



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Union-Endicott 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 10

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 15

 Preparation 15

 Recruitment and Placement 17

 Induction and Mentoring..... 17

 Evaluation 18

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 18

 Performance Management 21

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

 Other 23

 Issues of Equity..... 23

 Sustainability..... 25

Section VIII – Methodology 25

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dr. Suzanne McLeod	Barbara Brown
Phone	(607) 757-2111	(607) 760-0260
Email	smcleod@uek12.org	bbrown@uek12.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: May 12, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Southern Tier East	Broome-Delaware-Tioga 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
3929	1339	282	33	540	1833

Racial/Ethnic Origin					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
0%	7%	6%	3%	78%	7%

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
94%	4%

Teacher Qualifications				
# Teachers	Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate	Percent Teaching Out of Certification	Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years Experience	Turnover Rate all Teachers
323	0	0	44	18

Need Status
Average Need/Resource Capacity

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	46	21	n < 5	33
3(2012-13)	26	0	n < 5	15
4(2011-12)	63	8	n < 5	52
4(2012-13)	20	2	n < 5	11
5(2011-12)	58	14	n < 5	43
5(2012-13)	25	0	n < 5	12
6(2011-12)	59	14	None tested	45
6(2012-13)	25	4	n < 5	13
7(2011-12)	55	13	n < 5	40
7(2012-13)	27	0	None tested	12
8(2011-12)	61	10	n < 5	48
8(2012-13)	41	2	n < 5	21
District Wide (2011-12)	57	13	Cannot be calculated*	43
District Wide (2012-13)	27	1	Cannot be calculated*	14

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	59	19	n < 5	49
3(2012-13)	38	0	n < 5	22
4(2011-12)	74	30	n < 5	66
4(2012-13)	37	14	n < 5	28
5(2011-12)	73	30	n < 5	64
5(2012-13)	29	4	n < 5	20
6(2011-12)	72	36	None tested	57
6(2012-13)	35	8	n < 5	21
7(2011-12)	65	20	n < 5	51
7(2012-13)	24	3	None tested	13
8(2011-12)	65	16	n < 5	60
8(2012-13)	27	11	n < 5	16
District Wide (2011-12)	68	25	Cannot be	58

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

12)			calculated*	
District Wide (2012-13)	32	7	Cannot be calculated*	20

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	94	76	n < 5	89
4(2012-13)	88	69	n < 5	84
8(2011-12)	84	51	n < 5	79
8(2012-13)	83	60	n < 5	73
District Wide (2011-12)	89	61	Cannot be calculated*	84
District Wide (2012-13)	85	64	Cannot be calculated*	79

*Although there are more than five students who are part of this tested subgroup and took the exam district wide, no one grade tested more than 4 students; therefore, a district wide proficiency rate cannot be calculated.

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	79	25	53	6
Integrated Algebra	88	26	65	3
Geometry	97	35	100	14
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	81	32	20	0
Global History and Geography	78	37	45	7
U.S. History and Government	91	55	74	21
Living Environment	90	45	67	9
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	79	27	50	0
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	82	20	n < 5	n < 5
Physical Setting/ Physics	96	39	n < 5	n < 5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	82	39	87	40
SWD	46	3	54	7
ELL	None tested	None tested	n < 5	n < 5
ED	73	20	75	23

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	84	26	89	28
SWD	48	0	63	2
ELL	None tested	None tested	n < 5	n < 5

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

ED	75	12	77	12
-----------	----	----	----	----

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

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	8	0	0	2	6
Mathematics	8	0	1	2	5

2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)						
	n Tested	Percent of students scoring in each performance level:				
		Beg.	Int.	Ad.	Prof.	
Kindergarten						
All Students	2	-	-	-	-	
General Education	2	-	-	-	-	
SWD	-	-	-	-	-	
First Grade						
All Students	5	0	0	100	0	
General Education	5	0	0	100	0	
SWD	-	-	-	-	-	

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

Second Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	4	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	4	-	-	-	-
General Education	4	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Sixth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	0	-	-	-	-
General Education	0	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
Eighth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-

SWD	-	-	-	-	-
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	373	79	358	84
Students With Disabilities	71	51	76	64
Limited English Proficient	0	-	2	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	145	67	103	71

