New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Wheatland-Chili Central School District

Table of Contents

Contents

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Deborah Leh, Ed.D.	Deborah Leh, Ed.D.
Phone	(585) 889-6246	(585) 889-6246
Email	deborah_leh@wheatland.k12.ny.us	deborah_leh@wheatland.k12.ny.us

Section I – District Description

Source: All district description data comes from the Wheatland-Chili Central 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**
Genesee Finger Lakes	Monroe 2-Orleans BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	**Eligible for Free Lunch**	**Eligible for Reduced Lunch**	**Limited English Proficient**	**Students with Disabilities**	**Economically Disadvantaged**
693	177	81	5	101	250

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	**Black or African American**	**Hispanic or Latino**	**Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**White**	**Multiracial**
1	9	3	0	86	1

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	**Student Suspensions**
95%	5%

Teacher Qualifications				
# Teachers	**Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate**	**Percent Teaching Out of Certification**	**Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience**	**Turnover Rate all Teachers**
74	0%	3%	20%	15%

Need Status
Average Need District

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Wheatland-Chili Central School District 2012-2013 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)	59	20	None tested	54
3(2012-13)	33	0	n<5	14
4(2011-12)	54	0	n<5	36
4(2012-13)	24	29	None tested	20
5(2011-12)	61	0	None tested	43
5(2012-13)	43	0	n<5	43
6(2011-12)	50	0	None tested	40
6(2012-13)	24	0	None tested	20
7(2011-12)	64	10	None tested	47
7(2012-13)	33	0	None tested	33
8(2011-12)	56	13	n<5	50
8(2012-13)	39	0	None tested	29
District Wide (2011-12)	**57**	**9**	**Cannot be calculated**	**45**
District Wide (2012-13)	**33**	**4**	**Cannot be calculated**	**26**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	61	20	None tested	50
3(2012-13)	29	0	n<5	18
4(2011-12)	72	0	n<5	68
4(2012-13)	33	29	None tested	15
5(2011-12)	67	13	None tested	62
5(2012-13)	18	0	n<5	14
6(2011-12)	78	14	None tested	60
6(2012-13)	28	0	None tested	10
7(2011-12)	75	20	None tested	68
7(2012-13)	27	0	None tested	27

Grade				
8(2011-12)	47	6	n<5	33
8(2012-13)	28	0	None tested	22
District Wide (2011-12)	**66**	**12**	**Cannot be calculated**	**56**
District Wide (2012-13)	**27**	**4**	**Cannot be calculated**	**17**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
4(2011-12)	95	71	n<5	96
4(2012-13)	90	71	None tested	80
8(2011-12)	82	44	n<5	78
8(2012-13)	86	60	None tested	72
District Wide (2011-12)	**88**	**52**	**Cannot be calculated**	**87**
District Wide (2012-13)	**88**	**65**	**None tested**	**76**

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	**All Students**		**Students With Disabilities**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
Comprehensive English	77	36	28	6
Integrated Algebra	83	12	60	4
Geometry	98	44	n<5	n<5
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	84	28	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	81	40	47	13
U.S. History and Government	85	60	56	6
Living Environment	92	51	60	20
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	69	23	56	13
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	80	18	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/ Physics	84	26	None tested	None tested

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		**2009 Cohort**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
All	95	48	97	51
SWD	75	25	82	18
ELL	None tested	None tested	n<5	n<5
ED	100	50	95	42

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	97	22	100	21
SWD	83	17	100	0
ELL	None tested	None tested	n<5	n<5
ED	100	36	100	11

2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Grades 3-8						
	Grade	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	3	1	-	-	-	-
	4	1	-	-	-	-
	6	1	-	-	-	-
	7	1	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	3	1	-	-	-	-
	4	1	-	-	-	-
	6	1	-	-	-	-
	7	1	-	-	-	-
Science	4	1	-	-	-	-

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	1	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	1	-	-	-	-

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.
First Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-

Fifth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
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	58	93	64	92
Students With Disabilities	12	n<30	11	n<30
Limited English Proficient	0	n<30	0	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	14	n<30	13	n<30

List Any Measures Where the District **Did Not** Meet AYP in 2011-12
• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White
• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13
• None

