New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Utica City School District

<u>Table of Contents</u>

Contents

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Bruce Karam	Carla Percia
Phone	(315) 792-2222	(315) 792-2215
Email	bkaram@uticaschools.org	cpercia@uticaschools.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

District Location	
Region	**BOCES**
Upper Mohawk Valley	Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	**Eligible for Free Lunch**	**Eligible for Reduced Lunch**	**Limited English Proficient**	**Students with Disabilities**	**Economically Disadvantaged**
9,709	7,199	586	1,463	1,642	7,825

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	**Black or African American**	**Hispanic or Latino**	**Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**White**	**Multiracial**
0	25	18	15	38	4

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	**Student Suspensions**
93%	10%

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**
712	0	0	41%	18%

Need Status
High Need/Resource Urban-Suburban District

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: March 20, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	36	5	9	32
3(2012-13)	15	1	1	11
4(2011-12)	42	6	10	35
4(2012-13)	11	0	1	10
5(2011-12)	37	8	5	33
5(2012-13)	14	0	0	10
6(2011-12)	36	6	2	30
6(2012-13)	16	0	0	12
7(2011-12)	31	2	1	27
7(2012-13)	15	2	0	12
8(2011-12)	33	2	0	28
8(2012-13)	15	1	1	12
District Wide (2011-12)	**36**	**5**	**5**	**31**
District Wide (2012-13)	**14**	**1**	**1**	**11**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	46	15	15	42
3(2012-13)	18	5	4	15
4(2011-12)	50	18	20	44
4(2012-13)	17	3	1	16
5(2011-12)	44	14	12	40
5(2012-13)	11	1	0	8
6(2011-12)	41	7	7	35
6(2012-13)	20	2	3	16
7(2011-12)	41	5	19	37
7(2012-13)	6	0	0	5
8(2011-12)	43	12	19	40
8(2012-13)	9	0	1	6
District Wide (2011-12)	**44**	**12**	**15**	**40**
District Wide (2012-13)	**14**	**2**	**2**	**11**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	80	64	46	77
4(2012-13)	82	64	53	81
8(2011-12)	68	45	33	65
8(2012-13)	62	37	26	60
District Wide (2011-12)	**82**	**56**	**41**	**72**
District Wide (2012-13)	**73**	**52**	**41**	**72**

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	65	12	37	4
Integrated Algebra	64	7	26	1
Geometry	75	11	38	0
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	57	13	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	47	8	21	1
U.S. History and Government	67	27	44	13
Living Environment	59	13	21	0
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	84	35	50	10
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	74	14	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/ Physics	65	15	n<5	n<5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	72	18	74	29
SWD	43	6	42	6
ELL	37	0	49	0
ED	69	12	71	23

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	70	6	75	6
SWD	32	1	36	1
ELL	52	1	71	2
ED	67	3	73	4

	Grade	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	3	10	0	0	3	7
	4	15	0	2	3	10
	5	10	0	1	6	3
	6	14	0	4	2	8
	7	16	0	0	1	15
	8	5	0	0	0	5
Mathematics	3	10	0	2	3	5
	4	15	0	2	4	9
	5	10	0	2	3	5
	6	14	0	2	3	9
	7	16	0	0	3	13
	8	5	0	0	0	5
Science	4	15	0	0	2	13
	8	5	0	0	0	5

Table title: 2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Grades 3-8

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	18	2	0	9	7
Mathematics	18	0	3	9	6

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	125	14	38	42	5
General Education	119	14	38	43	5
SWD	6	17	50	33	0
First Grade					
All Students	162	19	43	28	10
General Education	159	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Second Grade					
All Students	111	11	28	45	16

General Education	107	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	121	30	25	31	15
General Education	114	29	25	32	15
SWD	7	43	29	14	14
Fourth Grade					
All Students	125	30	24	32	14
General Education	107	30	21	33	16
SWD	18	28	39	28	6
Fifth Grade					
All Students	106	34	21	31	14
General Education	89	37	19	29	15
SWD	17	18	29	41	12
Sixth Grade					
All Students	104	27	20	41	12
General Education	86	31	16	41	12
SWD	18	6	39	44	11
Seventh Grade					
All Students	94	43	26	23	9
General Education	85	45	22	24	9
SWD	9	22	56	22	0
Eighth Grade					
All Students	105	36	27	25	12
General Education	92	39	27	20	14
SWD	13	15	23	62	0
Ninth Grade					
All Students	129	39	25	31	5
General Education	120	40	26	29	5
SWD	9	22	11	56	11
Tenth Grade					
All Students	125	30	37	19	14
General Education	118	31	35	20	14
SWD	7	0	71	0	29
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	93	15	40	33	12
General Education	88	15	41	33	11
SWD	5	20	20	40	20
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	75	15	39	36	11
General Education	71	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	724	62	741	67
Students With Disabilities	157	45	153	43
Limited English Proficient	86	37	89	54
Economically Disadvantaged	469	57	452	66

List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2011-12
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students   - 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 – 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 – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander   - Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Students With Disabilities   - Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Limited English Proficient   - Secondary- Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino   - Secondary- Level ELA – Asian or Native   - 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: Total (4 and 5 Year) – All Students

