2013-14 DISTRICT COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (DCIP)

| CONTACT NAME | Janet Gillmeister | TITLE | Assistant Superintendent |
|--|--|--------|-------------------------------|
| PHONE | (716) 874-8400 x 5333 | E-MAIL | jgillmeister@kenton.k12.ny.us |
| Website Link for Published Plan | http://www.kenton.k12.ny.us/Page/12395 | | |

APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN BY THE SUPERINTENDENT AND BOARD OF EDUCATION (IN NEW YORK CITY, THE CHANCELLOR OR THE CHANCELLOR'S DESIGNEE) IS MANDATORY.

Implementation is required no later than the first day of regular student attendance.

Signatures confirm the respective parties certify that the DCIP addresses all of the required components of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver as detailed on page 1 of this document and understand that any significant modification of the school district's approved plan require the prior approval of the commissioner.

THE SIGNATURES BELOW CONFIRM APPROVAL.

| POSITION | PRINT NAME | SIGNATURE | 1 | DATE |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| SUPERINTENDENT | Mark P. Mondanaro | Mould fel | reeue | 9/30/2013 |
| PRESIDENT, B.O.E./ CHANCELLOR OR CHANCELLOR'S DESIGNEE | Robert Dana | Schell ag |) | 9/30/2013 |

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP TEAM: The DCIP must be developed in consultation with parents, school staff, and others pursuant to §100.11 of Commissioner's Regulations. Participants who are regularly involved in your district and school improvement initiatives, such as community organizations or institutes of higher education should be included. By signing below, stakeholders ascertain that, although they may not agree with all components of the plan, they have actively participated in the development and revision of the DCIP.

Instructions: List of stakeholders who participated in developing the DCIP as required by Commissioner's Regulations §100.18. Provide dates, locations, agendas and supporting documentation of Local Stakeholder meetings. Boxes should be added as necessary.

| Name | Title/Organization | Signature |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| See sign-in sheet next page | | |
| | | |

| Meeting Date(s) | Location(s) | Agenda attach | ed? | Supporting | documents included? |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|---------------------|
| July 23, 2013 | Administration Bldg | | | | |
| July 23, 2013 | (Principals) | Yes N | o 🔀 | Yes | No 🔀 |
| August 1, 2013 | Administration Bldg | | | | |
| | (Cabinet) | Yes N | o 🔀 | Yes 🗌 | No 🔀 |
| August 5, 2013 | Administration Bldg | | | | |
| | (Principals and teams) | Yes N | o 🔀 | Yes 🗌 | No 🔀 |
| August 13, 2013 | Administration Bldg | | | | _ |
| | (Cabinet, Principals and | Yes N | o 🔀 | Yes 🗌 | No 🔀 |
| | teams) | | | | |
| August 20, 2013 | Administration Bldg | | _ | | |
| | (Cabinet, Principals and | Yes N | o 🔀 | Yes | No 🔀 |
| | teams) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| September 24, | Administration Building | | o 🔲 | Yes 🔀 | No 🔛 |
| 2013 | (District Team) | Integrated into | the PPT | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Yes N | o 🔲 | Yes | No |

District Comprehensive Improvement Plan

Focus District Team

September 24, 2013

| Name | Role | Building | Signature |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Mark Mondanaro | Superintendent | Ad Bldg | Island houleur |
| Janet Gillmeister | Assistant Superintendent | Ad Bldg | Some Gellmenster |
| Robin Zymroz | Director Student Services | Ad Bldg | Chi D. Zong |
| Barbara Battaglia | Director Accountability | Ad Bldg | DANIA |
| Patrick Heyden | Principal* | Kenmore East | MODE |
| Jill Neuhaus | Teacher* | Kenmore East | Shel Nidro |
| Mary Patterson | Teacher | Kenmore East | March Pallerson |
| Dean Johnson | Principal* | Kenmore West | La July de |
| David Rogalski | Teacher* | Kenmore West | Mellon |
| Charlie Panepinto | Teacher | Kenmore West | Charlie Peneputa |
| Judy Flateau | HS Counselor | Kenmore West | Jedy Flatgy |
| Betty Sullivan | CLS Mental Health Professionals | District | Better |
| Elaine Thomas | Principal, MS | Kenmore Middle | Elave Thomas |
| Tom Schwob | MS Counselor | Kenmore Middle | Jom School- |
| Mary Piatek | Parent | HSA | not able to attend |
| Karen Whitelaw | Parent | PTSA | Karendi, Whitelaw |
| Jill O'Malley | Parent | КТРА | Gillymally |

^{*}Denotes membership on SCEP team

| Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| American I | ndian or Alaska Native | | Black or African American | | |
| Hispanic or | Latino | | Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | | |
| White | | | Multi-racial | | |
| Students w | rith Disabilities | | Limited English Proficient | | |
| Economica | lly Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Did Not Meet A | dequate Yea | arly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics | | |
| American I | ndian or Alaska Native | | Black or African American | | |
| Hispanic or | Latino | | Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | | |
| White | | | Multi-racial | | |
| Students w | rith Disabilities | | Limited English Proficient | | |
| Economica | lly Disadvantaged | | | | |
| Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science | | | | | |
| American I | ndian or Alaska Native | | Black or African American | | |
| Hispanic or | Latino | | Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | | |
| White | | | Multi-racial | | |
| Students w | rith Disabilities | | Limited English Proficient | | |
| Economica | lly Disadvantaged | | | | |
| Did I | Not Meet Adequate Yearly Prog | ress (AYP) fo | or Effective Annual Measurable Achievement Objective | | |
| Limited Eng | glish Proficiency | | | | |
| | Did Not Meet Ade | quate Yearl | y Progress (AYP) for Graduation Rate | | |
| American I | ndian or Alaska Native | Х | Black or African American | | |
| Hispanic or | Latino | | Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | | |
| White | | | Multi-racial | | |
| Students w | vith Disabilities | Limited English Proficient | | | |
| Economica | lly Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| LEA Name_ | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|
| _ | | _ | | |

DCIP Overview

School District Background

The Kenmore Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District is a large first ring suburban school district just north of the City of Buffalo. It was the largest suburban district of Buffalo throughout the last century, peaking with around a 22,000 student enrollment in 23 schools in 1971. As the manufacturing downturn started in Buffalo, the enrollment and demographics of the Town changed fairly quickly, leading to numerous school closings from the seventies through the mideighties. Today there are approximately 7,200 students in twelve school buildings, including two high schools, three middle schools, and seven elementary schools. In addition, 250 students attend the district's Universal pre-K program. The school district is also responsible for 230 students in alternative, BOCES and private placements. The district's student demographics continue to change, and the free and reduced lunch percentage is at an all-time high. The school district's combined wealth ratio has dramatically decreased over the past 12 years, and although the tax base is no longer growing to any real extent, local property taxes make up a large percentage of the school district's annual revenue.

The school district has increased student achievement over the mid-range in both ELA and Mathematics. We have had the same achievement reaction to the changed cut scores and Common Core assessments as most districts statewide on the average. We have also managed to create new achievement opportunities for students during these large reduction years by reallocating financial resources to create our first ever Career and Technical Education (CTE) certified career academies, International Baccalaureate diploma programs, and a Big Picture Program to help increase our cohort graduation rate. These multiple pathways are important components of our school district vision.

District Vision

In July 2008, Board of Education adopted a four-part District Vision, developed by a strategic planning team and an outside facilitator. This vision is comprised of the following components:

| <u>Core Values</u> | <u>District Goal</u> |
|--|--|
| Passion for excellenceRespect for all | Be the premier school district in New York State by 2020! |
| ■ Trust | <u>Vivid Descriptions</u> |
| ■ Empathy | |
| Integrity | The Ken-Ton School District will hold instant name recognition as the premier leader in educationOur |
| Team work | alumni will share with us that their education successfully prepared them for all future endeavorsThe best |
| Purpose | and the brightest educators will be attracted to our districtthe high quality of Ken-Ton education, and what |
| | we value, will continually attract families to our communityWe will have first class facilities that are a |
| We educate, prepare, and inspire all students to achieve their | model for other districtsBy virtue of our success we will have an extreme sense of pride within our |
| highest potential. | community. |

| LFA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 | |
|----------|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| | NCIIIIOIC TOWITOI TOHAWahaa OLJO | | 17 20 01 03 0000 | |

The Board of Education, after work sessions and yearly updates, has adopted the following Board of Education goals for this year, based on the work of the strategic planning team:

- Support district wide leadership enhancement and efficacy
- Enhance education technology
- Perform a comprehensive update of the BOE policies
- Increase stakeholder involvement
- Ensure safe learning environments
- Optimize financial and capital long term stability
- Support increased achievement for all students, aligned curriculum, and allocation of resources

These documents provide the direction district personnel use when making all decisions, from student achievement to the budget process.

Previous and Current Identification

The Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD has been identified as a Focus District in the area of Graduation Rate for the sub-accountability group of Black/African American in the 2006 cohort.

Only when the district numbers are aggregated to include both high schools and the Erie 1 BOCES Alternative Learning Program/outside district placements did we have enough to be identified as a sub-accountability group of 43 students. Data disaggregation regarding the 2006 cohort sub-group indicates that 20 of the 43 students did not graduate within four (4) years (53% graduated). The 20 students were fairly evenly enrolled at Kenmore West, Kenmore East, and Erie 1 BOCES Alternative Learning Program. They were also evenly split in gender and poverty, and dates of entry to KenTon ranged from 1997 to 2009. We had no LEP students, and only two of the twenty were students with disabilities. The overall district graduation rate on the 2010-11 School Report Card for the 2006 cohort was 77%. The individual building graduation rates for Kenmore East and Kenmore West were 88% and 83%, respectively. Data for the 2007 cohort yields 30 total students in the identified sub-accountability group, 16 of whom graduated, again yielding 53% graduates (due to the small cohort size). The overall district graduation rate on the 2011-12 School Report Card for the 2007 cohort is 81%. The individual building graduation rates for Kenmore East and Kenmore West were 86% and 86%, respectively. The Total Cohort Graduation Rate and Enrollment Outcome Summary on the SED website indicates that our 2008 cohort district graduation rate is 83.3%, with 65.8% for the identified sub-accountability group. The individual building 2008 cohort graduation rates for Kenmore East and Kenmore West are 86.8% and 85%, respectively. As our district enrollment drops, the percentage swings become more apparent.

We were required to identify one school to be a Focus School. All of our district schools are designated In Good Standing under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver. Since the district is identified in the Graduation Rate area, we chose our two (2) High Schools to be designated as Focus Schools.

In the summer of 2011, four (4) of our district buildings were identified as Schools in Need of Improvement in the area of ELA/Students With Disabilities. School Quality Review visits were conducted by BOCES in September and October 2011. The Quality Indicators, Basic Review Report and the Comprehensive Educational Plans were developed by the schools/district and submitted by the due date of January 31, 2012 as required. However, we never received a Quality Improvement Process Plan. In June of 2013, Kenmore West was required to conduct a School Review with District Oversight (Tenet 3) for its Focus designation. The district used this review to provide guidance for some actions in Tenets 2, 3, and 4. Major recommendations are listed only for those areas addressed as a

| LEA Name_ | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda L | JFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-00 | 000 | _ | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----|
| result of the | Kenmore West School Review. | We also condu | ucted a basic needs | assessment based or | n our internal Ins | structional Improveme | ent Plans, and develop | pec |
| district goals | s for the DCIP. | | | | | | _ | |

Reflecting upon the 2012-2013 DCIP

As we reflected upon the 2012-13 plan, we realized that the template encouraged fairly general actions, with little specificity. The truncated timeline prevented us from fully accomplishing some of the activities planned.