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 – Black or African American Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Multiracial Elementary/Middle-Level ELA - Students with Disabilities Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Multiracial Elementary/Middle-Level Math - Students with Disabilities 5-Year Graduation-Rate – 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 Science – Black or African American Secondary-Level ELA – White Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Economically Disadvantaged 4-Year Graduation-Rate – All Students 4-Year Graduation-Rate – Students with Disabilities 4-Year Graduation-Rate – Economically Disadvantaged 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 Student (12-3)	# of Student (13-14)	# of Adm n (12-3)	# of Admn (13-4)	# of Teacher (12-13)	# of Teacher (13-14)
Ann G. McGuinness Elementary School	Timothy Lowie	2002-14	Con	K-5	395	375	1 P, .4 AP	1 P, .4 AP	26	27
Charles F. Johnson Elementary	Pamela Riddleberger	2009-14	Con	K-5	423	409	1 P, .6 AP	1P, .6 AP	30	29

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

School										
Thomas J. Watson Elementary School	Emily Reagan	2010-14	Con	K-5	313	306	1P	1P	25	25
George F. Johnson Elementary School	Michelle Feyerabend	2010-13	Original	K-5	631	-	1P, 1 AP	1P, 1 AP	41	-
	Lawrence Dake	2013-14	Other New		-	611	1P, 1 AP	1P, 1 AP	-	40
Jennie F. Snapp Middle School	AnnMarie Foley	2001-13	Original	6-8	921	-	1 P, 2 AP	1P, 2 AP	72	-
	Catherine Kacyvenski	2013-14	Other New		-	889	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	-	72
Union-Endicott High School	Stephen DiStefano	2010-14	Con	9-12	1258	1202	1 P, 3 AP	1 P, 3 AP	94	93

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/union-endicott-appr-plan.pdf
Most current version as of: February 7, 2014

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
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	143	227	-	156
Effective	164	77	-	157
Developing	8	10	-	2
Ineffective	0	1	-	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	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; Amy Cox, Project Assistant	May 16, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by July 15, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	September 17, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	November 14, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 21, 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
5545-13-0042	\$502,250	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
<p>Preparation: 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: <i>To support their new role, Teacher Coaches, the Endicott Teacher Association President, the Lead Coach, building principals and district office administrators were trained in coaching for student success at an institute designed by a consultant, contracted with grant funds.</i></p>
<p>Recruitment and Placement: Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>
<p>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>Evaluation: The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>
<p>Professional Development and Growth: Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>Teacher coaches were coaching colleagues to set targets, implement plans, track data and revise interventions/strategies to improve student achievement. The District used Data Driven Instruction (DDI) to determine professional development needs.</i></p>
<p>Performance Management: Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>
<p>Career Ladder: Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>Teacher leaders and lead coach positions were established with use of grant funds. 15 teachers were hired as teacher coaches and one as a lead coach.</i></p>

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 - Create a career ladder opportunity for 15 teachers to become No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Teacher Coaches.</p>	<p>15 teacher coaches and a lead coach will be hired for each year of the grant cycle.</p>	<p>The district hired 15 coaches and a lead coach in year one. These positions were reposted and rehired in year two.</p> <p>Over two years, 100% administrators, including 2 new principals, were trained in Results Now work. NTLB coaches received 7 days of training; administrators received 8 days of training. (Administrators received the additional day of training due to a snow day.</p> <p>Administrators reviewed building action plans, shared</p>

		<p>what was working and determined next steps to further work.) Total staff trained in Les Loomis Results Now model: 6 principals, 7 assistant principals, 7 district office administrators, 15 NTLB coaches and 1 Lead Coach.</p> <p>2012-2013: 15 NTLB Teacher Coaches coached 19% of the district’s teachers (goal exceeded); 11.9% of students were targeted (goal exceeded).</p> <p>2013-2014: 15 NTLB Teacher Coaches coached 23.9% of the district’s teachers (goal exceeded); 27% of students were targeted (goal exceeded)</p> <p>Quarterly data dashboards have been created and disseminated to staff.</p>
<p>Goal II -Enable (the District) to fully implement No Tiger Left Behind Data Teams</p>	<p>By the end of 2013-2014, No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Data Teams will be fully implemented.</p> <p>By the end of 2013-2014 NTLB Coaches will facilitate the development of formative assessments to provide consistent and timely data to drive instructional modifications. During the summer, coaches will create professional development resources to leverage work with teachers and develop staff trainings on writing across the curriculum and Data Driven Instruction. Coaches will support district summer work in curriculum</p>	<p>Coaches led or co-facilitated with principals quarterly Data Driven Instruction (DDI) meetings based on quarterly assessments and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).</p> <p>5 Teachers received individual coaching (23.4%)</p> <p>100% of Teachers received DDI training on Superintendent’s Conference Days, at faculty meetings, department meetings, grade level meetings, data roll though meetings and during Professional Learning Communities (PLC) time on 4th Tuesdays</p>