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

- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities

Section III – District Schools Profile

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

Most current information as of: April 4, 2014

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Stud (2012-13)	# of Stud (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teach (2012-13)	# of Teach (2013-14)
T.R. Proctor High School	Steven Falchi	2007-14	Con	9-12	2720	2723	1 P, 6 AP	1 P, 5 AP	195	185
Donovan Middle School	Ann Marie Palladino	2010-14	Con	7-8	731	721	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	65	63
John F. Kennedy Middle School	Joshua Gifford	2012-14	Con	7-8	699	638	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	60	58
Albany ES	Tania Kalavazoff	2007-14	Con	K-6	570	594	1 P	1 P	35	34
Columbus ES	Pearl Bowker	Dec 2011-13	Original-Retired	K-6	635	636	1 P	1 P	41	37
	Elizabeth Gerling	2013-14	Other New							
Roscoe Conkling ES	Mary Belden	2012-14	Con	K-6	535	550	1 P	1 P	38	37
General Herkimer ES	Alicia D'Ambrosio	2011-14	Con	K-6	676	712	1 P	1 P	40	40
John F Hughes ES	JoAnn Russo	2002-14	Con	K-6	453	464	1 P	1 P	35	30
Thomas Jefferson ES	John Licari	2011-14	Con	K-6	550	576	1 P	1 P	37	35
Hugh R Jones ES	Alaine Canestrari	2007-14	Con	K-6	468	472	1 P	1 P	36	32
Kernan ES	Henry Frasca	2002-Feb. 14	Original-Retired	K-6	681	660	1 P	1 P	48	43
	Angela Evans	Feb 2014 – June 2014	Other New		681	660	1 P	1 P	48	43

Martin Luther King, Jr. ES	Mark DeSalvo		Original	K-6	347	299	1 P	1 P	25	23
	Becky Nugent	2013-14	Other New		347	299	1 P	1 P	25	23
Watson Williams ES	Cheryl Minor	Jan 2004-14	Con	K-6	668	640	1 P	1 P	44	41

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/districts/utica-city-school-district.html **Most current version as of:** August 2, 2013

Performance Evaluation Rubrics	
Teacher	**Principal**
NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (2012 Edition)	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Teacher Evaluation *(2012-13)*				
Presented as % by rating category	**Composite Rating**	**State-provided growth or other comparable measures**	**Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth**	**Other measures of teaching effectiveness**
Highly-Effective	46	46	127	279
Effective	303	189	233	267
Developing	146	157	104	5
Ineffective	58	161	89	2

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

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; Amy Cox, Project Assistant	April 22, 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	August 15, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	April Marsh, Project Assistant	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	April Marsh, Project Assistant	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	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 16, 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**
5545-13-0043	$1,176,125	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1**. 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: *Utica City School District's (UCSD) partnership with Utica College and its pre-service teaching program provided benefits for all stakeholders through the real life applications and professional development opportunities for pre-service teachers.*
2. **Recruitment and Placement** – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: *Through the use of a variety of both qualitative and quantitative data, the district assessed the needs of each building in order to make decisions that work to make certain the best teachers and principals stay in UCSD.*
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: ***The District hired 6 part time Instructional Coaches and 1 full time Instructional Coach for elementary and secondary schools. Instructional Coaches were assigned to designated schools to provide instructional support and professional development.***

4. **Evaluation** – The new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) system based on Education Law §3012-c.: ***At the end of each year District Supervisors had examined and reviewed APPR data for each teacher. At the end of each year mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) were established for ineffective and developing teachers. The district implemented action steps as per their APPR plan as needed.***

5. **Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: ***Through the Utica Teacher Center professional development workshops occurred in the following areas: APPR, Common Core Learning Standard shifts, Differentiated Instruction (DI), writing high quality Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), close reading, cultural awareness, Response to Intervention (RtI) and Total Participation Techniques.***

6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: ***In all 13 schools every teacher collected assessment data. Principals and central office staff reviewed the collected data. Principals scheduled grade level/subject area meetings at each building to provide teachers with the time to examine data and identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.***

7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: ***48 highly effective master teachers and 7 highly effective master school leaders were selected using APPR evaluations. Master teachers and school leaders were trained in APPR, Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and CCLS shifts, DI, SLOs, close readings, cultural awareness, RtI, and Total Participation Techniques.***

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I: By the end of Year 2, all teachers will use data to drive classroom instruction.	All master teachers and school leaders will attend professional development focused on data driven instruction provided by Oneida-Herkimer-Madison (OHM) BOCES and a Data Consultant. Individual teachers will collect data from iReady, ELA/math universal assessments, and formative assessments in content areas. Teachers will examine data at grade level meetings and	31 Master teachers, 2 leaders, and 3 Instructional Coaches attended the Data Workshop. The Teacher Center Director also attended the Planning Meeting. 36 Master teachers, 2 leaders, and 6 Instructional Coaches attended the Planning Meeting. The Teacher Center Director also attended the Planning Meeting. 29 Administrators attended the August 19th workshop.

	adjust, adapt, and create re-teaching opportunities.	14 teachers attended the How to Give Effective Feedback book study. 53 teachers, 8 teacher leaders, & Instructional Coach participated in the Data Driven Workshops. All teachers (658) in the district were required to collect and analyze data. Teachers met by grade & subject level. Individual schools also scheduled data days for teachers.
Goal II: Career ladder opportunities that would provide recognition for master teachers/school leaders will be created to encourage these experts to remain in their positions without changing careers. They would be trained and utilized as mentors for new and struggling teachers as well as professional development providers.	48 highly effective master teachers and 7 highly master school leaders will be selected using Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPR) evaluations. By October 1, 2013 master teachers and school leaders will have been trained in APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.	45 teacher leaders and 1full time Instructional coach received a stipend of $4,000. 4 master leaders received a stipend of $5,000 and 2 master leaders waived the stipend. During August, 2013, 3 Instructional Coaches, 34 STLE master teachers & 1 leader participated in an 18 hour online book study, "20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core". Due to schedule conflicts the 6 master teachers participated in a direct book study in July 2013 and 5 master teachers and 1 Instructional Coach made up the session.
Goal III: The district will create an addendum to the UCSD's existing ELA Instructional Strategies Guide (191 research-based instructional strategies) for all subject areas.	A 20 member committee representing all grade/subject areas will be created to research strategies. Research based titles relating to new district initiatives will be ordered and purchased for	A 20 member committee including the 6 Instructional Coaches met to develop and compile the addendum to the Instructional Strategies Guide. 50 different titles were purchased. Two copies of