We, as planned, continued to participate in the Network Team Institute (NTI) so that we could meet the required activities of the Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative. Our curriculum maps are in continual revision as we receive new information from the State Education Department (SED). We have refined our Data Inquiry Teams, using updated formative assessments, and examining student work and data in a variety of venues to inform instruction for the students sitting in front of us. Our Looking at Student Work Day (LASW) protocol (six times a year) allowed staff to spend time in Professional Learning Communities to discuss student work and determine strategies for increasing achievement. We conducted our twice-yearly Literacy Summits, engaging in dialogue regarding the necessary instructional shifts for higher-order thinking and student engagement across the content areas.

All of our administrators successfully completed the Teachscape training for the Danielson Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) rubric, and completed all evaluations under the new system. We did purchase OASYS, and began to develop the infrastructure needed to coordinate the multitude of components required for APPR. Professional development for administrators became more focused with regard to the RTTT initiative components.

Before we were identified as a Focus District, the District had already identified the need for multiple pathways to graduation, and initiated a Big Picture Program, an in-house alternative learning program for freshman and sophomores. This program had a successful first year, with students gaining credit not otherwise obtained. In addition, contact structures have been developed to connect with the personnel at the Erie 1 BOCES Alternative Learning Program to discuss attendance and achievement of students placed there so that we may connect with families when there are warning signs of drop-out.

As part of the multiple pathways, we were approved for our third Career and Technical Education Academy, and have an application pending for a fourth program. Kenmore West HS graduated its first cohort of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program. We achieved an 85% graduation rate for the program, surpassing NYS (65%), USA (70%), and Global (78.5%). Both of these initiatives work well with our already established Advance Placement coursework, providing students many opportunities to explore interests in a rigorous environment.

Our new Infinite Campus Student Information System provided a more-user friendly interface for teachers and administrators to develop reports regarding attendance and achievement. Although there were first-year challenges, the system allowed us to automate some reports otherwise completed by hand. The Tableau Early Warning System was not implemented last year due to technical difficulties. It is planned for the 2013-14 school year, with activities already begun. The implementation of Naviance was not done with fidelity during 2012-13, and has already made implementation strides beginning this past July.

We surveyed our high school students in the spring and conducted two World Cafes, one at each high school. The data obtained is valuable information regarding students' perceptions and suggestions for changes for better student engagement. We plan to continue pulling groups of students together to conduct a deeper analysis.

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 | |
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|

The National Federation for Just Communities of Western New York conducted culturally relevant professional development training for support staff and the staff of the transportation department.

As planned in the 2012-13 DCIP, the Infinite Campus Parent Portal was opened in Spring 2013 to all parents of secondary students. The Campus Portal provides students and guardians with real-time access to their information as it is entered by teachers, counselors, and staff. The first phase of the Intra-District Consolidation Study was conducted, setting the stage for increased community involvement in the 2013-14 school year.

Highlights of 2013-14 DCIP

Due to the new template, we are able to create a leaner, more-focused action plan for the district. Tenet 1 activities are focused on the continuation of the RTTT requirements. Administrators and teachers will participate in professional development regarding learning-focused instruction as outlined in the Danielson Rubric through a summer retreat. Administrators will participate in re-certification training through Teachscape, professional development regarding effective feedback and evaluation through the negotiated Leadership Strand, and process all APPR through the newly structured OASYS system. Our Big Picture Program teachers will have professional development in Novanet credit recovery to aid students in attaining much needed credit for graduation, while we also offer some of our students placement in a newly established "Twilight Academic Program." We will expand our Project Lead the Way program to the middle schools, training staff in the Gateway to Technology Program. The secondary administrators and counselors will be trained in Tableau, an Early Warning System that interacts with our Student Information system. As listed in the action plans, these initiatives, through indicated funding sources, will allow us to offer multiple pathways for Kenmore students to pursue paths to graduation.

As indicated in the Kenmore West Review, Tenet 2 focuses on providing our administrators with targeted professional development in RTTT initiatives. Sessions focused on the Tri-State Rubric, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), instructional "look-fors," student engagement, the Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE) and Local Assistance Plans (LAP), higher-order thinking skills, etc. will be offered to administrators on a monthly basis. A good portion of the plan focuses on Tenet 3. Curriculum Learning Specialists will continue to turn-key information learned at the Network Team Institutes, allowing us to pilot curriculum modules in ELA and math. We plan to increase the number of teachers who pilot ELA through the offering of a two day professional development opportunity by Expeditionary Learning. Curriculum maps will continue to be updated as a result of this important learning. We will also enter discussion with our Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) match partner regarding educational and professional services aligned with the CCLS. Technology will be purchased so that we can better assess and monitor student progress. ELLevation is an electronic system which will store data and learning goals for our ever-increasing ESL population. STAR Enterprise assessment system will be piloted at the elementary level in ELA and Math.

Tenets 4, 5, and 6 are focused on engaging key stakeholders in various aspects the RTTT initiatives and best practices. We will be enlarging our focus of the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) to Literacy Across the Disciplines through our Building Literacy Facilitators, as well as focusing on monitoring progress of student achievement through our re-vamped Instructional Improvement Plans. In addition to the student survey conducted last year, we will survey staff and parents and hold World Cafes with these groups to engage them in dialogue about school improvement practices. We will continue our work this year with New York University, focusing on culturally-relevant education and interactions; a need due to our changing demographics. Although this is primarily focused with our Instructional Support Teams, it extends to all staff this year. The use of the National Federation for Just Communities of Western New York will expand to conduct culturally relevant professional development training to all instructional staff at both high schools. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) will begin in four schools, with expansion planned for the rest of the district. We will be reaching out to parents through a school messaging system (Campus Messenger with Voice - ShoutPoint), Naviance (a system for four year HS planning and beyond), and the second phase of the Intra-District Consolidation Study.

| LEA Name_ | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | | |

District Structure to Support the Implementation

Our structure currently supports a framework of turn-key trainers by individuals with instructional/curricular/data expertise, as well as established "inquiry" teams.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Our Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction is responsible for the planning, design, organization, and assessment of the District's curriculum, staff development, instructional technology, and assessments to assure a comprehensive, articulated curriculum and instruction program aligned with District goals and New York State laws and standards. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction oversees the Director of the Office of Accountability and the Curriculum Learning Specialists, as well as the building principals for curricular, instructional, and supervisory purposes.

The *Director of the Office of Accountability* uses multiple measures of data to improve teaching and learning with school and department leaders. Individual, small, and large group contact times are provided throughout the year to analyze learning strengths and weaknesses. Professional development opportunities focused on assessment literacy and strategies that target interventions for students in need of improvement are also offered.

The seventeen *District Curriculum Learning Specialists* provide leadership within their respective departments refining curriculum maps, developing formative assessments and examining data to improve teaching and learning, as well as other duties regarding instructional materials. These positions are divided into 0.6 FTE classroom teacher and 0.4 FTE Curriculum Learning Specialist, as well as dedicated summer work. The Curriculum Learning Specialists interact with building department chairs to provide leadership, guidance, and staff development for all teachers. Monthly meetings, as well as participation in District Staff Development planning committees, are an integral part of the structure.

Principals and Assistant Principals are each responsible for a program/curricular area in the Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD. This provides an additional level in our organizational structure for focused staff development, data analysis, and oversight.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

New York State summative assessment data are disaggregated and collectively shared with our district, building and teacher leaders. A variety of reports from the Data Warehouse are examined and analyzed to determine learning patterns and trends over time. Conclusion statements and root causes are developed to address specific curricula, instructional and learning needs. Similar sessions are scheduled to examine building/department formative data.

Our school/department planning requires a systematic review and careful analysis of root causes of academic problems, student needs and existing activities to determine how instructional areas can be improved. The process of developing the Instructional Improvement Plan (IIP) allows School Planning Teams (SPT) or Department Planning Teams (DPT) an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the current instructional programs, discuss proposed modifications and/or alternatives, develop goals and objectives, and create action plans based upon scientifically-based research and/or best practices that will translate into observable, effective strategies to improve student achievement. These strategies include effective, research-based methods for the delivery of high-quality first instruction to all students, as well as Academic Intervention Services (AIS) for students who score below the State-designated performance level on State assessments and/or who are at-risk of not achieving the State standards. The IIP also includes a professional development strand to insure successful implementation of instructional

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | <u>14-26-01-03-0000</u> | |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| strategies. | Lastly, the School/Department Planning Teams | s develop a mechanism t | o regularly assess wheth | er the proposed activities have resulted in improve |
| student per | formance. These plans are a product of the col | laborative decisions of a | ll stakeholders: parents, | staff, administrators and students. Once the IIP is |
| approved. | it serves as a focus for implementing instruction | nal strategies and profess | ional development oppo | rtunities for the school year. |

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Since July 2008, we have and will continue to develop and provide professional development for our administrators and teachers, focused on using data and collaborative inquiry to improve teaching and learning. We scaffold many and varied sessions.

Summer Retreats have included the following focus topics:

- 2008 The Instructional Improvement Planning Process
- 2009 Root Cause Analysis (Paul Preuss)
- 2010 Common Core Standards and Assessments, Accountability
- 2011 APPR, CCLS, and Common Formative Assessments
- 2012 The SLO process
- 2013 APPR learning-focused instruction Danielson Group

District-wide Professional Development

Superintendent's Conference Days have been district-wide professional development opportunities focused on behaviors that strengthen teaching and learning for all. Such topics and initiatives include data roll-outs, curriculum mapping, benchmark assessments, common unit assessments, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Looking at Student Work (LASW), the various functions of data teams (inquiry teams), etc. These conference days provide scaffolded opportunities at both the macro and micro levels.

These are not just "one-time" occurrences. On-going professional development continues at the district level, with scheduled "mini-sessions" focusing on deepening the understanding of the elements of a PLC, data teams (inquiry teams), and the Instructional Improvement Process. These, and other topics, are further developed at the building and department levels, focusing on the needs of students at the individual level. Thus, the structured collaborative inquiry process in our district mirrors the required NYSED building inquiry teams.

Kenmore Staff Development Center

The Kenmore Staff Development Center mission is to be responsive to our school population and offer programs which enhance the professionalism of our entire Ken-Ton community. The workshop offerings are aligned with district goals and provide our entire staff with opportunities to further their knowledge of learning and instruction. It offers a wide range of workshops which are targeted toward the social and academic needs of our population of elementary, middle, and high school age students.

The Kenmore Staff Development Center provides and tracks professional development workshops for public and non-public administrators, teachers and support staff that is:

- Targeted and differentiated to the specific needs of staff;
- Focused on providing staff members with the opportunity to improve their skills to better meet the needs of their students; and
- Responsive to the needs of the District through alignment with the Professional Development Plan.

Over 95% of our staff takes advantage of the workshops sponsored by the Staff Development Center.

| LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|---|----------------|------------------|
| Leadership Strand | | |

Administrators in the district engage in professional development opportunities focused on literacy, leadership and creative decision making. Administrators are instrumental in providing site-based professional development throughout the year, helping staff to become self-directed in data-analysis and instructional strategies.