Section III – District Schools Profile

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

Most current information as of: April 4, 2014

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers (12-13)	# of Teachers (13-14)
T. J. Conner Elementary	Margaret Wright	2013 to date	New	K-5	295	282	1 P	1 P	32.3	28.5

Wheatland-Chili Middle/High School	Brad Zilliox	2012 to date	Original	6-12	400	377	1 P	1 P	47.2	43.8

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/wheatland-chili-appr-plan.pdf   **Most current version as of:** August 24, 2012

Performance Evaluation Rubrics	
Teacher	**Principal**
Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* (2011 Revised Edition)	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Teacher Evaluation *(2012-13)*				
Presented as % by rating category	**Composite Rating**	**State-provided growth or other comparable measures**	**Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth**	**Other measures of teaching effectiveness**
Highly-Effective	22	33	26	7
Effective	50	38	26	65
Developing	1	1	16	1
Ineffective	0	1	5	0

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

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	June 6, 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 21, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Rebecca Coyle, Project Coordinator	November 21, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	April 10, 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 18, 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**
5545-13-0046	$89,750	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: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
2. **Recruitment and Placement** – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools

that need them: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
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: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
4. **Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: ***The district utilized a data management system, Teachscape, to analyze teacher performance data to identify areas for improvement and professional development and provided training on Teachscape for teachers and leaders. The district used grant funds to establish Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Coaching positions to assist all teachers. APPR coaches provided support to teachers who received an Ineffective/Developing rating on their APPR review.***
5. **Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: ***Through STLE funded activities the district provided training for teachers and leaders to support their growth in understanding and implementing the Danielson Framework to assist them in improving their instructional practices.***
6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: ***Data from Teachscape, the district data management system, was used to make development and employment decisions.***
7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: ***The district used grant funds to provide effective and highly effective teachers the opportunity for advancement, through the design of a career ladder. APPR coaches provided support to teachers who received an Ineffective/Developing rating on their APPR review.***

Program Goals (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I: To establish an Annual Professional performance Review (APPR) Coaching Program as a career ladder position for effective and highly effective teachers.	Guidelines, rubrics, and application processes will be developed for the APPR Coaching and APPR Participant Programs, and shared with stakeholders. 10% of our effective/highly effective teachers will take advantage of our new Career Ladder opportunities by becoming APPR Coaches. 100% of district teaching staff will participate in APPR collaborative conversation experiences.	The APPR Coaching program was launched. Coaches have been trained and participants are engaging in the process. Ten teachers were identified as coaches. All teachers attended professional development on the Danielson 2011 Framework. APPR coaches worked with APPR participants through the cognitive coaching model to mediate thinking of participants related to the Danielson Framework components.

Goal II: To provide training for Administrators and the Teacher Center Director in the Danielson Framework for turnkey training of staff, resulting in improved student performance.	All teachers will attend professional development on the Danielson 2011 Framework with Candi McKay, of McKay Consulting, focused on components 3B and 3C of the rubric. Administrators and the Teacher Center Director will engage in eight mini-workshops for turn-key training with teachers on the Framework for Teaching. By the end of the two-year grant period, the district will decrease by 30% the number of students in the "white" subgroup scoring at Level 1, not on track, from 22 students to 15 students in English Language Arts (ELA) grades 3-8; and decrease the number of students in the "white" subgroup scoring at Level 2, not on track, from 81 students to 57 students in ELA grades 3-8; decrease by 30% the number of students in the Students With Disabilities subgroup scoring at Level 1, not on track, from 27 students to 19 students in ELA 3-8; and decrease by 30% the number of students in the Students With Disabilities subgroup scoring at Level 2, not on track, from 23 students to 16 students in ELA grades 3-8.	Observation reports reflect effective and highly effective scores in the areas of questioning techniques and student engagement. 100% of workshops occurred. Student assessment scores are not currently available, during reporting for Summary report.
Goal III: To obtain data upon which the District can make development and employment decisions.	Administrators and teachers will be provided with professional development on the use of Teachscape as an evidence collection repository	100% of administrators use the Teachscape data management system as the repository for teacher observations.