	research. Committee members will read the books and select effective strategies to include in the Guide. By the end of 2013-14 the full committee will have completed additional strategies to add to the existing guide.	some titles were purchased. All 658 teachers received a copy of the Instructional Strategies Guide.
Goal IV: Restructure Professional Learning Communities to include a focus on the Common Core and its many components and the impact of poverty on students' learning.	District wide PLC meetings will focus on close reading and Common Core Shifts in ELA for Year 1 The District will focus on Cultural Awareness and has initiated a book study using Eric Jensen's *Teaching With Poverty in Mind*. They will also focus on *Total Participation Techniques*	418 teachers participated in *Total Participation Techniques* Book Studies. The administrators, teachers, and teacher assistants at all 13 schools received training in Common Core Learning Standards shifts in math. 277 teachers participated in *Teaching with Poverty in Mind* Book Studies.
Goal V: Establish a partnership with Utica College's Education Department to both train and recruit newly certified teachers.	Establish a partnership with the Education Department at Utica College. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, we will have provided professional development for two cohorts for a total of 60-70 future teacher candidates in the areas of: APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RTI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.	Partnership was established with Utica College. 28 Utica College education students participated in the fall series of workshops. 22 Utica College education students participated in the spring series of workshops
Goal VI: Create a bank of exemplary lesson videos to use for mentoring and training.	The District will form a committee to establish protocol for reviewing videotaped lessons before posting to the website. By the end of the 2013-2014	138 lessons/parent support videos were taped and after review will be posted.

	school year, the District will have identified teachers who have created exemplary lessons. By the end of the 2013-2014 the District will have videotaped and posted 120 exemplary lessons.	
Goal VII: Establish part-time positions of Instructional Coaches to support teachers and school leaders in district initiatives	The District will hire 6 part time Instructional Coaches and 1 full time Instructional Coach for elementary and secondary schools. By October 2013 the Instructional Coaches will have attended all master teacher/leader trainings. Instructional Coaches will be assigned to designated schools to provide instructional support and professional development.	220 classroom teachers were assisted by the Instructional Coaches.
Goal VIII: Improve the rigor and relevance of classroom content and set high expectations for student learning through systematic professional development and follow up	The District will provided workshops for all teachers in CCLS shifts for ELA. The District will provide training for all teachers in writing SLOs. Workshops will be provided on topics such as: close reading, the development of pre/post assessments for SLOs, development of achievement tests, creating robust vocabulary, writing for the Core, reading for the Core, Heuristics, an introduction to CCLS Math K-5, practices and protocols for ELA modules, an introduction to CCLS ELA modules K-5,	125 workshops were offered serving 2,752 participants in total.

	creating an evidence binder, adolescent writers, using SmartBoards in the classroom, etc.	
Goal IX: To ensure that there is an equitable distribution of highly effective and effective teachers and school leaders	At the end of each year district Supervisors will examine and review APPR data for each teacher. At the end of each year mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) will be established for ineffective and developing teachers.	54 ineffective and 168 developing teachers were supported during 2013-14.
Goal X: School leaders will use common evaluation instruments and observation techniques to monitor instructional gaps.	The district APPR committee selected a monitoring instrument to evaluate all teachers. The instrument was approved by both the district and the teachers' union. All building leaders were trained in APPR evaluation tools and "Instructional Walk" procedures.	All 13 building principals and 10 assistant principals used the NYSUT rubric to evaluate all 658 teachers.
Goal XI: Retain highly effective and effective teachers and school leaders	By the end of 2012-13, a committee will be formed to develop and distribute a teacher/leader satisfaction survey. By the end of 2013-14, the survey will be distributed again and results will be compared to Year 1.	Survey results were compiled and will be used to drive future professional development.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
$1,176,125	$315,546	$868,868

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)
15 80	Substitute Teachers	96	-	$14,167	-	$2,575 $212
15	Teacher work to match district curriculum with state curriculum	186	-	$162,295	-	-
40	Consultants (12/3/12-6/30/13)	10	-	$46,382.20	-	-
40	P.J. Green – Data Services	52	-	$4,470	-	-
45	Barnes and Nobles	All USCD Staff	-	$29,842.44	-	-
45	United Artists Education	All USCD Staff	-	$145.79	-	-
45	World Research Co.	All USCD Staff	-	$2,226.00	-	-
45	Holden	All USCD Staff	-	$6,506.76	-	-
49	Oneida Herkimer BOCES	52	-	$7,000	-	-
40	Presenter for DDI Workshop	46	$1,000	-	$5,544 $1,356	$2,400
45	Instructional Research Materials	N/A	$387	-	$1,451	$1,996
15	Hire Instructional Coaches	5	$9,506	-	-	-
15	Train Master Teachers and School Leaders	46	$28,877	-	-	-
15 80	Master Teachers are trained in the use of data	46	-	-	$5,544 $1,356	$5,544 $1,357
15 80	Master teachers and school leaders participated in an Online or Direct Book Study: 20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core.	52	-	-	$18,144 $4,436	$21,126 $5,172
15 80	Master teachers will receive a stipend of $4000 to work with those in need of improvement to move them toward effective and highly effective evaluations.	46	-	-	$92,000 $22,494	$184,000 $45,043
15 80 40	Form a committee of representatives from all schools, all grade clusters, all areas of instruction—roughly 25 members. The committee will research strategies for the identified areas to add to the existing Instructional Strategies Guide.	25	-	-	$580 $48	$665 $55 $10,015
15 80 45 40	Identify a common district focus for PLCs for each year and determine professional development needed to help reach district focus.	All UCSD Staff	-	-	$47,530 $11,621 $14,513 $4,000	$72,296 $17,698 $43,074 $4,000
15 80	Establish a partnership with the Education Department at Utica College. Create goals with Utica College to benefit both the district and the future educators by exposing future teachers to relevant professional development and practical application. Invite future teachers to attend	6	-	-	$532 $130	$1,064 $260