	<p>alignment K-12 and development of short quarterly, common formative assessments in extended response form.</p>	<p>89 Teachers attended 11 Teacher Center classes taught by 6 NTLB Coaches 30 sessions were devoted to coaching training (Les Loomis Results Now trainings and monthly coaches meetings.)</p> <p>100% of teachers attended DDI sessions (held during faculty meetings, department meetings, grade level meetings, and data roll through meetings)</p> <p>6 principals met with and worked with NTLB Coaches on DDI and building action plans</p> <p>K-12 Quarterly assessments have been developed and administered: K-5 ELA and Math; 6-12 all content areas.</p> <p>Coaches conducted study groups in which they read 6 books, created Professional development (PD) resources placed in an electronic shared drive and used to provide PD to staff on 2 Superintendent's Conference Days.</p>
--	---	--

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

<p>Goal III -Fully implement a professional development plan that will provide direct professional development for both administrators and teachers in order to fully address the student achievement needs of all students, especially those of high-poverty and special education populations.</p>	<p>By the end of 2013-2014, a sustainability plan will be in place to continue the project work to address the achievement needs of all students, especially high-poverty and special education populations.</p> <p>By the end of 2013-2014, full implementation of professional development for coaches and administrators in the areas of writing across the curriculum and formative assessment development and use will be completed.</p>	<p>A Sustainability Plan was created: 8 coaches received stipends for ELA, math, science, social studies at the middle and high school level; 1 coach for 6-12 writing across the content area; 1 full time Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) for K-5 math coach in 2014-2015. Positions were budget approved by the community.</p> <p>Full implementation of Quarterly Assessments: K-5 ELA and Math; 6-12 all content areas. Board of Education (BOE) approved 2014-2015 calendars to include 3 early release days for DDI of these formative assessments. Writing across the curriculum plan and funding in place for coaching dedicated to this goal for 2014-2015.</p> <p>Coaches conducted study groups in which they read 6 books, created PD resources placed in an electronic shared drive and used to provide PD to staff on 2 Superintendent's Conference Days.</p>
--	---	---

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$502,250	\$212,500	\$289,750

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>
15	Teacher Coaches Stipends	16	\$49,477 (Not broken out, includes Code 80 benefits)*	\$96,210	\$123,604 (Not broken out, includes Code 80 benefits)*	\$178,500
15	Lead Coach Stipend	1		\$10,938		\$21,394

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

15	Substitute Teachers	33	\$4,500 (includes benefits)*	\$6,905	\$7,319 (includes benefits)*	\$18,707
40	Carey Center for Global Good	33	-	\$5,808	-	\$7,666
40	Leslie Loomis: Get-to-Great Training	19	\$12,402	\$15,000	\$18,013	\$15,000
45	Materials to support optional teacher professional development	N/A	-	\$3,866	\$183	\$28,200
46	Travel – Carey Center for Global Good Conference	4	-	\$594	-	\$1,348
80	Employee Benefits	50	*See above	\$23,142	*See above	\$53,934
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$66,379	\$162,463	\$149,119	\$324,763

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.
<p>Summary: The training held supported the district’s Goal I: create a career ladder opportunity for 15 teachers to become No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Teacher Coaches. Also, this partnership supported the district’s attainment of Goal III: to fully implement a professional development plan that will provide direct professional development for both administrators and teachers in order to fully address the student achievement needs of all students, especially those of high-poverty and special education populations.</p> <p>The district engaged in activities meant to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district’s career ladder. The district established a partnership with the Rensselaerville Institute, which has matched the district with Les Loomis, an education consultant, to train principals, district-level administrators, Teacher Coaches, and Teacher Leaders on the “Get to Great” model. Les Loomis, provided training to educators on the career ladder and district administration on data driven instruction (a strategy called the “Get to Great” model) and on developing a district-wide strategy for the use of data. Teacher Coaches then provided support to</p>	

all other educators in the district on these areas. This training focused on using data driven instruction to increase student achievement and was designed to ensure alignment between district leadership and instructional coaches. Mr. Loomis was originally associated with the Rensselaerville Institute, and is now working independently.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Rensselaerville Institute provides training to district staff through consultant Les Loomis	New Role	T-CL	D Strategy, DDI	FP	15	25	\$15,000
Teacher Leaders and administrators to Carey Center for Global Good Conference with Les Loomis	New Role	T-CL	D Strategy, DDI	FP	15	33	\$5,808