Dedicated Time

Our district devotes scheduled time for teachers and administrators to examine and analyze qualitative and quantitative pieces of student learning, as well as individualizing instructional strategies based on student need. We utilize the following forums:

- Early Release days for teachers to meet as data teams (6 per year)
- Data Rollouts full and half days of release time for departments and grade levels to examine and analyze data by subject
- Summer hours dedicated for curriculum projects
- Weekly department and grade level meeting times
- School Planning Team meetings
- Instructional Improvement Plan Team meetings

Timeline and Anticipated Barriers

The strategies and activities listed in this document have already commenced. We will continue to work toward our goal of increasing graduation rates for all accountability groups, using the General Fund, IDEA, Race to the Top, Perkins, Management Efficiency Grant, and the Consolidated Application funding sources. We were scheduled to have our SED review in March 2013 at Kenmore West High School, and the internal review at Kenmore East High School. This has been postponed until the Fall of 2013 for Kenmore West, and the Spring 2014 for Kenmore East. When we receive the IIT report, we will review our progress and assimilate the recommendations into our third year updated plan. We will continue to implement strategies and refining existing processes that are working, and focus on students in need who are identified from deeper analysis. We will search for possible relevant funding sources to supplement and optimize our dwindling revenue.

Funding and unfunded/underfunded mandates continue to be a barrier for us. We continue to struggle with rising costs and diminishing revenue. Over the last five years, we have abolished over two-hundred (200) positions, of which 120 were teachers. Our class sizes have risen steadily over the last five years, and ability to give needed attention to each student has diminished. The human resource time and labor for the development of assessments for the new APPR has been staggering, as has the lost instructional time due to the many required assessments for each student. This greatly impacts morale, as our staff cares deeply about the success for all students.

Conclusion

Our plan has been and will continue to be available to the public through our website, and in hardcopy upon request. It is our hope, through this plan, that we have structures in place so that all students can graduate through multiple pathways and have a deeper conceptual understanding of coursework through higher-order thinking strategies. We anticipate greater communication between buildings, as well as outside student placements. We will be able to better use multiple data sources with heightened analysis to identify and create success plans for our student population. Through this plan, all stakeholders should be able to better articulate the mission of the Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District.

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | |
|----------|--------------------------------|--|
|----------|--------------------------------|--|

| LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|---------------|------------------|
| LLA DLD3 COUC | 14-20-01-03-0000 |

Required Activities

Use this table to demonstrate costs associated with public school choice (SC), the DTSDE, the Distinguished Educator (DE) (if applicable), the Outside Educational Expert (OEE), and Supplemental Education Services (SES)(if applicable).

| Category: Identify | Activity(ies): Must detail | Fund | District | Improvement/Parent | Targeted | Timeline: |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| category: Identify the appropriate category associated with the activity, fund source(s), district cost(s), set- asides, targeted schools, and timeline referenced; e.g.: SC, | the actions that will take place. | Fund Source(s): Identify all Federal, State, and Local fund sources that will be used for the completion of | District Cost(s): Identify the district cost associated with each fund source. | Improvement/Parent Engagement Set- Aside(PE): If the activity satisfies one of the mandated set- aside requirements check the appropriate box below. | Targeted Schools: Identify the school(s) targeted by each activity and their identification status. | Identify the projected timeline for each activity which is to include a start and end date. |
| DTSDE, DE, OEE, or SES. | | each activity. | 440,000 | | | Cantanahan |
| OEE | 1. DTSDE Rubric: A Comprehensive Overview This will include all administrators. The discussion will center on use of the DTSDE Rubric and how to use to improve instruction, in particular, but also, how to use this tool to create a dynamic high-performing school culture that sustains. 2. Relevant Research Review: Operating as an Instructional Leader This will include a targeted | 1003a Title I School Improvement Grant | \$40,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE | District Level | September 2013-August 2014 |

| T | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | eview of the information | | |
| | rom Marzano, Reeves, | | |
| | Fullan, DuFour and others | | |
| | or the purposes of building | | |
| | capacity. In particular, | | |
| | when shifting culture, and | | |
| e | effectively coaching staff, it | | |
| is | s critical that we | | |
| u | understand the background | | |
| a | and rational for what we | | |
| a | are suggesting. | | |
| 3 | B. Tenet Two: | | |
| L | eadership | | |
| TI | his will include an | | |
| u | understanding of how CCLS, | | |
| A | APPR, Data-Driven | | |
| Ir | nstruction and the DTSDE | | |
| R | Rubric work | | |
| ir | nterdependently. | | |
| 4 | I. Tenet Three: | | |
| C | Curriculum Development | | |
| Т | This will include a deep | | |
| d | discussion of : | | |
| l w | Vhat do we mean by Rigor? | | |
| l w | Vhy Curriculum Matters? | | |
| Т | Fext Complexity- Where | | |
| a | are we? | | |
| W | Ve will use the Tri-State | | |
| | Rubric/other tools to assess | | |
| tl | hese elements | | |
| 5 | 5. Tenet Three: | | |
| | Professional Learning | | |
| | Communities | | |
| | Ve will examine this as a | | |
| | powerful vehicle for change | | |
| | and collaboration. School | | |
| le | eaders will have the | | |
| 0 | ppportunity to review the | | |

| | | T | |
|---|--|---|---|
| type of work these teams | | | |
| conduct and how to | | | |
| maximize their impact on | | | |
| teaching/learning and | | | |
| school culture. | | | |
| 6. Tenet Four: | | | |
| Teacher Practices and | | | |
| Decisions | | | |
| Our discussion will focus on | | | |
| engaging students in | | | |
| learning and taking | | | |
| ownership for learning. | | | |
| These include key | | | |
| Instructional Shifts: | | | |
| Growth Mindset | | | |
| and why we must work | | | |
| within this context | | | |
| Linking student | | | |
| engagement and | | | |
| assessment. | | | |
| Learning Targets | | | |
| and why they are critical to | | | |
| engaging students in | | | |
| learning. | | | |
| Close reading and | | | |
| Text-dependent questions. | | | |
| Experiencing this as an | | | |
| adult learner. | | | |
| Engaging students | | | |
| in discourse. The role of | | | |
| discussion choice, authentic | | | |
| discussion and | | | |
| student/teacher balance. | | | |
| Gradual release of | | | |
| responsibility. How to | | | |
| systematically employ. | | | |
| , | | | |
| | | İ | i |

| LEA Name_ | Kenmore-Town of | Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS | Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 | |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------|----------|------|------------------|--|
| | | | | | | |

| DTSDE | Send appropriate district staff to DTSDE training in Albany | 1003a Title I School Improvement Grant | \$10,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE | District Level | September, November 2013, February, May 2014 |
|-------|---|---|----------|------------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | ☐Improvement ☐PE | | |
| | | | | □NA | | |
| | | | | ☐Improvement ☐PE | | |
| | | | | □NA | | |

| LEA Name_ | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 1.1 1.2 | _ = ' | 1.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Tenet 1 as a v | | | HED | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | • | • | • | |
| contained in a major recommendation bu | t is aligned to the | 6 tenets is identif | fied, the district should address t | the identified ne | ed within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining | why the need is be | eing addressed. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment w | ith the achieveme | nt of the major re | commendation or identified need | d. They should be | e written as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and relev | ant to the recomn | nendation. | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| 1. 100% of administrators will attend a tw | o-dav 2013 summ | er retreat desiane | d to improve professional conver | sations between | administrators |
| and teachers regarding learning-focused in | • | 3 | , | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2. One teacher from each building will atte | end the two-day 20 | 013 summer retre | at to bolster professional collabo | ration with admi | nistrators. |
| , | , | | . , | | |
| 3.100% of administrators will pass the Tea | ichscape Danielsoi | n calibration certif | ication on the first pass. Calibrat | tion will be offere | d twice yearly. |
| 40 11 11 1 | | | | | 10: : 1 |
| 4. Provide continuing professional develop | _ | | · | d monthly leveled | d Principal |
| meetings regarding effective feedback and | d evaluation to all | administrators wh | no evaluate teachers. | | |
| 5.100% of all teachers' and administrators | a' APPR will be pro | cessed through th | e OASYS system. | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the | Federal, State, | district cost | the mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| goal to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| geometric and the second | sources that | with each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | appropriate sex selection | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | 334166. | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | and cha date. |
| | | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |

| | | 1 | | | |
|---|--------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1.Begin contract negotiations with the | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | Spring 2013 |
| Danielson Group for the two-day retreat | | | | | |
| 1.Secure contract and location; notify | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | June 2013 |
| administrators | | | | | |
| 1.Hold 2013 summer retreat | RTTT | \$9000 | | same | 7/18-19/13 |
| professional development for | | | | | |
| administrators regarding APPR learning- | | | | | |
| focused supervision | | | | | |
| 1.Design and distribute retreat | General fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 7/23/13 |
| evaluation survey to administrators | | | | | |
| 1.Evaluate survey results and publish | General Fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 9/13/13 |
| 1.Follow up evaluation with | General Fund | \$350 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 4/1/14 |
| administrators | | | | | |
| 2.Invite teachers to summer retreat | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 6/14/13 |
| 2.Teachers attend retreat for PD on | RTTT | \$6600 | | same | 7/18-19/13 |
| APPR learning focused supervision | | | | | |
| 2.Design and distribute retreat | General fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 7/23/13 |
| evaluation survey to teachers | | | | | |
| 2. Evaluate survey results and publish | General Fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 9/30/13 |
| 2.Follow up evaluation with select | General Fund | \$350 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 4/1/14 |
| teachers | | | | | |
| 3.Renew Teachscape license for 2013-14 | RTTT | \$5625 | | District Level | 7/1/13 |
| 3.Invite administrators to complete | General Fund | \$2500 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | 8/8/13-9/30/13 |
| calibration certification (two hours each | | | | | |
| admin) | | | | | |
| 3.Evaluate calibration results | General fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 9/30/13 |
| 4.Purchase four books (by Marshall and | RTTT | \$5200 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | By 9/15/13 |
| Platt) for all supervising administrators | | | | | |
| 4. Negotiate and establish a calendar for | General fund | \$280 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By 9/15/13 |
| the Leadership Strand PD | | | | | |
| 4. Publish the calendar and invite | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By 9/20/13 |
| administrators | | | | | |
| 4.Hold professional development for | General Fund | \$14,000 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | By January 1, |
| administrators regarding learning- | | | | | 2014 |

| focused observations/evaluations and | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| effective feedback (ten hours each | | | | | |
| total) | | | | | |
| 5.Purchase OASYS system | RTTT | \$10,985 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | July 1, 2013 |
| 5.Configure OASYS system | General Fund | \$1500 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 7/1-8/10, 2013 |
| 5.Develop custom forms | General Fund | \$2250 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 2013 |
| 5. Develop administrative training | General Fund | \$375 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 2013 |
| materials | | | | | |
| 5.Develop teacher training materials | General Fund | \$225 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By September |
| | | | | | 10, 2013 |
| 5.Inservice training for administrators | General Fund | \$1350 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 8/28,29,30/2013 |
| 5.Inservice training for teachers | General Fund | \$450 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September 2013 |
| 5.Start System | N/A | N/A | ☐ Improvement ☐ PE ☒ NA | same | September 2013 |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | | B. HEDI Rating: |
|---|--|---|
| | Tenet 1 as a whole NA | ☐H ☐E ☐D ☐I ☒NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: In t | the boxes below identify the major recomme | endation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not |
| contained in a major recommendation but is | aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the distric | ct should address the identified need within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining why | the need is being addressed. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with t | he achievement of the major recommendation | n or identified need. They should be written as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant | • | , |
| | | |
| 1.By September 5, 2013, 100% of the Big Pictu | re students will have access to, and 100% of th | ne Big Picture teacher advisors will be trained in, the |
| NovaNet Recovery Program as another means | of students earning course credit for subjects i | not successfully completed. |
| | | |