	professional development facilitated by master teachers and master school leaders so that they are given the skills and knowledge needed for our district's diverse population. School leaders and community leaders will provide workshops for Education Majors in areas such as professionalism and career readiness.					
15 80 40	Assign instructional coaches to work with and be accountable to designated schools. Also assign instructional coaches as professional developers as needed.	6	-	-	$10,888 $2,662 $35,560	$40,187 $18,678 $65,145
15 80 40 45	Provide opportunities for professional development to all staff in areas that will increase rigor and relevance of classroom content and set high expectations for student learning.	All UCSD Staff	-	-	$128,188 $31,342 $11,190 $2,679	$209,313 $51,256 $11,190 $3,769
15 80	Create a bank of exemplary lessons to use for mentoring and training	-	-	-	-	$4,074 $997
	Total Actual Expenditures		**$39,770**	**$307,257**	**$449,258**	**$848,057**

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

Source: STLE file compiled by the New York State Education Department

Guiding questions to direct the review:

> *I. Does the school district have a comprehensive systems approach to the recruitment, development, support, retention and equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders?*

> *II. Is the grant impacting high need students and shortage subject areas?*

Preparation

Preparation	
Standard	The district is engaging in activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district's career ladder. This can include encouraging and/or enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional certifications.

Summary: The district used grant funds to attain their Goal V: create goals with Utica College to benefit both the district and the future educators by exposing future teachers to relevant professional development and practical application.

The district met this standard by establishing a partnership with the Education Department at Utica College. Multiple pre-service teachers were able to garner real teaching experience and attend numerous professional development opportunities with existing Utica CSD educators.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Workshop sessions have been presented to Utica College students who are aspiring to become teachers.	Pre-Service	T - PS	HN, D Strategy	District	15	50	$1,064
Workshop sessions have been presented to Utica College students who are aspiring to become teachers.	Pre-Service	T – PS	HN, D Strategy	District	80	50	$261

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:
- Established a partnership with the Education Department at Utica College.
- Workshop sessions were presented to Utica College students who are aspiring to become teachers. The following sessions were provided: Overview of the Common Core on January 31, 2013 and Student learning Objectives (SLOs) on February 14, 2013. Additional 2 hour sessions include: APPR on March 14, 2013, "Close Reads" on April 18, 2013, Cultural Awareness on April 25, 2013, and Professionalism and Career Readiness on May 2, 2013. Utica College student teacher supervisors also attended these sessions.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The Master Leaders conducted six (6) two hour professional development sessions for Utica College pre-service teachers (future teachers) on the following topics: Cultural Awareness, Professionalism & Career Readiness, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), APPR, "Close Reads", and Common Core. Utica College Supervising Teachers, District Cooperating Teachers, and Education Professors from Utica College also attended some of the sessions.
- Workshop sessions were presented to Utica College students who are aspiring to become teachers. The following sessions were provided: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) on September 19, 2013, Overview of the Common Core on October 10, 2013, Cultural Awareness on October 31, 2013, "Close Reads" on November 7, 2013, APPR on November 14, 2013, and Professionalism and Career Readiness on December 5, 2013. Utica College student teacher supervisors have also attended these sessions.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- 28 Utica College education students participated in the fall series of workshops, and 22 Utica College education students participated in the spring series of workshops. By the end of the 2013-14 school year, the district had provided professional development for two cohorts of future teacher candidates in the areas of: APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RTI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.
- A partnership was established with Utica College Education Department and will continue after STLE has ended.

Recruitment and Placement

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools has effective or highly effective educators.
Summary: The district used grant funds to attain their Goal V: create goals with Utica College to benefit both the district and the future educators by exposing future teachers to relevant professional development and practical application. Prior to STLE there were no teacher leaders in the district to mentor ineffective or developing teachers. The district successfully met this standard through grant funded activities that: have examined the current distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and school leaders so there was a sufficient ratio of mentors for struggling staff.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Recruit/ Transfer	Total Amount
Teacher Leaders	Teacher	Transfer	HN, Coach, APPR - TIP	Stipend	15	46	$184,000
Teacher Leaders	Teacher	Transfer	HN, Coach, APPR – TIP	Stipend – Benefits	80	46	$45,043

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:
- A STLE Master Teacher reported that "We have worked collaboratively with Utica College to develop a partnership that aides in the recruitment and placement of quality teachers and fosters continued development."

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- Utica CSD developed a partnership with Utica College. Workshop sessions have been presented to Utica College students who are aspiring to become teachers. The following sessions were provided: Overview of the Common Core on January 31, 2013 and SLOs on February 14, 2013. Additional 2 hour sessions include: APPR on March 14, 2013, "Close Reads" on April 18, 2013, Cultural Awareness on April 25, 2013, and Professionalism and Career Readiness on May 2, 2013. Utica College student teacher supervisors have also attended these sessions.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- Master leaders conducted six (6) two hour professional development sessions for Utica College pre-service teachers (future teachers) on the following topics: APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural

Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques* . Utica College Supervising Teachers, District Cooperating Teachers, and Education Professors from Utica College also attended some of the sessions.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- Utica College wants to continue training sessions for their student teacher classes. The sessions have been well received by the future teachers as well as the education professors at Utica College.
- The STLE Master Leaders have found presenting the content to future teachers rewarding. In addition, the Master Teachers will continue to be asked to create videos of exemplary lessons.
- The district indicated that 28 Utica College education students participated in the fall series of workshops. 22 Utica College education students participated in the spring series of workshops.
- By the end of the 2013-14 school year, the district had provided professional development for two cohorts of future teacher candidates in the areas of: APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.