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The district interviewed and hired 15 No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Teacher Coaches and Lead Coach.
- May 9 – Phone conference with Les Loomis (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Director, Lead Coach) to finalize plans for May 29 training.
- Fifteen NTLB teacher coaches, the Endicott Teacher Association President, Lead Coach, building principals and district office administrators were trained in results work and coaching for student success.
- June 3 – Superintendent’s Advisory Council Meeting: principals and district level administrators reviewed the workshop results from the Les Loomis’ Get-to-Great NTLB/STLE Training.

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- Teacher leaders indicated that the training helped to focus the district’s efforts and helped facilitate conversations regarding the sustainability of the program. The training has helped teacher coaches bring back lessons learned to their mentees. The training helped teachers use differentiated instruction to meet instructional goals. The training helped teachers look at data to ask results-based questions and to design action plans for students.
- The superintendent indicated that the focus was on data driven instruction, which helps the district make adjustments and build capacity. She stated, “The district sets high targets and Les Loomis helped unite administrative leadership teams and coaches. Les helped the district make adjustments and build capacity.”

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- Les Loomis conducted training with teacher coaches and all district administrators on Data Driven Instruction (DDI) and creating action plans to target individual student needs.

Recruitment and Placement

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

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

Induction and Mentoring

Induction and Mentoring	
Standard	The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes.
Summary: This standard was not specifically addressed with grant funded activities. However 62 teachers are being coached by teacher coaches who are funded by the STLE grant.	

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:

- 62 teachers are being coached this year - 29 elementary and 33 secondary teacher volunteers. This represents 19% of the teachers in the district. Some teachers did not volunteer to participate in peer coaching because they saw it as “one more thing to do.”
- Coaches worked to communicate that coaching could help teachers extend what they are already doing and focus their efforts in measurable ways that will accelerate student achievement. On the positive side, teachers were supported and provided Professional Development during faculty, department/grade level and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings as well as during the Spring Superintendent’s Conference Day.
- Coaches and administrators helped teachers to look at their data in a “non-threatening” way, make the DDI cycle a routine part of their professional practice and implement instructional changes based on data and small measurable targets to move special education and poverty students forward in achievement.

Evaluation

Evaluation	
Standard	The district is fully implementing an APPR plan that complies with Education Law §3012-c and is approved by the commissioner. Through the evaluation system the district has a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices
Summary: This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

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

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.

Summary: Activities allowed the district to meet Goal III: to fully implement a professional development plan that will provide direct professional development for both administrators and teachers, in order to fully address the learning needs of all students, especially those of high-poverty and special education populations. Teachers attended bi-monthly Data Driven Instruction (DDI) meetings where coaches and administrators supported the teachers in using data to drive instruction, helping the district toward attaining Goal II: enable the district to fully implement No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Data Teams.

The district made progress toward meeting this standard through the implementation of the teacher coach program. Evidence suggested that the training that teacher coaches and administrators received and turn keyed to other teachers was beneficial.

Les Loomis, the consultant contracted through grant funds, supported teachers and administrators with strategies to continue data driven instruction action planning and to use data to inform decision making, including professional development and goal setting. The district used data to improve instruction and connected professional development on the analysis of data. There was a focus on Common Core to lead to both teacher and student success. Data is being used to inform instruction and professional development. Teacher coaches successfully supported teachers in creating action plans to help improve student achievement in more meaningful ways. Teachers reported having a deeper understanding of DDI and ways in which data can be used to enhance instruction.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Get to Great Training with Les Loomis	PD – T External, PD – P	Group, NP	DDI, Coach	FP	40 46	25	4 days	\$39,415