| that are not compatible with traditional sch | iool hours. | | | | |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.Secure 5 NovaNet ports from Erie 1 | General Fund | \$5000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | June 4, 2013 |
| BOCES for use during the 2013-14 school | | | | East, | |
| year | | | | Kenmore | |
| | | | | West, Focus | |
| | | | | Schools | |
| 1.Secure a Kenmore East HS staff | General Fund | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 8/13/13 |
| member to conduct professional | | | | | |
| development in the NovaNet program | | | | | |
| 1.Each of the four teachers assigned to | General fund | \$35 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 9/3/13 |
| Big Picture will attend NovaNet | | | | | |
| professional development | | | | | |
| 2.Continue to hold conversations with | General Fund | \$440 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | Spring 2013 |
| Erie I BOCES to finalize the details of the | | | | East, | |
| two Twilight programs; one that is strictly | | | | Kenmore | |
| academic and the other that offers a CTE | | | | West, Focus | |
| component | | | | Schools | |
| 2.Director of Student Services will meet | General Fund | \$620 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | May 1, 2013 |
| with High School counselors and | | | | | |
| principals to review the Twilight Program | | | | | |
| and discuss the CTE and academic options | | | | | |
| 2.Director of Student Service to inform KE | General Fund | \$155 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | May 7, 2013 |

| LEA Name <u>Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda</u> | UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | | |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | |
| and KW HS that the new program has | | | | | |
| been approved by the BOCES Board and | | | | | |
| have the school counselors begin the | | | | | |
| process of speaking with students and | | | | | |
| their families about the program | | | | | |
| 2.Director of Student Services will send | General Fund | \$55 | Improvement PE NA | same | By August 26, |
| final listing of student participants to Erie | | • | | | 2013 |
| I BOCES, along with their transcripts | | | | | |
| 2.Coordinate with the transportation | General Fund | \$220 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By August 26, |
| department to set the bus schedule for | | | | | 2013 |
| assigned students | | | | | |
| 2.Students begin attending Twilight | General Fund | \$190,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September 3, |
| Program | | | | | 2013 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Tenet 1 | | | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | | | 1.5 | D. LIEDI Betine | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | ☐ 1.1 ☐ 1.2 ☐ Tenet 1 as a v | 1.3 <u> </u> | _]1.5 | B. HEDI Rating | g: D ∏I ⊠NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | | ior recommendation(s) and sour | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but | | • | • | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | - | | ed, the district should address th | ie identined need | a within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | my the need is bei | ing addressed. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | | • | ommendation or identified need | . They should be | written as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | ant to the recomm | endation. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1.By August 31, 2013, provide professional | development to 10 | 00% of the Middle | School Technology Education ted | | Gateway to |
| Technology (PLTW) program for implement | | | | | |
| | tation in the 2013- | 14 school year, to | align with the PLTW program in | the high schools. | |
| 2 De July 4, 2042, establish a sun d | | | | | Stanbarda |
| 2.By July 1, 2013, establish a supply and mo teachers in 2013-14. | | | | | technology |

| LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda | UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| Instruction will submit the proposed Middle School allotment for GTT to the Assistant Superintendent of Finance | | | | | | | |
| 2.The approved 2013-14 budget will show the \$2000 per Middle School for CTE GTT materials/supplies, to be accessible 7/1/13-6/30/14 | General Fund | \$6000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | July 1, 2013 | | |
| 3. Secure funding to purchase the remaining equipment needed for the GTT CTE program implementation | Management Efficiency Grant | \$20,000 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | 3 middle schools – good standing | July-October 2013 | | |
| 4.KE SCEP 1.4 – costs for principal's meeting with counselors for CTE | General Fund | \$540 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East – Focus School | See SCEP | | |
| | Tenet 1 | | | | | | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 1.1 1.2 Tenet 1 as a v | \square 1.3 \boxtimes 1.4 $[$ whole \square NA | 1.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: contained in a major recommendation but and provide a strong rationale explaining w | is aligned to the | 6 tenets is identifi | | | | | |
| | , | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant | | | ommendation or identified need | . They should be v | ritten as | | |
| 1.By August 26, 2013, all six members of th as a Teacher Advisor and/or a Learning Thr | | | | • | • | | |
| 2. By August 8, 2013, the district will establ KenTon Big Picture with ongoing opportuni | | • | <u> </u> | | • | | |

practices.

| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.Register for the national Big Picture | General fund | \$110 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | July 1, 2013 |
| Learning Conference | | | | and Kenmore | |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | Schools | |
| 1.Attend the Big Bang Conference in | Management | \$12,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 7, 8, 9 |
| Providence, Rhode Island | Efficiency | | | | 2013 |
| | Grant | | | | |
| 2.Contact the national Big Picture | General fund | \$55 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | May 30, 2013 |
| Learning staff for a list of NY Big Picture | | | | and Kenmore | |
| Schools who are interested in mentoring | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | Schools | |
| 2.Develop and initiate a contract with the | General Fund | \$3800 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | July 1, 2013 |
| principal of the LaFayette CSD Big Picture | | | | | |
| Program in LaFayette, NY | | | | | |
| 2.Establish visitation dates for LaFayette | General fund | \$55 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September 1, |
| principal to come to KenTon Big Picture | | | | | 2013 |
| 2.Principal of LaFayette Big Picture will | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 11/18-19/13, |
| visit KenTon Big Picture for purposes of | | | | | 4/28-29/14 |
| mentoring/coaching advisors and | | | | | |
| internship coordinator | | | | | |

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | | |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 1.1 1.2 | - = - | 1.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | Tenet 1 as a w | | | HED | | | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | • | • | | | | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but | | | ed, the district should address the | e identified need | within the plan | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | th the achievemen | t of the major reco | ommendation or identified need. | They should be v | vritten as | | | |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | ant to the recomm | endation. | | | | | | |
| 1.By October 1, 2013, 100% of the district's visualization system to monitor, support, as success/failure. | • | | | • | • | | | |
| 2. Provide financial support for activities in | Focus Schools as ii | ndicated in their SC | CEPS. | | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: | | | |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the | | | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | | | |
| activities to match the number of the | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | | | |
| goal to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | | | |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to | | | |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start | | | |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. | | | |
| | of each | | | status. | | | | |
| | activity. | | | | | | | |
| 1.Purchase Tableau's Early Warning | General fund | \$18,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore, | August 1, | | | |
| System data visualization program | | | | Franklin, and | 2013 | | | |
| | | | | Hoover MSs | | | | |
| | | | | (good | | | | |

School

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD |
|----------|--------------------------------|
| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD |

| EA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|--------------|------------------|
| | |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | | 2.32.4 vhole | | B. HEDI Rating: | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | n the boxes belov | v identify the maj | | e citation; if a n | eed that is not | |
| contained in a major recommendation but | • | | ed, the district should address the | identified need | within the plan | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | hy the need is bei | ng addressed. | | | | |
| Per the Kenmore West School Review with District Oversight SOP 3.3 (HEDI rating D), explicit professional development will be provided to Administrators and Curriculum Learning Specialists in the following suggested areas: use of HOTS, student engagement, research-based instructional look-fors in alignment with CCLS and APPR, gradual release of responsibility, etc. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | h the achievemen | t of the major reco | mmendation or identified need | They should be w | ritten as | |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | nt to the recomme | endation. | | | | |
| 1.Provide at least 30 minutes of targeted pr principals, and assistant principals) and Cur meetings on topics regarding CCLS, DTSDE | riculum Learning S | pecialists during e | ach of the regularly scheduled mo | • | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: | |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to | |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start | |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. | |
| | of each | | | status. | | |
| | activity. | | | | | |
| 1.The Assistant Superintendent for | General fund | \$ 600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By September | |
| Curriculum and Instruction will develop a | | | | | 1, 2013 | |
| list of professional development topics | | | | | | |
| for each of the scheduled leveled | | | | | | |

| principal and Curriculum Learning Specialist meetings | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|----------------------|----------------|--|
| 1. The first agenda item on each of the monthly meetings will PD dialogue, led by the ASCI, regarding such items as the Tri-State Rubric, the LAP process, PARCC, evidence guides, HOTS (Bloom and Webb), instructional "look-fors," student engagement, gradual release of responsibility, etc. | General Fund | \$7500 | □Improvement □PE ☑NA | District Level | 5 mtgs per month, 10 months (Elem, Mid, HS, AP, CLS) |
| 1.The ASCI will continue to discuss and look for changes in building/teacher practices during the building walkthroughs and visitations throughout the year | General Fund | Unable to calculate, part of daily job duties | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | Sept 2013- June 2014 |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 2.12.2 | □ 2.3 □ 2.4 □ | 2.5 | B. HEDI Rating | • | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|--|
| | Tenet 2 as a v | vhole NA | | HED | □I⊠NA | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: In the boxes below identify the major recommendation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not | | | | | | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan | | | | | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | hy the need is bei | ng addressed. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with the achievement of the major recommendation or identified need. They should be written as specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant to the recommendation.1.Provide financial support for activities in Focus Schools as indicated in their SCEPS. | | | | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: | | |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the | | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | | |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | | |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | | |

| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1. KE SCEP 2.1 Five priorities | General fund | \$1080 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KW SCEP 2.2 Vision Committee | General fund | \$320 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 2.2 Multiple Pathways | General fund | \$1000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KW SCEP 2.3 IST to RTI | General fund | \$400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 2.3 Strive for 85 | General fund | \$650 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KW SCEP 2.4Supervisory assignments | General Fund | \$950 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE and KW SCEP 2.5 Inter-rater | General Fund | \$370 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| reliability | | | | and Kenmore | |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | Schools | |

| LEA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | |
|----------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | |

| LEA BEDS Code | |
|---------------|--|
|---------------|--|

14-26-01-03-0000

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | $3.1 \boxed{3.2}$ Tenet 3 as a v | _ = - | 3.5 | B. HEDI Rating | |
|--|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | In the boxes below | w identify the ma | | ce citation; if a r | need that is not |
| | contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed. | | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | ny the need is bei | ng addressed. | | | |
| Per the Kenmore West School Review with I | District Oversiaht S | SOP 3.2 (HEDI ratin | na E) and SOP 3.3 (HEDI ratina D). | the district curric | culum maps |
| (including units and sample lesson plans) w | • | • | | | • |
| rigorous practice. | | , | ŕ | 33 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | h the achievemen | t of the major reco | ommendation or identified need. | They should be v | vritten as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | nt to the recomm | endation. | | | _ |
| | | | | | |
| 1.By July 2014, a maximum of six Curriculur | | | | i Institute sessior | is in Albany, |
| representing K-12 ELA and Math, in order to | o turn-key informa | tion regarding the | CCLS Curriculum modules. | | |
| 2.During the 2013-14 school year, we will in | acrease the numbe | er of teachers who | will nilot the FLA and math curric | ulum modules fra | om 18 to at |
| least 40. | ierease the nambe | i oj tedericis wilo | will prior the LLA and math carried | aram modules fre | 711 10 to at |
| redst rei | | | | | |
| 3.By June 2014, ELA and Math Curriculum n | naps will be again | updated in NYLeai | rns to reflect the new information | regarding CCLS, | regarding new |
| information from SED and the COII curricult | | , | , | <i>y y</i> | 3 3 |
| 4.Through the recently approved QZAB, ent | er discussion with | our match nartnei | r Δ+ Educators regarding profess | ional develonme | nt |
| , , , | | • | | • | |
| opportunities that accomplish the goals set forth in the Recommended Deliverables Proposal and the Professional Services Agreement for 2013-2016. (Cloud-based work location, PD modules for SDC, job-embedded PD in CCLS, resources, etc) | | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |

| | | 1.6.1 | | 1 | 1 |
|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1. Representative Curriculum Learning | General Fund | \$3,500 | ⊠Improvement | District Level | 7/8-12/13 |
| Specialists will register and attend the | RTTT | \$20,000 | | | 11/12-15/13 |
| NYS Network Team Institute in Albany as | | | | | 2/4-7/14 |
| members of the Network Team | | | | | 5/13-16/14 |
| Equivalent Level 1 Team | | | | | 7/7-11/14 |
| 1.Information will be turn-keyed to the | General Fund | Not able to | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 9/4/13, |
| Elementary and Secondary ELA and Math | | calculate; part | | | 11/5/13, and |
| Committees, Department and Grade | | of job duties | | | after each |
| Level Chairpersons, Building Literacy | | | | | Institute |
| Teams; Professional Development will be | | | | | |
| held on the Superintendent's Conference | | | | | |
| Days | | | | | |
| 2.ELA (Secondary and Elementary) and | General Fund | Not able to | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By September |
| Math (Secondary) Curriculum Learning | | calculate; part | | | 30, 2013 |
| Specialists will solicit additional teachers | | of job duties | | | , |
| to pilot the curriculum modules during | | , | | | |
| the 2013-14 school year | | | | | |
| 2.The district will schedule a two-day | Management | \$21,000 | | District Level | 8/28-29/13 |
| professional development opportunity | Efficiency | 7, | | | 7, 20 20, 20 |
| for interested grades 3-8 ELA teachers | Grant | | | | |
| with Expeditionary Learning, to give first- | Grane | | | | |
| hand training the CCLS curriculum | | | | | |
| modules | | | | | |
| 2.The Elementary and Secondary ELA | General Fund | \$2,000 | | District Level | September – |
| Curriculum Learning Specialists will | Generalia | 72,000 | | District Level | December |
| provide follow-up professional | | | | | 2013 |
| development through the Staff | | | | | 2013 |
| Development Center model | | | | | |
| Development Center model | | | | | |

| | T | T | | T | T |
|---|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 2.Additional teachers will access the ELA | General Fund | \$60,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By October 1, |
| module student books purchased for | | | | | 2013 |
| each elementary and middle school | | | | | |
| building | | | | | |
| 3.The secondary ELA and Math | General Fund | \$25,400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By April 2, |
| Curriculum Learning Specialists will lead a | | | | | 2014 |
| team of teachers to update the master | | | | | |
| curriculum maps (NYLearns) to reflect the | | | | | |
| CCLS through the Career Option II | | | | | |
| process; update and align the Common | | | | | |
| Formative Assessments | | | | | |
| 3.Teachers will be able to access the | General Fund | Not able to | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By June 30, |
| district curriculum maps and develop | | calculate; part | | | 2014 |
| personal maps, reflecting lesson plans | | of job duties | | | |
| and additional resources (MyMaps) | | | | | |
| 4.A+ Educators and Assistant | Management | Part of | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | Summer 2013 |
| Superintendent for Curriculum and | Efficiency | \$200,000 | | | |
| Instruction establish dates for "audit" of | Grant | match | | | |
| schools | | | | | |
| 4.A+Educators perform "audit" in 12 | Management | Part of | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | September |
| buildings | Efficiency | \$200,000 | | | 17, 18, 19, |
| - | Grant | match | | | 2013 |
| 4.ASCI and A+ Educators meet to | Management | Part of | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | September |
| determine next steps | Efficiency | \$200,000 | | | 19, 2013 |
| • | Grant | match | | | |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | ⊠ 3.1 □ 3.2 □ 3.3 □ 3.4 □ 3.5 | B. HEDI Rating: |
|---|--|--|
| | Tenet 3 as a whole NA | ☐H ☐E ☐D ☐I ☒NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | n the boxes below identify the major recommendation | (s) and source citation; if a need that is not |
| contained in a major recommendation but | is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should | d address the identified need within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | hy the need is being addressed. | |

| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | h the achievemen | t of the major reco | ommendation or identified need. | They should be v | vritten as |
|---|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | nt to the recomm | endation. | | | |
| 1. By January 2014, the district will provide electronic system which will store data and English language acquisition. | | | | - | |
| 2.By September 2013 investigate and imple progress, student learning progress, and aid | | | | chers to monitor | school |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| · | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.As soon as Title III is approved, | Title III | \$3120 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District level | By January |
| purchase appropriate ELLevation licenses | | | | | 2014 |
| 1.District will work with ELLevation to | General Fund | \$600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By January |
| exchange student data as necessary | | | | | 15, 2014 |
| 1.Provide professional development to | Title III | \$2130 | | District Level | By February |
| the ESL administrator and ESL staff | | | | | 15, 2014 |
| 2.Initiate discussions and contract | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | All 7 | July-August |
| negotiations with BOCES and Renaissance | | | | elementary | 2013 |
| Learning for STAR Enterprise in Early | | | | schools; In | |
| Literacy, Reading and Math, as well as | | | | Good | |

LEA BEDS Code__

14-26-01-03-0000

LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD

linkages to Infinite Campus for the 2013-

Standing

| 14 school year | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------|----------------------|------|-----------------|
| 2.Complete contracts and submit to | General fund | \$61,000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By September |
| Superintendent; determine costs for | | | | | 1, 2013 |
| program | | | | | |
| 2. Work will begin with district, BOCES and | General Fund | \$600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By September |
| Renaissance Learning to align with | | | | | 15, 2013 |
| Infinite Campus and set up classroom | | | | | |
| student lists | | | | | |
| 2.Hold meeting with elementary | General fund | \$150 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | July 31, 2013 |
| principals to develop a better | | | | | |
| understanding of the program and | | | | | |
| determine training (PD) dates/times | | | | | |
| 2.Hold meeting with BOCES personnel to | General Fund | \$150 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 13, |
| discuss possible training plan and further | | | | | 2013 |
| understanding of the program | | | | | |
| 2.Provide professional development to | General Fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 30, |
| elementary principals, and review the | | | | | 2013 |
| PPT that will be used with teachers for | | | | | |
| their introductory professional | | | | | |
| development | | | | | |
| 2.Set benchmark assessment | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By September |
| administration windows | | | | | 1, 2013 |
| 2.BOCES and principals will present PPT | General fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September 3- |
| as the initial PD for teachers | | | | | 4, 2013 |
| 2.Teachers will receive professional | Title IIA | \$11,500 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September |
| development regarding STARS (subs and | | | | | 16, 17, 18, 19, |
| trainer costs) | | | | | 20, 2013 |

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 | B. HEDI Rating: |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | ☐H ☐E ☐D ☐I ☒NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | n the boxes below identify the major recommendation(s) | and source citation; if a need that is not |

| contained in a major recommendation but and provide a strong rationale explaining w | - | | ed, the district should address the | e identified need | within the plan |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | | - | ommendation or identified need. | They should be v | vritten as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | int to the recomm | endation. | | | |
| 1.Provide financial support for activities in I | Focus Schools as in | ndicated in their SC | CEPS. | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.KW SCEP 3.1 Best practices | General Fund | \$1900 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 3.2 PD calendar and action | General fund | \$1900 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| plan | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 3.3 PD for higher order | General fund | \$3570 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| thinking | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 3.5 DIT and actions | General fund | \$2200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 3.5 Data analysis/classroom | General fund | \$60 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |

| IFA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD |
|------------|--------------------------------------|
| LLA Maille | Refillible-Town of Tollawalida Of 3D |

| IFΔ | BEDS | Code | |
|-----|-------------|------|--|
| | ひしひろ | Coue | |

14-26-01-03-0000

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | | 4.34.4 vhole | 4.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| C Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | | ior recommendation(s) and source | | | | | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale : In the boxes below identify the major recommendation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan | | | | | | | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed. | | | | | | | | | |
| | • | - | as D) and SOD 2.2 (HED) rating E) | the district will in | ntagrata | | | | |
| Per the Kenmore West School Review with District Oversight SOP 3.3 (HEDI rating D) and SOP 3.2 (HEDI rating E), the district will integrate literacy throughout all subject areas through the work of the Building Literacy Facilitators. | | | | | | | | | |
| meracy imoughout an subject areas imoug | The work of the i | Bullating Effectively 1 | demeators. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with the achievement of the major recommendation or identified need. They should be written as | | | | | | | | | |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | ant to the recomm | endation. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Create a professional development plan and publish the 2013-14 calendar by September 2013 that incorporates the principles of the CCLS | | | | | | | | | |
| Literacy Across the Disciplines. | | | | | | | | | |
| | = | | | | | | | | |
| 2.During the 2013-14 school year, Building Literacy Facilitators will deliver, through the use of the professional development plan and calendar, | | | | | | | | | |
| clearly defined processes and guidelines so that 100% of staff and administration can be aware of and effectively evaluate their involvement/role | | | | | | | | | |
| in building knowledge of the CCLS and the implementation of Literacy Across the Disciplines. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 By Sentember 2013, each school and dist | rict denartment wi | Il establish a proce | ess to review progress toward incr | eased student ac | hievement as | | | | |
| 3.By September 2013, each school and district department will establish a process to review progress toward increased student achievement as indicated in their Instructional Improvement Plan (IIP), which is based on data, conclusion statements, root causes, instructional implications, | | | | | | | | | |
| priorities, and action plans. | | | | | | | | | |
| , | <i> </i> | | | | | | | | |
| 4.By December 20, 2013, engage the staff of the two Focus Schools to process the School Performance Scan survey data, and make recommendations for collaborative work regarding areas in need of improvement. | | | | | | | | | |
| - | F. Fund | G. District | | I Targatad | J. Timeline: | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | H. Improvement/Parent Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | I. Targeted Schools: | Identify the | | | | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | | | | |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | | | | |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | | | | |
| to which they correspond. | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to | | | | |
| | will be used for | source. | app. opriate box below. | and their | include a start | | | | |
| | 50 0500 101 | 1000.00. | l | | oraac a start | | | | |