Induction and Mentoring

Induction and Mentoring	
Standard	The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes.
Summary: The district has focused its efforts with Induction and Mentoring to help the fulfill both Goal II: career ladder opportunities that would provide recognition for master teachers/school leaders were created to encourage these experts to remain in their positions without changing careers and Goal IX: retain highly effective and effective teachers and school leaders. Master Teachers/School Leaders were trained and utilized as mentors for new and struggling teachers as well as professional development providers, and examined the current distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and school leaders so there will be a sufficient ratio of mentors for struggling staff. The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators had mentoring opportunities; both formally and informally.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Master Teachers/School Leaders as mentors (34 Master Teachers and 1 School Leader)	T Mentor, P Mentor	Formal, Informal	Coach, APPR – TIP, PIP	District	15	54 – Ineffective, 168 Developing	$21,126
Master Teachers/School Leaders as mentors (Benefits for the 34 Master Teachers and 1 School Leader)	T Mentor, P Mentor	Formal, Informal	Coach, APPR – TIP, PIP	District	80	54 – Ineffective, 168 Developing	$5,172

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:
- At the end of the year mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) were established for ineffective and developing teachers based on 2012-13 Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPR) ratings.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The Instructional Coaches were assigned to buildings. They supported teachers through modeling and by providing teachers with effective research based strategies. Instructional coaches also facilitated workshops and book studies.
- In December 2013, Master Teachers received the first payment of $2,000 for activities they performed as Master Teachers such as: attendance at monthly meetings, monthly APPR communication, facilitation of 12 hours of professional development, facilitation of a book study, assisting colleagues with Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), taping of 3 lessons, 6 hours of mentoring monthly, and facilitation of a data driven instruction (DDI) workshop on November 5, 2013.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- 46 teacher leaders were identified and trained so that each building had Teacher Leaders for mentoring and delivery of professional development (PD). 222 teachers received mentoring/support.
- 54 ineffective and 168 developing teachers were supported during the 2013-14 school year.
- The Master Teachers and Master Leaders were able to serve as mentors for developing and ineffective teachers and school leaders and presented a minimum of 12 hours of PD, conducted a book study, spent 6 hours mentoring per month, provided SLO and APPR guidance, and taped Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) lessons.
- 125 workshops were offered serving 2,752 participants in total.

Evaluation

Evaluation	
Standard	The district is fully implementing an Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan that complies with Education Law §3012-c and is approved by the commissioner. Through the evaluation system the district has a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices
Summary: The district met Goals II, Goal IX, and Goal X: career ladder opportunities that would provide recognition for master teachers/school leaders were created to encourage these experts to remain in their positions without changing careers. Master Teachers have been trained and utilized as mentors for new and struggling teachers as well as professional development providers; the district examined the current distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and school leaders so there will be a sufficient ratio of mentors for struggling staff. Initiative and	

School leaders have used common evaluation instruments and observation techniques to monitor instructional gaps.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Teacher Leaders & Instructional Coach	T – Eval, P – Eval	PD, Pos – All,	Coach, APPR – Obs	District	15	658 Teachers	46	$184,000
Benefits for the Teacher Leaders & Instructional Coach	T – Eval, P – Eval	PD, Pos – All,	Coach, APPR – Obs	District	80	658 Teachers	46	$45,043
Master Leader Benefits	T – Eval	Pos- All	Coach, APPR – Obs	District	15	658 Teachers	6	$20,000 $4,896

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 APPR committee selected a monitoring instrument to evaluate all teachers.   The instrument was approved by both the district and the teachers' union. Additionally, all building leaders were trained in APPR evaluation tools and "Instructional Walk" procedures.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- District supervisors have examined and reviewed APPR data for each teacher. Mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) were established for ineffective and developing teachers.
- The STLE Master Teachers created and shared with building colleagues APPR Communications in September 2013 for Teaching Standards 1 & 2, in October 2013 for Teaching Standard 3 and in November 2013 for Teaching Standards 4 and 5.
- The New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) rubric and approved APPR plan was used to evaluate all teachers.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- All 13 building principals and 10 assistant principals used the NYSUT rubric and approved APPR to evaluate all 658 teachers.
- The district indicated that mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) were established for ineffective and developing teachers based on 2012-13 ratings. Additionally, 54 ineffective and 168 developing teachers were supported during 2013-14.
- Teachers' APPR ratings from 2013-14 were reviewed and charted.
- The Master Teachers received a stipend of $4,000 to work with those in need of improvement to move them toward effective and highly effective evaluations. Master teachers also attended all professional development (PD) & monthly STLE meetings,

read all book study titles conducted school based and district PD, prepared and videotaped 3 model lessons, and provided monthly APPR communication to teachers, and assisted teachers with SLOs.

- Master Leaders received a stipend of $5000 to work with school leaders in need of improvement to move them toward effective and highly effective evaluations. They also attended all PD & monthly STLE meetings, read all book study titles, conducted workshops for Utica College Education Students (Future Teachers), assisted teachers with SLOs, and reviewed pre/post assessments and achievement tests for alignment with CCLS, rigor & reliability.