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

	External							
Results First Training with Les Loomis	PD – T External, PD – P External	Group, NP	DDI, Coach	FP	40 and 46	25	4 days	\$18,013
Carey Center for Global Good Conference (continuing work with Les Loomis)	PD – T External	Group, NP	DDI, Coach	FP	40	33	2 days	\$5,808
Twice monthly DDI meetings with coaches and administrators to help teachers use data to drive instruction	PD – T Internal	Group, DDI	DDI, Coach	District	N/A	346*	2 times monthly	N/A
Coaches continue to seek teacher volunteers. They reach out to teachers to work with them on helping students who are not achieving.	PD – T Internal	Individual	DDI, Coach	District	45	Unclear	On-going	\$4,049

*District indicates that “all educators” participate. 346 is based on 2011-12 district school report card.

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:

- A principal indicated that teacher coaches were working with all teachers in the area of DDI. Based on DDI outcomes, action plans were created to help improve low performing students in more meaningful ways. These action plans allowed for teachers to set short and long term goals.
- A principal indicated that teachers have a much deeper understanding of DDI and ways in which data can enhance instruction and move students forward.
- The district indicated that it was connecting professional development to Common Core in ways that help both teachers and students to be successful.
- A mentee stated that she/he is “Worked with my mentor on analyzing data to help me improve as a teacher as well as help my students meet short and long term goals.” Additionally, she/he worked with the mentor on creating action plans for the students the mentee has identified as in need/low performing.
- A teacher leader indicated that the professional development provided by Les Loomis helped instructional leaders ask results based questions to drive instruction.
- A principal indicated that working with small groups of faculty allowed coaches to help plan for/suggest what further development was needed.
- A teacher leader indicated that the district was looking at student data and action plan goals to determine success of its efforts and training. This also helped them to monitor and adjust on a continual basis.

- A teacher leader indicated that the professional development provided allowed for her/him to ask results based questions to drive instruction, and to determine the best data to analyze in order to help teachers be successful with DDI; both coaches and teachers are much more reflective in their teaching, which has led to being better teachers. Many more teachers are asking for coaching help because they have seen how DDI can help all of their students - not just those who struggle.
- The Superintendent indicated that the district bridged the gap between administrators and teachers by establishing trust and constantly making data the focus of all their work so teacher buy-in was built in.
- Les Loomis gave the teachers and administrators the tools they needed to continue DDI action planning and using data to inform them of all decisions from Professional Development (PD) to goal setting.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- Twenty-six people attended two-day training in Rensselaerville.
- Fifteen NTLB teacher coaches, the Endicott Teacher Association President, Lead Coach, building principals and district office administrators were trained in results work and coaching for student success.
- NTLB Coaches were coaching their colleagues to identify measurable targets, utilize data to further define and measure the areas of desired growth; and collaboratively examine and change instructional practice to meet desired goals.
- The Lead Coach continued to coach NTLB Coaches in understanding the Whatever it Takes/Prototype belief system and truly utilizing DDI to change classroom instruction as well as clearly establishing the coaches' roles as outside the supervisory evaluative processes.
- May 6 – Superintendent's Advisory Council Meeting. Lead coach attended meeting. Principals developed Elementary, Middle School and High School Action Plans for the 2013-2014 school year. Principals established a list of professional development needs at the elementary, middle and high school level. They gave input into next steps and planning for Year 2 grant work.
- May 9 – Phone conference with Les Loomis (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Director, Lead Coach) to finalize plans for May 29 training. Assistant Superintendent and Curriculum Director now give direct input to customize training that aligns with STLE project work and district work.
- June 3 – Superintendent's Advisory Council Meeting: principals and district level administrators reviewed the workshop results from the Les Loomis' Get-to-Great NTLB/STLE Training. Administrative teams made recommendations for professional development for next year.
- June 17- Board of Education (BOE) meeting Director of Curriculum presentation: Moving Forward with Writing – what has been done in the district and next steps that include coaches' support of district work.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- September 3, 2013 – Coaches conducted Professional Development on Superintendent's Conference Opening Day: writing across the curriculum, DDI, Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPR).