	and management system for announced, unannounced, and walkthrough data for collection and analysis of APPR data. Structured review of data will occur by administrators in February 2014 to identify growth opportunities for teachers relative to Framework components.	100% of teachers use the Teachscape data management system for the accomplishment of their structured review.
Goal IV: To offer coaching to all teachers through the APPR Coaching and/or collaborative conversation processes, including teachers identified by our APPR plan as Developing or Ineffective in specific components.	50% of our developing/ineffective teachers will improve to the effective and highly effective levels by the end of the grant period. 100% of District teaching staff will participate in APPR collaborative conversation experiences.	100% of our developing/ineffective teachers improved to the effective level. 50% of District teaching staff participated in APPR collaborative conversation training/experiences.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
$89,750	$50,116	$69,625

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (*This information is available from STLE interim and final reports*)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported *(10/31/12 – 3/1/13)*	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F *(10/31/12 – 6/30/13)*	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported *(7/1/13 – 12/31/13)*	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F *(7/1/13 – 6/30/14)*
40	Candy McKay, McKay Consulting	-	$3,000	$8,920	-	$28,800
	Implementing the Framework for Teaching in Enhancing Professional Practice Action Tool Books	-	$620	-	-	-
15	Professional Development - Cognitive Coaching	15	-	-	$5,937	-
40	Professional Development - Collaborative Conversations through learning walks	-	-	-	$9,600	-
15	Teacher Center support	1	-	$6,799	$2,950	$25,489
45	Association for Sup and Curriculum	-	-	$563	-	-
45	Synergy Global	-	-	$251	-	-
45	HighSmith	-	-	$994	-	-
45	MiraVia LLC	-	-	$1,020	-	-
45	Center for Cognitive Coaching	-	-	$89	-	-
45	Barnes and Noble	-	-	-	-	$1,881
45	Scholastic	-	-	-	-	$522
45	Learner-Centered Initiatives	-	-	-	-	$318
45	Jimmie Bearden	-	-	-	-	$1,478

45	Monroe 2 BOCES	-	-	-	-	$5,152
80	Employee Benefits	-	-	$2,390	-	$4,184
90	Indirect Cost	-	-	$567	-	$1,762
	Total Actual Expenditures		**$3,620**	**$20,125**	**$18,487**	**$69,586**

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

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

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

Preparation

Preparation	
Standard	The district is engaging in activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district's career ladder. This can include encouraging and/or enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional certifications.
Summary: This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.	

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

Recruitment and Placement

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

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compen-sation	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 component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.	

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

Evaluation

Evaluation	
Standard	The district is fully implementing an 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: Through this component the district supported its Goal II: to provide training for Administrators and the Teacher Center Director in the Danielson Framework for turnkey training of staff, resulting in improved student performance. Also, it supported Goal IV: to offer coaching to all teachers through the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Coaching and/or collaborative conversation processes, including teachers identified by our APPR plan as Developing or Ineffective in specific components. The district was successful in implementing an effective APPR plan. It appears as though the plan was clearly communicated to district stakeholders. They utilized a data management system, Teachscape, to analyze teacher performance data to identify areas for improvement and professional development and provided training on Teachscape for teachers and leaders.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Danielson framework training	P-Eval	PD	APPR-Obs	FP-DS	15	7		$8,400

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 indicated that they are in the initial stages of the mentoring work. Coaches are trained and ready. It was noted that the reports in Teachscape helped to dictate needs and that APPR was used to inform decisions.
- A building administrator indicated that cognitive coaching training - modeling, debriefing and practicing is an important piece of the training; buy in from those wanting to be a coach has been great.
- The Teacher Center Director/Curriculum Director indicated that the coaches have a good rapport, are receptive and are looked up to within the district.
- A mentee indicated that he/she is looking forward to working with a coach on a specific area of need.

- A mentee indicated that he/she is looking for assistance in ELA and hoping to transfer it to other areas.
- An APPR coach indicated that teachers are paying more attention to what they are teaching which represents a culture change.
- An APPR coach indicated that the district has been clear with expectations and provided the necessary training to be successful.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:
- Guidelines, rubrics, and application processes were developed for the APPR Coaching and APPR Participant Programs, and shared with stakeholders.
- 50% of developing/ineffective teachers will improve to the effective and a highly effective level by the end of the grant period is a stated goal.
- The district indicated establishment of APPR Coaching positions to assist all teachers, including teachers who are ineffective or developing in certain APPR components, to improve and ultimately become effective in the identified components.
- The district has a goal to utilize a data management system, Teachscape, to analyze teacher performance data to identify areas for improvement and professional development and to provide training on Teachscape for teachers and leaders.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:
- All teachers, including developing and ineffective teachers, were offered opportunities to work with APPR coaches in framework components.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:
- Teachscape reports showing teacher effectiveness in component areas, including structured reviews.
- Teachscape reports showing teacher effectiveness in component areas.