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: Evidence suggests that the district used grant funded activities to meet its numerous, professional development goals within its STLE grant. The district identified and planned for professional development opportunities for their teachers and principals; among those were: training in Data Driven Analysis, Common Core Learning Standard (CCLS) shifts, differentiated instruction, and STEM-based initiatives. As well, the district developed a career ladder through the creations of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focusing on English Language Learners (ELLs), Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students within Utica CSD.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Turnkey PD from Teacher Leader and Instructional Coach	T – PD Internal	Group	Coach, APPR – Obs, DDI	District	15 80	All UCSD Staff	Monthly	$184,000 $45,043
Principal Leaders	P – PD Internal	Group	Coach, APPR – Obs, DDI	District	15 80	All UCSD Staff	Monthly	$20,000 $4,896
Research strategies texts were ordered to be used for committee research and strategy writing.	T – PD Internal	Group	Coach, DDI	FP - DS	45	46	N/A	$1,996
All 658 teachers received a copy of the Instructional Strategies Guide.	T – PD Internal	Group	CC – ELA, CC - Math	District	40	658	N/A	$10,015
418 teachers participated in *Total Participation Techniques* Book Studies.	T – PD Internal	Group	D Strategy	District	45	418	32 Sessions	$43,074
277 teachers participated in *Teaching with Poverty in Mind* Book Studies.	T – PD Internal	Group	Community D Strategy Parent	District	40	277	20 Sessions	$4,000
Professional development workshops and book studies have occurred in a multitude of areas.	T – PD, P – PD	Group	D Strategy	District	15 80 40 45	2752 Participants	125 Workshops	$209,313 $51,256 $11,190 $3,769

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:
- The Superintendent reported that STLE has provided a vehicle for an organized approach to providing professional development within the district. Prior, training was haphazard and disjointed since it was dependent on inconsistent funding.
- The Grant Coordinator reported that STLE provided more training than ever before. It has energized teachers. STLE Teacher Leaders are the "go to" people to support standards. The level of engagement has increased for each of the monthly meetings.
- A Teacher Leader reported that Principals have relied heavily upon Teacher Leaders which has resulted in increased confidence. Being a Teacher Leader allows teachers to lead without having to leave the classroom.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The district indicated that it provided workshops for all teachers in Common Core Learning Standard shifts for ELA. The District provided training for all teachers in writing SLOs. Additional workshops were provided in: close reading, the Development of Pre/Post Assessments for SLOs, Development of Achievement Tests, Creating Robust Vocabulary, Writing for the Core, Reading for the Core, Heuristics, Introduction to Common Core Math K-5, Practices & Protocols for ELA Modules, Introduction to Common Core ELA Modules K-5, Creating An Evidence Binder, Adolescent Writers, and Using SmartBoards in the Classroom, etc.
- The master teachers and school leaders attended professional development focused on data driven instruction provided by OHM BOCES and a Data Consultant. Individual teachers collected data from iReady, ELA/math universal assessments, and formative assessments in content areas. Teachers examined data at grade level meetings and adjust, adapt, and create Re-teaching opportunities.
- Master Teachers and School Leaders were trained in APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The Master Teachers attended an additional Using Data to Drive Instruction workshop on August 27, 2013.
- Master Teachers facilitated a Data Driven Instruction workshop in their buildings on a District half day in-service - November 5, 2013. Individual Teachers collected relative data in their buildings. Each School Based Inquiry Team (SBIT) examined State Assessment data and i-Ready data by class/grade level. They identified trends and presented the information to teachers. Teachers met by grade level to examine data, determine students' strengths & weaknesses, to identify strategies, and form groups for instruction.
- Instructional Coaches worked with teachers as they implemented the Common Core Modules.

- Instructional Strategies Guide Committee met monthly from July 2013 through December 2013 to identify research based instructional strategies.
- Master Teachers videotaped three (3) lessons each. Thus far 28 lessons have been taped.
- In September & October, The Common Core Shifts in Math were presented to all staff in the Utica City School District. Sixty four workshops/Book Studies focused on Regents Reform topics were offered from July 1 - December 31, 2013.
- The master teachers and school leaders have attended professional development focused on data driven instruction provided by OHM BOCES and a Data Consultant.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- 31 Master teachers, 2 leaders, and 3 Instructional Coaches attended a Data Workshop. 29 Administrators attended the August 19th workshop. 14 teachers attended the How to Give Effective Feedback book study. 53 teachers, 8 teacher leaders, & I Instructional Coach participated in the Data Driven Workshops.
- August 2013, 3 Instructional Coaches, 34 STLE master teachers & 1 leader participated in an 18 hour online book study: 20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core. Due to schedule conflicts the 6 master teachers participated in a direct book study in July 2013 and 5 master teachers and 1 Instructional Coach made up the session. On August 20, 2013, 4 master leaders and 20 administrators took part in the book study with *20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core*.
- The administrators, teachers, and teacher assistants at all 13 schools received training in Common Core Shifts in Math. 418 teachers participated in *Total Participation Techniques* book studies. 277 teachers participated in *Teaching with Poverty in Mind* book studies.
- 46 master teachers and 6 master leaders were trained in APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
Summary: The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions. Additionally, through these activities, the district is making progress towards its STLE Goals IX and Goal X: examine the current distribution of effective and highly effective teachers and school leaders so there will be a sufficient ratio of mentors for struggling staff, and School leaders will use common evaluation instruments and observation techniques to monitor instructional gaps. In all 13 schools every teacher collected assessment data. Principals and Central office staff have reviewed the collected data. Principals scheduled grade level/subject area meetings at each building to provide teachers with the time to examine data and identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. 46 teacher leaders were identified and trained so that each building had teacher leaders for mentoring and delivery of PD.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
Teacher Leader/ Instructional Coach	T – PM	Develop	Coach, DDI, APPR - Obs	Stipend	15	46	$184,000
Principal Leaders (2 Waived the Stipend)	T – PM, P - PM	Develop	Coach, DDI, APPR - Obs	Stipend	15	6	$20,000