- Coaches and administrators were leading DDI sessions with faculty two times a month. Teachers analyze data and revise DDI action plans.
- Coaches attended training in DDI, iData, Common Core and special education issues to do turn-key training with teachers. Principals and administrative department heads have met to plan DDI PD. They have co-facilitated faculty and department/grade level meetings. Coaches have led DDI sessions during 4th Tuesday Professional Learning Communities (PLC) time.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Full coach/administrator training in Results Now training was completed (Les Loomis trainings held January 10 and March 19).
- 6 coaches taught 11 classes at the district Teacher’s Center with 89 teachers attending.
- 2 coaches have assisted teams of teachers with alignment of the math curriculum with the Common Core State Standards.
- 2 coaches have assisted teams of teachers with alignment of the writing curriculum with the Common Core State Standards.

Performance Management

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

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

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
Standard	Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions.
<p>Summary: The districts’ STLE Goal I - to create a career ladder opportunity for 15 teachers to become No Tiger Left Behind (NTLB) Teacher Coaches, has been accomplished, as well as the target outcome to hire a lead coach.</p> <p>The district successfully implemented a career ladder program by creating new teacher coach positions and a lead coach position compensated through STLE grant funded stipends. Additionally, the district ensured that teacher and lead coaches received the training and preparation necessary to carry out their additional roles and responsibilities through professional development with Les Loomis, an education consultant. In particular, coaches were trained on the use of data to make instructional decisions, and are then turn-keying this training to other teachers.</p>	

The district indicated that teacher coaches have played a significant role in raising student achievement, especially for students with disabilities and students who are academically disadvantaged, by providing coaching to educators on implementing data driven instruction (DDI) and creating individualized plans for students with academic needs.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Teacher coaches	T-FT	STLE 1	Coach, DDI, Turnkey, SWD	15	Stipend	15	\$96,210
One lead coach	T-FT	STLE 1	Coach, DDI, Turnkey, SWD	15	Salary	1	\$10,938

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:

- During the 2012-2013 STLE grant cycle 15 teachers were hired as NTLB Coaches.
- Lead Coach held monthly NTLB Coaches meetings to strengthen coaching skills and provide support and direction for program work.

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- A principal indicated that the administration worked with all staff to create a high level of understanding of what the coaches’ roles are. This communication helped with buy-in and increased the likelihood of teachers asking for help.
- A principal indicated that coaches worked hand in hand with teachers to help bring professional development to the building.
- A teacher leader indicated that being in a leadership position helped her/him to look at the "bigger picture."
- A teacher leader indicated that “I am helping teachers and parents understand Common Core on a deeper level.”
- A teacher leader indicated that helping teachers analyze data to identify those students struggling the most has changed teaching and has resulted in continuous monitoring of student progress.
- A mentee indicated that teachers were working with coaches to analyze data and to create action plans to help struggling students.
- The Superintendent indicated that teacher coaches helped every teacher write action plans and provided turn-key training on DDI.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- For 2013-2014 teacher coach positions were re-posted as per teacher contract for annual position appointments. 15 teacher coaches were hired for Year 2 of the STLE grant.
- Teacher coaches continued to work with teachers to help them set individualized student targets based on DDI, as well as helping support them specifically on addressing the

needs of students with disabilities. The district attributed recent growth in student performance, especially for students with disabilities and students who are economically disadvantaged, to this.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The Superintendent presented data dashboards at BOE meetings on January 6, March 10, and May 19, 2014. After the first quarter data dashboard, the BOE voted to approve hiring 4 part-time reading teachers to offer target support to each of the 4 elementary school’s primary grade levels (K-1-2). By the third quarter, these students had overall “caught up” and were on target to reach the BOE’s benchmark text level literacy goals.
- The BOE included funding in the 2014-2015 budget to add an additional Grades 3-5 Literacy Collaborative Leader, a K-5 full-time Math Coach, and 9 secondary part-time teacher coaches: 6-8 ELA, 6-8 Math, 6-8 Science, 6-8 Social Studies, 9-12 ELA, 9-12 Math, 9-12 Science, 9-12 Social Studies, and 6-12 Writing.

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.
<p>Summary: Although none of the activities undertaken by the district through the STLE grant are specific to academically at-risk students, Goal III: to fully implement a professional development plan that will provide direct professional development (PD) for both administrators and teachers in order to fully address the student achievement needs of all students, especially those of high-poverty and special education populations, demonstrated the district’s commitment to at-risk students. The district’s grant funded activities demonstrate an effort to focus upon teaching techniques to improve the academic success of high needs students. In particular, the district has reported decreased special education referrals, improved attendance and higher graduation rates since implementing grant activities.</p> <p>Of note, teacher coaches trained and funded through STLE activities served on the districts Response to Intervention (RtI) team and some teacher coaches provided RtI PD to middle school teachers. The district indicated that the use of teacher coaches to support educators in developing individualized student achievement plans has led to increases in outcomes for students with</p>	

disabilities and students who are economically disadvantaged.