| | Alexander de la Constitución | | | : d = ±: f' 1 ' - | and and det |
|---|------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| 10 11 11 | activity. | 21/2 | | 5 | 6/5/40 |
| 1.Convene the Literacy Steering | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District level | 6/5/13 |
| Committee | | 4 | | | |
| 1.Committee will review and finalize prior | General fund | \$550 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 6/5-7/24/13 |
| Vision/Mission/and Building Literacy | | | | | |
| Facilitator (BLF) role descriptions with | | | | | |
| regard to CCLS | | , | | | <u> </u> |
| 1.Committee will submit posting to | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 7/24/13 |
| Human Resources for release | | | | | |
| 1.Principals will email staff announcing | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By 8/1/13 |
| BLF postings, Vision and Mission | | | | | |
| 1.Committee will secure rooms for the | General Fund | \$60 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | By 8/1/13 |
| year | | | | | |
| 1.Calendar will be published to all staff | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By 8/1/13 |
| via email | | | | | |
| 2.Identify 2 BLF (approval by BOE for | Title II A | \$28,800 | | District Level | By 9/13/13 |
| stipend) and Literacy Team members per | | | | | |
| building – stipend is to pay for their role | | | | | |
| in providing PD to all staff in buildings | | | | | |
| throughout the year | | | | | |
| 2.BLFs will schedule and conduct a | Title IIA | Part of above | | District Level | By 9/15/13 |
| minimum of two (four recommended) | | stipends | | | |
| hour-long faculty meetings regarding | | | | | |
| Literacy across the Disciplines | | | | | |
| 2.Hold first BLF meeting to explain | General Fund | \$100 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 9/17/13 |
| Mission and BLF roles (stipend), review | | | | | |
| timeline | | | | | |
| 2.Administrators plan for 10/22 Summit | General Fund | \$100 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 9/23/13 |
| BLF planning meeting | | | | | |
| 2.Hold BLF Summit planning meeting | General Fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 10/9/13 |
| (CCLS, Instructional Coaching | | | | | |
| development) | | | | | |
| | 1 | i | 1 | 1 | i |

| 2.Hold District Literacy Summit with | General Fund | \$400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 10/22/13 |
|--|--------------|--------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Building Literacy Teams, provide PD | | | | | |
| aligned with CCLS | | | | | |
| 2.Administrators plan for Spring Summit | General Fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 2/11/14 |
| BLF Planning Meeting | | | | | |
| 2. Hold BLF Spring Summit planning | General Fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 2/26/14 |
| meeting (CCLS, Instructional Coaching | | | | | |
| development) | | | | | |
| 2.Hold Spring District Literacy Summit | General Fund | \$400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 3/6/14 |
| with Building Literacy Teams, provide PD | | | | | |
| aligned with CCLS | | | | | |
| 2.Summer Institute Planning Meeting | General Fund | \$400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 3/20/13 |
| | | | | | |
| 2. District Literacy Steering committee | General Fund | \$600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | 5/29/13 |
| will review work; Summer Institute | | | | | |
| Planning | | | | | |
| 3.Each school and district department will | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | All schools (2 | No later than |
| submit their draft IIP to the Assistant | | | | Focus, 10 | 7/15/13 |
| Superintendent for C & I | | | | good | |
| | | | | standing) and | |
| | | | | district | |
| | | | | departments | |
| 3.The ASCI will review and provide | General Fund | \$1400 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | No later than |
| feedback to all principals and Curriculum | | | | | 8/30/13 |
| Learning Specialists regarding the plan | | | | | |
| consistency with the new template and | | | | | |
| requirements such as progress | | | | | |
| monitoring and modifying instruction | | | | | |
| 3.Revised plans will submitted to ASCI | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | No later than |
| · | | | | | 9/15/13 |
| 3.Principals and CLSs will initiate the | General fund | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | 9/15/13 |
| implementation of the IIP, monitoring | | | | | through May |
| progress through summative and | | | | | 2014 |
| formative assessments, and discussing | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |

1. Provide financial support for activities in Focus Schools as indicated in their SCEPS.

| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.KW SCEP 4.2 Student Learning Plans | General Fund | \$110 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 4.2 Student engagement/tri- | General fund | \$1600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| state | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 4.3 CCLS/differentiated | General fund | \$1350 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| instruction | | | | - Focus School | |
| 1.KW SCEP 4.4 NFJC | General fund | \$130 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 4.4 Student cultural café | General fund | \$1675 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |

| LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD LEA BEDS Code 14-26-01-03-000 | LEA Name K | Cenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | LEA BEDS Code | 14-26-01-03-0000 |
|---|------------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
|---|------------|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|

Tenet 5

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 5.1 5.2 | 5.3 5.4 | 5.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | Tenet 5 as a w | | | HED | | | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but | is aligned to the 6 | s tenets is identifie | ed, the district should address the | e identified need | within the plan | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | h the achievement | t of the major reco | mmendation or identified need. | They should be w | ritten as | | | |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | nt to the recomme | endation. | | | | | | |
| 1.By September 4, 2013, all teachers of both addressing issues of cultural relevancy. | h of the district Foo | cus High Schools w | ill have participated in three hour | s of professional | development | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: | | | |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the | | | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | | | |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | | | |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | | | |
| , , | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to | | | |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start | | | |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. | | | |
| | of each | | | status. | | | | |
| | activity. | | | status. | | | | |
| 1.A meeting will held between the district | General Fund | \$130 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | August 5, | | | |
| Director for Special Education and | | | | and Kenmore | 2013 | | | |
| representatives from the National | | | | West - Focus | | | | |
| Federation for Just Communities (NFJC) | | | | schools | | | | |
| to plan for an Opening Day workshop to | | | | 00.100.0 | | | | |
| be conducted at both the district's High | | | | | | | | |
| Schools | | | | | | | | |
| 1.Each High School Principal collects | General Fund | \$300 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | August 7-16, | | | |
| demographic information regarding the | | 1 - 2 - 2 | | | 2013 | | | |

| LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------|----------------------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| teachers in their buildings to be shared with NFJC as they prepare for the workshops | | | | | | |
| 1.A three hour Professional Development workshop consisting of teachers divided into 9 groups will held at each High School and is delivered by NFJC addressing issues of cultural relevancy | IDEA section 611 CEIS funds | \$10,800 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | September 3, 2013 | |
| 1.Next steps – both High School Principals will meet with NFJC reps | General Fund | \$\$200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | October 9, 2013 | |
| Tenet 5 | | | | | | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 Tenet 5 as a whole NA B. HEDI Rating: H E D I NA | | | | | | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: In the boxes below identify the major recommendation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with the achievement of the major recommendation or identified need. They should be written as specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant to the recommendation. | | | | | | |
| 1.By September 30, 2013, four elementary schools will formally launch a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program in their building. This process will provide professional development to 100% of the staff in the foundations of PBIS for implementation in the 2013-2014 school year. This will become a foundation for future expansion to the district's other elementary, middle and high school buildings. | | | | | | |
| 2. By December 31, 2013, three elementary schools, three middle schools and two high schools will have adopted and begun the process of developing plans for the introduction of PBIS to their skills with a formal program launch to take place in September 2014. | | | | | | |

3.By May 30, 2014, all seven elementary schools, three middle schools, and two high schools will purchase signage and rewards to further equip

and prepare for the PBIS program that they will initiate or be continuing in the 2014-15 school year.

| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions that will take place in order to achieve the identified goal(s). Number the activities to match the number of the goal to which they correspond. | F. Fund Source(s): Identify all Federal, State, and Local fund sources that will be used for the completion of each activity. | G. District Cost(s): Identify the district cost associated with each fund source. | H. Improvement/Parent Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If the activity satisfies one of the mandated set-aside requirements check the appropriate box below. | I. Targeted Schools: Identify the school(s) targeted by each activity and their identification status. | J. Timeline: Identify the projected timeline for each activity which is to include a start and end date. |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1.Initiate professional development for the teachers from each of the four buildings by having each teacher participate in one of five PBIS training workshops through Erie 1 BOCES. | General Fund | \$1080 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | Edison, Holmes, Lindbergh, Franklin Elementary schools, all good standing | July – August 2013 |
| 1.Conduct a half-day "kick-off" training and unveiling of the building implementation plan for PBIS | General Fund | \$648 | ☑Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | September 3, 2013 |
| 1.Send an introductory letter to all parents of students in each school that introduces the PBIS model that the school will be using | General Fund | \$1200 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | By September 30, 2013 |
| 2.Conduct a three-hour introductory professional development session for the PBIS model to the principals and teacher leaders from three elementary, three middle, and two high schools | General Fund | \$2854 | ⊠Improvement □PE □NA | Hoover, Hamilton, Roosevelt Elementary; Hoover, Franklin, Kenmore Middle (all six in good standing); | July 31, 2013 |

2. Principals in each of these schools in

conjunction with their Teacher Leaders

will implement professional development for the faculty of their schools to elicit their interest and determination to bring PBIS to their school that will be followed

one elementary and one middle school Elementary 611 2014 will expand their plans for improved and Hoover building signage and enhancement of Middle their planned PBIS rewards program schools (good standing) Improvement PE NA 3. The Teacher Leaders and Principal of **IDEA Section** \$27,000 Hamilton, By May 31, two elementary, two middle, and two 611 Hoover 2014 high schools will (upon an affirmative Elementary; building vote) expand their plans for Hoover, improved building signage and Franklin, enhancement of their planned PBIS Kenmore rewards program Middle schools (good

| LEA Name Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD | | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | standing); | Ī |
| | | | | Kenmore East | |
| | | | | and Kenmore | |
| | | | | West HS | |
| | | | | (Focus | |
| | | | | schools) | |
| | | | | 301100137 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Tenet 5 | | | |
| | | | | _ | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 5.1 5.2 | | 5.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | |
| | Tenet 5 as a v | | | | □I⊠NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | | • | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but | • | | ed, the district should address the | identified need | within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | hy the need is bei | ng addressed. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | th the achievemen | t of the maior reco | ommendation or identified need. | Thev should be w | vritten as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | | - | | , | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 Descride financial apparent for activities in | Facus Cabaala aa in | dianta din thair CC | T.D.C | | |
| 1.Provide financial support for activities in a E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| _ | and Local fund | associated with | | • • | |
| to which they correspond. | sources that | each fund | requirements check the | targeted by each activity | each activity which is to |
| | will be used for | | appropriate box below. | and their | include a start |
| | | source. | | identification | |
| | the completion | | | | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |

| 1.KW SCEP 5.2 Dean of Discipline, | General fund | \$645 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------|----------------------|--------------|----------|
| Advisor/student | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 5.2 IST/RTI | General fund | \$650 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 5.3.2 Character Ed | General fund | \$1000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KE SCEP 5.4 Safety Committee | General fund | \$800 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East | See SCEP |
| | | | | – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |
| 1.KW SCEP 5.5 IST | General fund | \$175 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore | See SCEP |
| | | | | West – Focus | |
| | | | | School | |

| LFA Name | Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| LLA Namic | Kellillore Town of Tollawalida of 3D |

| LEA BEDS | Code |
|----------|------|
|----------|------|

14-26-01-03-0000

Tenet 6

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | ⊠6.1 | ☐6.3 ☐6.4 ☐ | 6.5 | B. HEDI Rating: | ∏I ⊠NA | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | | | or recommendation(s) and source | | | | |
| contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan | | | | | | | |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining w | - | | | | F - | | |
| | , | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment wit | h the achievement | t of the major reco | mmendation or identified need. | They should be w | ritten as | | |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and releva | nt to the recomme | endation. | | | | | |
| | 1.As requested by parents and as a result of a communication tools study last year, initiate a school messaging system that interacts with our Student Information System for attendance monitoring and email/voicemail notification for weather and broadcast messages by December 30, 2013 | | | | | | |
| 2. By September 30, 2013, 100% of high schestablish open communication and reciprocoprogress toward meeting graduation requir | al communication | between the scho | ol, students, and their families in t | • | | | |
| 3.By December 20, 2013, collect, analyze, and report High School family perception survey results so that families may be more involved in their children's education and that the home/school partnership is promoted. | | | | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: | | |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the | | |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected | | |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for | | |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity | | |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to | | |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start | | |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. | | |
| | of each | | | status. | | | |