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 Superintendent reported that in 2006 State Education Department (SED) conducted an audit of the ELL curriculum as well as a diagnostic review of each building, and a School Quality Review. The feedback in combination with the Regents Reform Agenda, guided all professional development approaches.
- The Grant Coordinator reported that several systems were created to evaluate and monitor teacher knowledge gained from attending professional development sessions. Knowledge gained is documented and must be used in the development of a lesson plan/unit which will be assessed for accurate implementation. Student test scores are also monitored.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- 46 highly effective master teachers and 6 highly master school leaders were selected using APPR evaluations.
- The district also indicated a committee was formed to develop and distribute a teacher/leader satisfaction survey.   At the end of 2013-2014, the survey will be distributed again and results will be compared to year 1.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The district indicated that at the end of the school year District Supervisors have examined and reviewed APPR data for each teacher. At the end of the school year mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans have been established for ineffective and developing teachers.
- The District APPR committee selected a monitoring instrument to evaluate all teachers. The instrument was approved by both the District and the teachers' union. All building leaders were trained in APPR evaluation tools and Instructional Walk procedures.
- The district also indicated a committee was formed to develop and distribute a teacher/leader satisfaction survey. At the end of 2013-2014, the survey was distributed again and results were compared to year 1.
- Each School Based Inquiry Team (SBIT) examined State Assessment data and i-Ready data by class/grade level. They identified trends and presented the information to teachers. Teachers met by grade level to examine data, determine students' strengths & weaknesses, to identify strategies, and form groups for instruction.

- Individual teachers collected data from iReady, ELA/math universal assessments, and formative assessments in content area. Teachers examined data at grade level meetings and adjusted, adapted, and created Re-teaching opportunities.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- 48 highly effective master teachers and 7 highly master school leaders have been selected using APPR evaluations.
- The District utilized the NYSUT rubric for evaluation of all teachers.
- All building administrators and district administrators received training on the NYSUT Rubric and APPR. All building administrators also received training on Instructional Walk procedures.
- A survey was constructed and administered to teachers in June 2013. The satisfaction survey was also distributed to all staff in June 2014. 382 teachers responded. Of those 382 teachers, approximately 93% gave positive responses to the survey.

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
Standard	Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions.
Summary: The district effectively used grant funds to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers and principals had opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities received the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions. Additionally, efforts toward meeting this standard support the district in meeting its STLE Goal II: career ladder opportunities that would provide recognition for master teachers/school leaders will be created to encourage these experts to remain in their positions without changing careers. They would be trained and utilized as mentors for new and struggling teachers as well as professional development providers. The district used STLE funds to provide opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: 48 highly effective master teachers and 7 highly master school leaders were selected using APPR evaluations. Master teachers and school leaders have been trained in APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RTI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Teacher Leader	T – FT	STLE 1	D Strategy	15, 80	Stipend & Benefits	45	$180,000 $44,649
Teacher Instructional Coach	T – FT	STLE 1	D Strategy	15, 80	Stipend & Benefits	1	$4,000 $394
Principal Leader	P – FT	STLE 1	D Strategy	15, 80	Stipend & Benefits	6, 2 waive	$20,000 $4,896

						d the stipend	

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 notes:
- The Superintendent and Grant Coordinator reported that the Career Ladder positions allowed the district to place teachers with potential, in leadership roles to benefit the district. The administration hand-picked people with a positive can-do attitude, rated HE/E, with credibility, respected, team player, CC Ambassador for the district. This combination allowed them to develop a strong cadre of teacher leaders.
- A Teacher Leader reported that Principals rely heavily upon Teacher Leaders. Being a Teacher Leader allowed teachers to lead without having to leave the classroom. Being a Teacher Leader built confidence. Teachers welcomed the opportunity to step up. The majority of people evolved into the position because they had the desire and interest.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The district indicated that it has hired 6 part time Instructional Coaches and 1 full time Instructional Coach for elementary and secondary schools. The Instructional Coaches have attended all master teacher/leader trainings. Instructional Coaches have been assigned to designated schools to provide instructional support and professional development.
- The district indicated that the selection process for master teachers and leaders was based on 2011-12 APPR evaluations. The list of master teacher candidates was reviewed with the teachers' union and principals. It was also approved by the Superintendent.   Thirty (30) elementary and 18 secondary teacher leaders were identified. Seven (7) master leaders were identified.
- On the March 21, 2013 Superintendent's Conference Day, almost every STLE teacher leader led one or more workshop sessions for our entire teacher population. Teachers selected two workshops to attend on that day. The presentation of PD by peers was a huge success. Every time the district posted a workshop led by a STLE teacher leader, it would immediately close out. Also, the evaluations of the workshops were always positive. Over the past three years the district has attempted without success to get teachers to videotape exemplary lessons. Through STLE they were able to videotape more than 120 lessons. Utica City SD STLE teacher leaders rose to the occasion. These lessons are in the process of a final review for posting for all teachers use.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- 48 highly effective master teachers and 7 highly master school leaders were selected using APPR evaluations. Master teachers and school leaders have been trained in APPR, Common Core, Common Core shifts, Differentiated Instruction, SLOs, close reading, Cultural Awareness, RtI, and *Total Participation Techniques*.

- 6 part time Instructional Coaches hired and 1 full time Instructional Coach for elementary and secondary schools. The Instructional Coaches have attended all master teacher/leader trainings. Instructional Coaches have been assigned to designated schools to provide instructional support and professional development.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- 31 Master teachers, 2 leaders, and 3 Instructional Coaches attended the Data Workshop. The Teacher Center Director also attended the Planning Meeting. 36 Master teachers, 2 leaders, and 6 Instructional Coaches attended the Planning Meeting. The Teacher Center Director also attended the Planning meeting. 29 Administrators attended the August 19th workshop. 14 teachers attended the How to Give Effective Feedback book study. 53 teachers, 8 teacher leaders, & I Instructional Coach participated in the Data Driven Workshops.
- During August 2013 3 Instructional Coaches, 34 STLE master teachers & 1 leader participated in an 18 hour online book study: 20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core. Due to schedule conflicts the 6 master teachers participated in a direct book study in July 2013 and 5 master teachers and 1 Instructional Coach made up the session. On August 20, 2013, 4 master leaders and 20 administrators took part in the book study: 20 Literacy Strategies to Meet the Common Core.
- The district also indicated that STLE master teachers signed up to videotape 3 lessons each. Taping has been completed. A committee met to review submitted lessons and make recommendations for any changes. After the lessons were edited, they will be posted. 138 lessons/parent support videos were taped and after review will be posted.