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 no longer has any Schools In Need of Improvement, has increased graduation rates, decreased special ed. referrals, improved attendance, has students involved in setting their own goals, and has every teacher setting Aim High Goals.
- When commenting on professional development, a principal stated, “we are able to see where students are in terms of graduation, which helps to narrow our focus and find those areas where improvement is needed. Mostly males are dropping out with poverty not a big hindrance. These needs are being addressed through PD.” Additionally this principal stated that “Attendance issues affect the graduation rate the most, tells administration that they are on the right track with instruction.”
- The Superintendent indicated that every person, including herself, is involved in “living DDI top down.” She meets with students who have had a superintendent's hearing and monitors them, works with their families, guidance counselors and other staff to support the most at risk students with a goal of them passing regents and graduating. She indicates that she has a 90% success rate.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district attributed growth in students who are economically disadvantaged and in students with disabilities' academic achievement to professional growth opportunities for teachers on the career ladder.
- Fifteen Teacher Coaches were hired and trained in modeling how to set targets and implement instructional changes to meet goals. They coached peers to improve the achievement of students with disabilities and students who are economically disadvantaged.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated “Coaches are members of building RTI teams. Some coaches will provide PD and training to the Middle School RTI teams to refine the RTI process and progress monitoring.”

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Status Update Call:

- Les Loomis worked with Principals; his work allowed the district to focus energy on SWDs and High Need Students. The work of Loomis’ supported the district in determining the underlying cause for the issues. Disaggregated dashboard was created to support and provide context to support the neediest kids.

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 as a target outcome for Goal III: “By the end of 2013-2014, a sustainability plan will be in place to continue the project work to address the achievement needs of all students, especially high-poverty and special education population.” At this time, there is no evidence of progress in meeting this target.	

Short Description	Code	Type
Personnel	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 Department’s visit team discussed sustainability with the district during the site visit. The district indicated that they were interested in STLE 3, but felt the language around coaches serving "evaluative roles" casued the district’s teachers union too much hesitation to sign off on it. However, the district also indicated that they cannot be grant dependent and need to find ways to sustain efforts by July 1, 2014 more than likely. The superintendent stated that she wants the district to move away experiences such as, "Oh, that grant came and went, and so did career ladders, attitude and culture."

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district’s response to questions about sustainability was “Coaches have attended training in DDI, iData, Common Core and special education issues to do turn-key training with teachers. Principals and administrative department heads have met to plan DDI PD. They have co-facilitated faculty and department/grade level meetings. Coaches have led DDI sessions during 4th Tuesday PLC time.” Therefore, there is not yet a clear plan to sustain positions or programs.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The BOE included funding in the 2014-2015 budget to add an additional Grades 3-5 Literacy Collaborative Leader, a K-5 full-time Math Coach, and 9 secondary part-time teacher coaches: 6-8 ELA, 6-8 Math, 6-8 Science, 6-8 Social Studies, 9-12 ELA, 9-12 Math, 9-12 Science, 9-12 Social Studies, and 6-12 Writing.

Section VIII – Methodology

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

Individuals interviewed

District Level

- Superintendent
- Grant Manager

Principals:

- Charles F. Johnson School
- Ann G. McGuinness School
- Jennie F. Snapp Middle School
- Union-Endicott High School

Teacher Coaches:

- Teacher Coach, ELA K-5
- Teacher Coach, Social Studies K-5
- Teacher Coach, Math K-5
- Teacher Coach, Special Education 6-8
- Teacher Coach, Instructional Technology 6-12

Teachers:

- Middle School Special Education Teacher ELA/Social Studies
- High School Special Education Teacher

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

N/A

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Union-Endicott CSD Interim Year 1 STLE Report
- Union-Endicott CSD Final Year 1 STLE Report
- Union-Endicott CSD Interim Year 2 STLE Report
- Union-Endicott CSD Final Year 2 STLE Report
- Union-Endicott CSD Site Visit Notes
- Union Endicott Year 2 Final Status Update Call Notes