helped to provide on-going monitoring and support and provided instant feedback for improvement. However, more evidence will be necessary to determine whether the district fully accomplished Goal III: to implement integrated and aligned	

performance management structures and supports with rigorous standards and performance-based accountability that use evaluation data to inform the development and equitable distribution of effective educators, and its related targets.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	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 site visit interviews:

- The Project Coordinator indicated that data is now available for principals so they are now able to drive PD that is offered. Teachers are much more informed regarding the type of PD they should be taking.
- The Director of Professional Development indicated that the district is looking at rating scores to determine effectiveness.
- The Director of Educator Effectiveness indicated that relationships have been created that has helped to move forward with the changes with Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR).
- The principal indicated that lesson planning was a needed focus for teachers and that feedback and coaching has led to improvement.
- The principal indicated that targeted support is much better planned because of the ratings data and there is greater depth of knowledge in the areas of improvements targeted.
- Building administrators also felt the training provided to them by Insight Education has given them the tools necessary to complete effective teacher evaluations.

Evidence from the Year 1 Interim Report:

- Syracuse CSD contracted with an executive search firm to identify a new Executive Director of Talent Management. After a national, rigorous recruitment and selection process, someone was hired to begin work on February 19, 2013.
- The Office of Talent Management is developing specific plans for linking teacher and leader evaluation data to STLE continuum decisions. To date, a strategic compensation plan has been agreed to by the Syracuse Teachers Association and the Syracuse Association of Administrators and Supervisors. Additionally, draft guidelines for tenure determinations based primarily on APPR results have been developed.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- In order to identify a highly qualified candidate ready to support the district’s work around teacher and principal evaluations at a high level, the district executed an extensive search. The Director of Educator Effectiveness position remained vacant until a great candidate was identified. This means there was a significant gap in personnel/capacity for this last quarter.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Syracuse CSD’s Peer Observer program was continued, with content experts serving as Peer Observers who completed 2 observations with feedback of all non-tenured teachers and 1 observation with feedback of all tenured teachers.
- The district worked with teachers and leaders to refine the instructional and leadership practice frameworks for the district and school leaders engaged in monthly calibration sessions with support from Insight Education.
- Reports were made available beginning in the fall of 2014 in real time to all administrators on Teachscape, the district’s teacher evaluation platform.
- All teachers with Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) completed PD aligned with specific areas identified for growth; the number of optional PD hours completed by teachers in 2013-2014 set a district record.

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

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

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 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), English Language Learners (ELL), bilingual and/or special education.
Summary: This standard is not directly addressed, however its efforts in Recruitment and Placement are supporting an equitable distribution of highly effective and effective teachers and	

principals working with high need 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 site visit interviews:

- The Project Coordinator indicated that the district has redesigned the interview process to choose better teachers and leaders and grant funding has helped them to recruit the best educators.
- The Project Coordinator indicated that the district has been able to recruit high quality teachers and leaders.
- The Director of Recruitment indicated that new hires have been strong educators in the schools where they have been placed.
- The Director of Recruitment indicated the primary focus is on recruiting to attract E/HE teachers and that the work with Cross & Jofus and Teacher Match to determine the best and strongest teachers and leaders has been beneficial.
- Cross & Jofus has helped to focus and improve all areas of the district’s recruitment efforts. These improvements have allowed for more defined ways in which to recruit Highly Effective educators, especially in high need areas.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- A standard recruitment/transfer award amount was determined based on budget availability and expected number of awards.
- The district offered recruitment/transfer awards to teachers and select ancillary staff who accepted a new position at one of the district's seven (7) Innovation Zone schools by mutual consent.
- The district committed to equitably distributing staff who have demonstrated high levels of performance or evidence-based potential to meet and exceed high performance standards.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- It has remained a challenge to recruit individuals with the skills to support the district’s strategic work around strengthening teacher and leader effectiveness. The district experienced turnover with staff within the office with primary responsibility for this work, which was a challenge to communicating about the work as effectively as the district would like.

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 allocated or reallocated other Federal funding, State funding, and local funding to support continuation of many components of its STLE 1 program.	

Short Description	Code	Type
Executive Director of Talent Management and Director of Educator Effectiveness positions, the Peer Observer program, support from Cross & Jofus, and support from Insight Education.	Personnel	SF

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:

- Discussions were held around the creation of a plan in order for the district to be able to carry out programs and initiatives currently being supported by outside consultants. Given the success of these partnership within the district, there should be a plan in place to ensure success in these areas continue, especially the work that has been done with Insight Education.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The District has taken some steps to ensure programmatic sustainability but this is a continuing challenge. The creation of the Executive Director of Talent Management position helped make possible the reorganization of work in the District, bringing the coordination of strategies and activities along the Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness continuum into one division – the Office of Talent Management. First, this reorganization has been much more than just structural. Decisions regarding teachers and leaders – from recruitment through retention and everything in between – are focused on the District’s goal of recruiting, developing, supporting, and retaining excellent teachers, leaders, and support staff, which is one of the five goals of the District’s five-year strategic plan. All staff members in the division understand the strategic direction of the work, away from a traditional division focused on paperwork and compliance to a division focused, above all, on helping ensure every classroom has a great teacher, every school has a great leader, and we have the best of the best in our support team positions. This change in focus feels permanent to the district, and has spread to other divisions and across their schools.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The District has allocated or reallocated other Federal funding, State funding, and local funding to support continuation of many components of its STLE 1 program. These include the Executive Director of Talent Management and Director of Educator Effectiveness positions, the Peer Observer program, support from Cross & Jofus, and support from Insight Education. For 2015-2016 and beyond, the District will re-evaluate priorities to ensure appropriate funding is provided to continue the critical work around strengthening teacher and leader effectiveness.

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:

- Executive Director of Talent Management
- Director of Special Programs
- Director of Professional Development
- Director of Educator Effectiveness
- Talent Management Coordinator
- Director of Recruitment and Selection

Partner Organizations representatives:

- Insight Education
- Cross & Joftus

Principal:

- Franklin Elementary School

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Syracuse Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Syracuse Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Syracuse Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Syracuse Year 2 Final STLE Report
- Syracuse Site Visit Notes