Other

Other	
Standard	[Note: There is no standard for "Other".] The district uses grant funds for activities and/or positions that do not directly align with the seven TLE components.
Summary: This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	Compensation	Total Amount
N/A						

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), English Language Learners (ELLs), bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: The district used STLE funded activities to support the equitable distribution of high quality educators. In particular, the district examined the current distribution of effective and	

highly effective teachers and school leaders so there would be a sufficient ratio of mentors for struggling staff.

Additionally, an addendum to the district's Instructional Strategies Guide was created to add researched-based strategies in these areas: Common Core, Differentiated Instruction, STEM initiatives, Data-Driven Instruction (DDI), Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and RTI, as well as with ELLs and SWDs.   The Guide emphasized high-level cognitive processes and use of technology (SmartBoards, the Internet, and other multi-media).

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:
- An Instructional Coach reported that, "*Teaching with Poverty in Mind* has impacted the way that teachers set up the climate in their classrooms to establish a learning environment that supports respect, safety and trust."
- After doing a book study on *RtI from All Sides* by Mary Howard, teachers requested the follow-up book by Mary Howard to be used in an additional book study.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- At the end of each year, District Supervisors have examined and reviewed APPR data for each teacher. At the end of each year mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) have been established for ineffective and developing teachers.
- The district wide PLC meetings have focused on close readings and Common Core Learning Standard shifts in ELA for Year 1.
- The district indicated that it has focused on Cultural Awareness and has initiated a book study using Eric Jensen's *Teaching with Poverty in Mind*. They have also focused on Himmele & Himmele's *Total Participation Techniques*.
- One of the Instructional Coaches is a former ESL teacher. She provided support to classroom teachers in research based strategies targeted toward ELLs.
- One of the Instructional Coaches provided support to teachers of SWDs in research based strategies.
- The Instructional Strategies Guide Committee researched and identified strategies to facilitate learning for ELLs and SWDs. They created an addendum to the Instructional Strategies Guide with additional strategies catalogued by skill and subgroup.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The mentoring, professional development, and Teacher Improvement Plans were established for ineffective and developing teachers based on 2012-13 ratings.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The district indicates that it focused on student engagement for diverse students through book studies using Eric Jensen's *Teaching with Poverty in Mind* and Himmele & Himmele's *Total Participation Techniques*. Over the 2 year period 24 sessions of

> *Teaching with Poverty in Mind* took place with 356 participants and 34 sessions of *Total Participation Techniques* were offered with 479 participants.

- 46 teacher leaders were identified and trained so that each building had teacher leaders for mentoring and delivery of PD; 222 teachers received mentoring/support.

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
Summary: The district has used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district. While it is not completely clear how the district will sustain programs and personnel related to the STLE grant, the district has given some indication of positions that will be sustained through a shift in funds and also those that will not be continued.	

Short Description	Code	Type
The master teachers and school leaders will also be able to serve as mentors for developing and ineffective teachers and school leaders and will be paid through the Teacher Center.	Personnel	SF
The Instructional Coach position will not be sustained	Personnel	NC

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:

- A Teacher Leader reported that, "The STLE grant and PD coursework will prove to be the single most important force driving us toward successful implementation of the Common Core framework. Without this PD, teachers would be at a huge disadvantage. In a year of transition a common message, a common voice will serve the needs of our teachers and students alike. The STLE has been and will continue to be an agent of change."
- A Master Leader reported that, "The Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Grant (STLE) initiative has allowed us to improve instructional and professional practice aimed at increasing student achievement. We have been able to offer robust professional development opportunities internally that reinforce the goals of the NYS Regents Reform Agenda including implementation of the Common Core. We have worked collaboratively with Utica College to develop a partnership that aides in the recruitment and placement of quality teachers and fosters continued development. The STLE participants have become the foundation of a customized leadership program that will allow the district to continue to use data to inform both teaching and learning, measure effectiveness, and sustain improvement efforts."

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that although the funding for the program will end in June 2014, the training that the STLE grant has provided is building their internal bank of professional

developers. The Master Teachers have truly become leaders. They have become the "go to" people in their buildings. Teachers turn to them with questions and for support. They facilitate workshops for districtwide conference days and take the lead in curriculum development and implementation. They continue to assume leadership roles. Hopefully, some of the master teachers will chose to pursue administration degrees and become future administrators that will guide and lead our schools and district.

<u>Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:</u>
- The district indicated that in the future the master teachers and school leaders will be paid through the Teachers Center to provide needed district professional development and guidance.   The Master Teachers and School Leaders will also be able to serve as mentors for developing and ineffective teachers and school leaders. Utica College wants to continue the district training sessions for their student teacher classes.   They have been well received by the future teachers as well as the education professors at Utica College. The STLE Master Leaders have also found presenting the content to future teachers rewarding. In addition, the Master Teachers will continue to be asked to create videos of exemplary lessons.

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.

<u>Individuals interviewed</u>
District Level
- Superintendent
- K – 12 Curriculum Director
- Director of Grants

Building Level
- High School Principal
- Elementary Principal
- Instructional Coach

Partners
- Teacher Center Director
- Supervisor of Future Teachers – Utica College
- Two future teachers

<u>Description of classroom observations</u> (including amount of time, student population and rubrics used to conduct observations)
- N/A

<u>Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report</u>
- Utica CSD Year 1 FS-10F

- Utica CSD Site Visit Notes
- Utica CSD Year 1 Final Report
- Utica CSD Year 2 Interim Report
- Utica CSD Year 2 Final Report