| | activity. | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------|----------------------|--|---|
| 1.Select messaging system from tools evaluated in 2012-13 | General fund | \$150 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | By July 1, 2013 |
| 1.Secure contract with Shoutpoint and integration with Infinite Campus Messenger with Voice through Monroe BOCES | General fund | \$9000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | By July 15, 2013 |
| 1.Coordinate technology systems of Shoutpoint and Infinite Campus | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By September 30, 2013 |
| 1.Provide notification to parents through the website and newsletters that system has been activated | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | October 2013 |
| 1.Provide PD to parents through the creation of a PowerPoint presentation and a PDF manual | General Fund | \$375 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | October 2013 |
| 2.Purchase Naviance through Erie 1 BOCES | General Fund | \$9000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | Kenmore East and Kenmore West – Focus Schools | July 1, 2013 |
| 2.Provide initial professional development to high school counselors in Naviance program for ½ day at each school | General fund | \$405 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | Between September 23 and October 4, 2013 |
| 2.Provide ongoing professional development for each of the 10 school counselors for at least five hours throughout the school year | General Fund | \$810 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | October 2013-May 2014 |
| 2.Provide notification to students and their families to open communication between the school and home regarding planning for college and career readiness | General fund | \$108 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By November 15, 2013 |
| 2.Develop and provide professional development to students and parents in the Naviance program | General Fund | \$540 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | same | No later than December 1, 2013 |

| LEA NameKenmore-Town of Tonawanda | UFSD | LEA BEDS Code_ | 14-26-01-03-0000 | | |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 2.Open Naviance "portal" to parents and students, providing all parents and students access to and training in using an active account for ongoing parent engagement with counselors | General fund | \$10,310 | ☐Improvement ☑PE ☐NA | same | No Later than December 1, 2013 |
| 3.Administer the electronic Community/Family engagement survey to all parents in the two High Schools | General fund | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Kenmore East and Kenmore West - Focus schools | 9/16-10/4 2014 |
| 3. Solicit representative parents to participate in the World Café in each HS | General fund | \$200 | ☐Improvement ☑PE ☐NA | same | By October 11, 2013 |
| 3.Principal/ ASCI, and OEE meet to review data and determine trends | General fund | \$600 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | same | By October 21, 2013 |
| 3.Hold the World Café in each HS | General fund | \$7000 | ☐Improvement ☑PE ☐NA | same | October 22 and 23, 2013 |
| 3.HS principals meet and work with parents to develop plans, strategies and structures to address the needs as identified in the surveys and World Café determinations | General fund | \$2000 | □Improvement ☑PE □NA | same | By December 20, 2013 |
| | | Tenet 6 | | | |
| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | | | 6.5 | | □ I ⊠ NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: contained in a major recommendation but and provide a strong rationale explaining w | is aligned to the | 6 tenets is identifi | • | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with | th the achievemen | at of the major rec | ommandation or identified pand | Thou should be y | uritton as |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with | in the achievemer | it of the major rec | ommendation or identified need | i. Triey should be v | vritten as |

specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant to the recommendation.

- 1.Implement the second phase of the Intra-District Consolidation Study by holding public focus group and community meetings regarding the final report of the consultant study team; continue to encourage community involvement and engagement through work sessions, surveys, faculty/community information sessions throughout the 2013-14 school year.
- 2. Implement a "listening session" meeting with a BOE member, an administrative member, and key community members to dialogue about pressing district issues, to be held once per month during the 2013-14 school year.
- 3. The district will provide a room for the PTSA, and participate in the monthly PTSA meetings to increase parental engagement regarding important issues during the 2013-14 school year.

| important issues during the 2013-14 school | yeur. | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions | F. Fund | G. District | H. Improvement/Parent | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
| that will take place in order to achieve | Source(s): | Cost(s): | Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If | Schools: | Identify the |
| the identified goal(s). Number the | Identify all | Identify the | the activity satisfies one of the | Identify the | projected |
| activities to match the number of the goal | Federal, State, | district cost | mandated set-aside | school(s) | timeline for |
| to which they correspond. | and Local fund | associated with | requirements check the | targeted by | each activity |
| | sources that | each fund | appropriate box below. | each activity | which is to |
| | will be used for | source. | | and their | include a start |
| | the completion | | | identification | and end date. |
| | of each | | | status. | |
| | activity. | | | | |
| 1.Hold a Focus Group meeting, led by the | General fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | June 8, 2013 |
| SES Study Team. Broad-based | | | | | |
| community/staff input session rank- | | | | | |
| ordering scenarios while discussing | | | | | |
| aspects. Additional thoughts will be | | | | | |
| noted | | | | | |
| 1.Community receives the final SES | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | By July 10, |
| reports including Focus Group summary | | | | | 2013 |
| and information (posted on website) | | | | | |
| 1.Hold Special BOE meeting with Focus | General Fund | \$3525 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | Same | July 23, 2013 |
| Group to thank them and discuss final | | | | | |
| report. Provide hard copies of final report | | | | | |
| to Focus group and attending community | | | | | |
| members | | | | | |

| _ | 1 | | | 1 |
|--------------|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| General fund | \$230 | │ | Same | July 25, 2013 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| General fund | \$210 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | August 6, |
| | | | | 2013 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | 9/10, 10/8, |
| | | | | 11/12, 12/10 |
| | | | | 2013 |
| N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | Fall 2013 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| General Fund | \$500 | ☐Improvement ☑PE ☐NA | Same | Fall 2013 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | By December |
| | | | | 20, 2013 |
| | | | | |
| General Fund | \$300 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | January 2014 |
| | | | | |
| N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | Same | February |
| | | | | 2014 |
| General Fund | \$1500 | ☐Improvement ☑PE ☐NA | District Level | April-June |
| | | | | 2014 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | N/A N/A General Fund General Fund N/A | General fund \$210 N/A N/A N/A N/A General Fund \$500 General Fund \$2000 N/A N/A | General fund \$210 | General fund \$210 |

| implementation | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------|----------------------|----------------|--|
| 2.The BOE President invites key community members to participate in a Listening Session to dialogue about key district issues | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | July 29, 2013 |
| 2.Calendar of Listening Session meetings is created and distributed | N/A | N/A | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☒NA | District Level | August 6, 2013 |
| 2.Listening Session meetings are held on a monthly basis from 7-9 PM | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | 9/9, 10/7, 11/4, 12/2, 1/6, 2/3, 3/3, 4/7, 5/5, 6/2 |
| 3. Supply a space for the PTSA to house materials and hold meetings | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | 7/1/13 |
| 3.One Central Office administrator will attend each monthly meeting of the PTSA to engage in dialogue regarding key district issues. | General Fund | \$2000 | ☐Improvement ☐PE ☐NA | District Level | First Monday of each month |

Tenet 6

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 6.5 | B. HEDI Rating: |
|---|---|--|
| | ☑Tenet 6 as a whole ☐NA | ☐H ☐E ☐D ☐I ☒NA |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: | In the boxes below identify the major recomm | endation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not |
| contained in a major recommendation bu | t is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the distr | ict should address the identified need within the plan |
| and provide a strong rationale explaining | why the need is being addressed. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | ith the achievement of the major recommendation | on or identified need. They should be written as |
| specific, measurable, attainable, and relev | ant to the recommendation. | |

share

- Focus

School

Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda UFSD Focus District Team - Update

September 24, 2013

Agenda

- Introductions New Members
- Purpose
- Review of Requirements of a Focus District
- Since We Last Met
- What is New in the Template
- Today's Work
- Next Steps

Introductions

| Role | Name |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Superintendent | Mark Mondanaro |
| Assistant Superintendent | Janet Gillmeister |
| Director Student Services | Robin Zymroz |
| Director Accountability | Barbara Battaglia |
| Principal* | Patrick Heyden |
| Teacher* | Jill Neuhaus |
| Teacher | Mary Patterson |
| Principal* | Dean Johnson |
| Teacher* | David Rogalski |
| Teacher | Charlie Panepinto |
| Counselor, HS | Judy Flateau |
| CLS Mental Health Professionals | Betty Sullivan |
| Principal, MS | Elaine Thomas |
| Counselor, MS | Tom Schwob |
| Parent | Mary Piatek |
| Parent | Karen Whitelaw |
| Parent | Jill O'Malley |

Purpose

To fulfill the requirements of the Focus District Designation

Final Update of the District Comprehensive Improvement Plan

Review: Requirements of a Focus District

School IdentificationOEETrainingDTSDEOn-Site ReviewsDCIP/SCEP

Requirements Summary

- District identifies an Outside Educational Expert (OEE) if chooses; this year SED will be providing OEE for diagnostic review
- Select district personnel must attend SED training on the Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE)
- District must participate in on-site diagnostic reviews
- Each Focus School must develop a School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP)
- Each District must develop a District Comprehensive Improvement Plan (DCIP)

DTSDE Six Tenets: Big Ideas

District Leadership & Capacity

1.1 Recruiting, hiring and retaining human capital 1.2 Fiscal, facility and fiscal resources 1.3 District vision 1.4 Comprehensive professional development

1.5 Data-Driven

Culture

School Leadership Practices and Decisions

2.1 District support of school leader
2.2 School leader's vision
2.3 Systems and structures for school development
2.4 School leader's use of resources
2.5 Use of data and teacher and midmanagement

effectiveness

Curriculum Development and Support

3.1 District support concerning curriculum 3.2 Enacted curriculum 3.3 Units and lesson plans 3.4 Teacher collaboration 3.5 Use of data and action planning Teacher Practices and Decisions

4.1 District support of teachers
4.2 Instructional Practices and strategies
4.3 Comprehensive plans for teaching
4.4 Classroom environment and culture
4.5 Use of data, instructional practices and student learning

Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health

5.1 District support of student growth 5.2 Systems and partnerships 5.3 Vision for social and emotional developmental health 5.4 Safety 5.5 Use of data and student needs Family and Community Engagement

6.1 District support of family and community engagement 6.2 Welcoming environment 6.3 Reciprocal communication 6.4 Partnerships and responsibility 6.5 Use of data and families

DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SCHOOL AND DISTRICT EFFECTIVENESS

The overarching Tenet statement is located in this bo_X .