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: The district used grant funds to successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. These efforts assisted the district in making progress toward achievement of Goal II: to provide training for Administrators and the Teacher Center Director in the Danielson Framework for turnkey training of staff, resulting in improved student performance and Goal IV: to offer coaching to all teachers through the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Coaching and/or collaborative conversation processes, including teachers identified by the district APPR plan as Developing or Ineffective in specific components.

Through STLE funded activities they provided training for teachers and leaders to support their growth in understanding and implementing the Danielson Framework to assist them in

improving their instructional practices. The district established APPR Coaching positions to assist all teachers, including teachers who are ineffective or developing in certain APPR components, to improve and ultimately become effective in the identified components.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Danielson framework training	T-PD External P-PD External	Group	APPR-Obs	FP-DS	15	7		$8,400
Cognitive Coaching training for coaches	T-PD Internal P- PD Internal	Group	Coach	District	15	15	4 days	$17,746
Collaborative Conversation Through Learning walks	T-PD Internal T- PD Internal	Group	Coach	District	40	46	9 days	$28,800
Supplies/Materials for APPR coaching training	Materials	Group	APPR - Other	District	45	10		$9,351
Teacher Center Director stipend	T-PD Internal	Group	Grant	TC - Partner	15	1 Director; All participating teachers		$7,743

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:
- District administrators expressed that the coaches played an important role within the district of breaking down barriers to increased student achievement.
- Educators reported that the support of an APPR coach assisted teachers in paying closer attention to their instructional practices.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- All teachers attended professional development on the Danielson 2011 Framework.
- Administrators and the Teacher Center Director engaged in eight mini-workshops for turn-key training with teachers on the Framework for Teaching.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report and Status Update Call:
- Professional Development was provided to all staff in the learning walk protocol to support collaborative conversations to enable school-wide conversations about teaching and improvement of professional practice.
- APPR coaches worked with APPR participants through the cognitive coaching model to mediate thinking of participants related to the Danielson Framework components.
- APPR coaches were fully trained in cognitive coaching and in the collaborative learning walk protocol through McKay Consulting. The district is currently planning for select

individuals to attend Level #2 of the Cognitive Coaching through the use of District general funds.

- Professional development was arranged through the Teacher Center (TC) and provided to teachers on a variety of topics related to the common core instructional shifts, the Danielson Framework components, and literacy through the content areas.

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. This activity supports attainment of Goal III: to obtain data upon which the District can make development and employment decisions. Data from Teachscape (data management system) is used to make development and employment decisions.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compen-sation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
N/A							

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:
- To obtain data upon which the District can make development and employment decisions is stated as a program goal.
- Governance Board (Superintendent of Schools, Curriculum Director, Teacher's Union President, a high school teacher, an elementary school teacher, and the Teacher Center Director) identified effective and highly effective teachers in Framework components.
- Teachers will be offered opportunity to become APPR Coaches.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- APPR Coaches were identified and provided coaching and professional development on the Framework.

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 provide effective and highly effective teachers the opportunity for advancement, through design of a career ladder. The District made progress toward the accomplishment of Goal I: to establish an APPR Coaching Program as a	

career ladder for effective and highly effective teachers, through grant initiatives.

APPR coaches provided support to teachers who received an Ineffective/Developing rating on their APPR review. Coaches participated in Teacher Center sponsored orientation and they were provided release time to conduct observations. They participated in pre/post conferences, researched best practice teaching practices, and submitted written reflections regarding the coaching experience. The Teacher Center Director, with the support of the Center's Policy Board, provided professional development opportunities for them to acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to address the New York State Regents Reform Initiatives – Common Core Learning Standards, APPR, and Data Driven Instruction (DDI).

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compen-sation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Teacher Center Director Career Ladder position	T-FT	STLE 1	DDI, CC – ELA/Math, APPR	15	$6,799	1`	$6,799
APPR coach stipends	T - FT	STLE 1	APPR - Other	15	$26.04 per hour	10	$5,938

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 site visit:
- A teacher who received mentoring from an APPR coach expressed looking forward to working with a coach on ELA instruction with hopes of transferring the knowledge gained to other areas of instruction as well.
- The APPR coaches felt that the career ladder step was a "natural next step." Coaches reported they felt that in order to be effective in this role, one needs to remain in the classroom, allowing the person to have a better understanding.
- District administrators expressed that the coaches are playing the important role within the district of breaking down barriers to increased student achievement.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:
- The district identified ten teachers as Coaches; selection occurred in June 2013; stipends will occur in Year #2 and will total $23,164.
- Those selected participated in Teacher Center sponsored orientation held in the summer and throughout the school year.
- Coaches can use up to four half days of release time each semester to conduct observations.
- Coaches participated in pre/post conferences, researched best practice teaching practices and submitted written reflection regarding coaching experience.
- Coaches provided non-evaluative support to all teachers, including teachers who received an Ineffective/Developing rating on their APPR.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report and Status Update Call:
- Funding was reimbursed for stipends paid to APPR coaches and APPR participants.
- APPR coaches worked with APPR participants through the cognitive coaching model to mediate thinking of participants related to the Danielson Framework components.
- APPR coaches were fully trained in cognitive coaching and in the collaborative learning walk protocol through McKay Consulting.
- The district is currently planning for select individuals to attend Level #2 of the Cognitive Coaching through the use of District general funds.
- The district planned to offer additional teachers the opportunity to become APPR Coaches, followed by cognitive coaching training and collaborative learning walk training.

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	Compen-sation	Total Amount
N/A						

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including STEM, ELL, bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: The district used STLE funded activities to support the instructional improvement of teachers, including those identified by the district APPR plan as Developing or Ineffective, through the creation of APPR Coach positions. The district defined high needs students as those who are not successful on the NYS assessments – those who score at levels 1 or 2. Since a large proportion of the high needs students are students with disabilities (SWDs), a particular focus has been on this subgroup.	

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:
- The district has established APPR Coaching positions to assist all teachers, including teachers who are ineffective or developing in certain APPR components, to improve and ultimately become effective in the identified components.

- 50% of developing/ineffective teachers will improve to the effective and highly effective levels by the end of the grant period, is a stated goal.

<u>Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:</u>
- All teachers, including developing and ineffective teachers, were offered opportunities to work with APPR coaches in framework components.

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, through professional development, use of a data management system to analyze teacher performance data to identify areas for improvement and professional development, and by creating the career ladder APPR coach position. Also, the district has shown a commitment to sustain the APPR coach position beyond the funding period.	

Short Description	Code	Type
District will sustain the APPR coach position beyond the funding period	Personnel	SF

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

<u>Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report and Status Update Call:</u>
- The district responded "Yes" to the question "Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/ stipend after the grant period?"
- The district is currently planning for select individuals to attend Level #2 of the Cognitive Coaching through the use of District general funds. The district is planning to offer additional teachers the opportunity to become APPR Coaches, followed by cognitive coaching training and collaborative learning walk training.
- The district is planning to offer additional teachers the opportunity to become APPR Coaches, followed by cognitive coaching training and collaborative learning walk training. They indicate that they planning for sustainability.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:
- The district stated, " We are currently utilizing all of our grant funding related to our teacher center, Title I, Title IIA, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA) funding to support the Regents reform initiatives, and will continue to do so. We have found the greatest success in focusing all of our funds on APPR implementation, data driven instruction, and the integration of the common core learning standards, given the significance of this work. Our general fund budget will be adjusted during 2015-2016 to be able to continue the work that was commenced through the STLE grant funding."

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
- District Treasurer
- Curriculum Director
- Teacher Center Director

Building Level
- Middle School and High School Principal
- Administrative Teacher on Special Assignment

Career Ladder
- APPR Coach
- APPR Coach
- APPR Participant

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
- Year 1 FS-10-F Report
- Wheatland-Chili Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Wheatland-Chili Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Wheatland-Chili Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Wheatland-Chili Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call
- Wheatland-Chili Year 2 Final STLE Report
- Wheatland-Chili Site Visit Notes