| rections and student-learning outcomes. | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Statements of Practice | Highly Sflective | Effective | Developing | Ineffective |
| Natement of Precision 8.2: The school leader and staff support and additions the quality implementation of rigorous and collewest controlls aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards CCLS) in Pre 8.42. | a) The school leader and staff provide screintent, systematic, and timely individualized and group professional development support to all teachers across goods and subjects to ensure that pertind decidings are made about the defining of the curticula. By the school leader footens a culture where teachers ensure that the implemented CCSS curticula are dynamic and address what students need to know in order for the school-wide goals to be achieved. d) The school uses cohesive and comprehensive curticula that include clear, descriptive units of studies aligned to the CCSS and consider what students need to know across all grades to become college- and careen-ready. | a) The school leader and staff provide consistent and systematic support to all beachers across grades and subjects aligned to rigorous and otherest cities durinals. b) The school leader and teachers work to ensure that the implemented curricula are aligned to the CCS. c) The school leader and comprehensive curricula that include char, descriptive units of studies aligned to standards and consider what students need toknow across all grades. | a) The school leader and staff provide curriculum support that does not target the expectations set forth in the CCLS. B) The school sealer and staff use of sumfouls thouses on standard that are not CCSI-aligned. d) The school uses curricula that consider standards and what students need to know. | a) The school leader and staff do not provide our fluidure support to beaches. b) The school leader and staff our fluids are stall and are not aligned to standards, d) The school has plans for teaching students t are not aligned to any standards. |
| Statement of Practice X.IX. Feachers ensure that unit and lesson plans that are aligned to the CCCS coherent cunfoulum introduce complex materials that climulate higher-order thinking and build deep sonceptual understanding and knowledge around specific context. | a) Teachers are supported so that their instructional expective is developed and numbered during regularly scheduled grade-level meetings, which are guided by targeted agendas based on student and school data to ensure that all unit plans across their grade/subject are aligned to the CCIS collevent curriculum and meet students' needs, the CCIS collevent curriculum and meet students' needs, content areas and dissess that expose students to a progression of sequenced and staffolded complex materials that need the learning needs of pertinent groups of students (i.e., special education and lingtish language learners) so that they are able to achieve at high condition that of the condition that content thirting skills in all groups of students and develop analytical, exhaulted and referred with condition traces by providing supports and extensions recreasing for student achievement. | a) Teachers formally participate in grade-level or other meetings to collaboratively oneste and examine coherent CCCS-aligned curriculum unit plans across their grade/subject. Of Teachers use CCCS-pacing calendars and unit plans across all grades, context areas and cleases that expose students to a progression of exponence complex materials. c) Teachers use CCCS-aligned lesson plans that promote higher-order thinking wills and help students analyte information. | a) Teachers formally participate in grade-level or other meeting opportunities to discuss unit plans across their grade-leuk-ject areas. By Teachers use unit plans in classes that expose students to materials aligned to their grade. c) Teachers use lesson plans that are aligned to standards. | a) Teachers meet informally and/or have nony or protocols for working on unit plans. It is trackers use grade/subject materials that a sligned to unit plans or pacing calendars. If Teachers do not consistently use lesson plan instruct students. |

15

| enet 2 - School Lander Predices and Decision | s: Visionary leaders create a school community and culture that lead to success | is State Education Department Diagnostic Tool for School and District well-being and high academic outcomes for all students via systems of | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Statements of Fraction Highly Effective Effective Developing Ineffective | | | | | | | |
| are call | a) the school community where and promotes a distinctive and nobust whom for student achievement and well-being and holds their accountable read community to realize this whom as cuttined in its CIP and advantable. It is also apported by staff, families and and income across the first thresholds and and income across the first thresholds and end income across the first thresholds and end income across the first thresholds and end income across the first thresholds and ensure and S are successful. | a) The school community shares a vision concerning student achievement and well-being and for how they want to work as a community to realize this visions a cuttimed in the CSP and other school improvement documents. b) The vision is created by a select group of staff and families and is supported by the school community such that it is uniformly seen, heard and known across the community. (I'the school community develops and works toward specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and timely goals that reflect priorities that are aligned with the vision. | a) The school community has a vision for student achievement and well-sing and is in the process of developing shared commensip. b) The vision created is gaining more support with the staff, families and students across the community. c) The school community develops and works toward specific, measurable, anothicus, restitic and timely goals, these goals are not priorities aligned to the vision. | a) The school community has a vision, but it is misalign student achievement and well-being based on the scho data. b) The vision is unknown and/or has not been shared with the staff, families and students across the community. b) The school community does not develop and work toward goals, or, if the community is working toward a they are not specific, measurable, antibitious, realistic a timely. | | | |
| atement of Practice 2.8: adam effectively use evidence-based stems to examine and improve includical and hook-wise practices in the orbital areas nutient achievement, cumfoulum 8 treather actions; leadership development; enrousing/family engagement, and student clair and emoclanal developmental health) at make progress toward mission-orbital ais. | a) The school leader models excellence in the creation and use of systems that are dynamic, adaptive and interconnected and lead to the collection and analysis of outcomes that will gold a cycle of continuous improvement and action. b) The school hader exposes and supports practices in all areas that impact a school and student progress and achievement that are self-generative, which include vincous feedback toops and examples of best practices that head to sustained high performance. if the school indeed creative—and, where appropriate, collaborates with cart and denilles to explicitly communicate—perthent school goals that are timely, transparent and widely available to all stakeholders and used by them to improve the quality of student life. | a) The school leader encourages the staff to use systems that are dynamic, adaptive, interconnected and lead to the collection and analysis of outcomes. By the school of the school is a second to by the school hader exposes and supports practices in areas that impact a school and student progress and achievement, which include feedback loops and examples of best practices connected to student achievement. c) The school leader communicates pertinent school goals that are timely, transparent and widely available to all stakeholders. | a) the softool leader encourages the staff to use systems that lead to the collection and analysis of outcomes. b) the softool leader expects staff to use text practices related to school and student progress and achievement. c) the softool leader is working on developing whool goals and putting steps into place to communicate them to all stakeholders. | a) the school leader does not encourage the staff to systems that lead to the collection and analysis of outcomes. b) The school leader expects the staff to use best pract both as not clearly articulated what and how those practices are, nor has the leader provided space for the staff to identify the best practices. c) Creating school goals is not a priority, or the school leader has not communicated the goals to the statisholders. | | | |
| element of Prestite 2.4: aden make strategic decisions to organize sources consensing human, programmatic of fiscal capital so that school improvement of student goals are advisced. | a) the school leader strategically recruits, blies (and, where the district makes the hiding decisions, the school leader ensures that the appropriate staff is assigned to the exhool and scatalins personnel. The leader also use partnerships with organizations to create a pool of between all extensed human capital that enables the school to creatively, equitally and being subject that exhibits and scalar leaders, and structures that afford students and teachers the additing to tally benefit from a feedble and foliageted program, which includes a creative extended learning time program that is aligned to student achievement. () The school leader consistently analyzes the fiscal capital available to the school leader consistently analyzes the fiscal capital available to the school leader consistently analyze the fiscal capital available to the school leader consistently profitcal and strategic decisions to find targeted efforts that are aligned to school-eide goals, and considers the needs of all students and staff members. | a) The school leader recruits, hires (and, where the district nuises the hiring decisions, the school leader ensures that the appropriate staff is seigned to the school) and sastains personnel that enable the school to need the associated and social needs of the stadents and school. (a) The school leader creates and uses generic systems and structures for programming stadents and teaches that address student achievement, and incorporates an extended learning the program. (I) the school hasder analyses the fiscal capital suitable to the school community to make funding decisions that address the school goals. | a) the school leader applies to hire, but has not taken the appropriate steps to secure personnel that will allow the school to meet the adademic and social needs of the students, where the district makes the hirting decident, the school hasder has not clearly articulated the school's needs. B) The school begin used to see that programming students and treathers that do not address the changing needs of scudent achievement. () The school sealer consider the fiscal capital available to the school community with the intent to connect it with school goals. | a) The school leader does not link the hiring of person with the need to ment the academic and social goals a students, and where the distinct makes the hiring deci- the school leader does not communicate with the dist about hiring needs. b) The school mader does not have established system attractions for programming students and trachers connected to student achievement. c) The school leader does not connect the use of fiscal capital and school goals. | | | |

J. Gillmeister 9/24/2013

| | All Statements of | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| *Tenet 4 - Teacher Prestitus and Decisions: Tea | chers engage in stretegic practices and decision-making in order to address t | Practice : | are whitehelds | ngagement, thinking and achievement. | | | |
| Statement of Practice Statement of Practice 4.3: Teachers use | Highly Stactive a) Teachers have a transparent, targeted plan that is informed by data | deconstructed | into sub- | ineffective a) Teachers do not have plans that are based on data. | | | |
| Instructional practices and strategies organized around annual, unit and daily lesson plans to meet established student goals and promote high levels of student engagement and inquiry. | (summative, interfin, attendance, (8%, NTSELAT, etc.), grade-level and school-wide goals for all groups of students. By Teaches use instructional practices and costagies that are aligned to plans and include accommodations for students with disabilities and linguistic needs of linguistic needs of linguistic needs of linguistic needs of linguistic needs in the product students to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions for all students of the provided timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions for all students. Grade timely and support of the provided timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions for all students. Grade timely appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely appropriate instructional interventions. The provided timely are supported to the provided timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions. The provided timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions and extendions to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions. | Ill groups on statements of I teachers use institute alignous on the statements of I teachers use institute aligned to plans and include of disabilities and linguistic reads finglish profitient students and plans instructional interventions to students. If teachers onese short- and long-term goals for students based on grade-level benchmarks. | practice on instructional interventions to (i) feathers' established goals for students are static and do not consider students' short- or long term progress. | b) Teachers use instructional practices and crossegies that are neither aligned to a plan nor provide instructional interventions to students. c) Teachers have not established short- or long-term goals for students. | | | |
| Statement of Practice 4.1: Teachers provide coherent, Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS)-based instruction that leads to multiple points of access for all students to achieve targeted goals. | a) Teachers one instructional practices that are systematic and explicit, based on expondial leach plans aligned to CDS confloatum maps to instruct students, leading to high levels of achievement. b) Treachers one data to provide students with a vide wafety of ways to engage in learning so that the students can achieve their targeted includual goals. | a) Teachers use instructional practices aligned to CCLS confoulum maps to instruct statems, leading to student achievement. b) Teachers provide students with a wide variety of ways to engage in learning that enable students to achieve includual guels. | a) Teachers use instructional practices that are aligned to standards but do not lead to increased student adherement. b) Teachers provide generic instruction to students that limits the ways in which students are able to access learning and achieve goals. | A) Treicher Instruction is incoherent and not based on any lesson plans. Id Yeachers' Instruction is not purposeful or adaptive. | | | |
| Statement of Practice 6-6: Teachers create a sale environment that is unturally responsive, tablaced to the tempths and meets of all students, and leads to high levels of student engagement and inquiry. | a) Teachers and students create environments by which students are often do and there is a common understanding of how one is treated, treate others and contributes to positive ministratements of behaviors by outing behavioral expectations that are explicitly taught. B) Teachers around the chool use of students that administrately diverse groups of students, provide access to learning and coolai opportunities, and encourage students to have a voice in their educational experience. B) Seathers and students officially and of thinking and questioning through the use of instructional materials that contain high levels of text and content complexity. | a) Teachers create environments by which there is a common understanding and recognition of acceptable and safe behaviors by using behavioral expectations that are equilibrit staglet. b) Teachers use strategies that are sensitive to diverse groups of students and their needs, which provide access to learning and social opportunities. d) Teachers stimulate student thinking by asking questions that relate to instructional materials that contain high levels of text and content complexity. | in) Teachers put forth a plan for acceptable student behaviors that is inconsistently exceptized by student. It is the teacher provide opportunities to acknowledge diverse groups of students. It is the teachers and operations that relate to generic instructional materials and foster a compilant disconoun environment. | a) Trachers do not have an established set of expectations for student behavior. b) Teacher's strongles are not sensitive to students' need and link! learning and social opportunities. c) Teachers ask lower-order thinking questions that do not garner student engagement. | | | |

On-Site Diagnostic Reviews

Types of Reviews

State-Led Reviews

The following reviews will be conducted by the Integrated Intervention Team:

- District level reviews.
- Review of Priority Schools that will implement a whole school reform model beginning in 2013-2014.
- Reviews of selected schools that are receiving a 1003(g) School Improvement Grants.
- Reviews of a sample of Focus Schools within each Focus District (at least one elementary/middle school and one high school, if each type is identified).

District-Led Reviews

The following reviews will be conducted by a district-led school review team:

- Focus and Priority Schools that are not reviewed by an Integrated Intervention Team.
- Optional: Districts may want to consider conducting mock DTSDE reviews in other schools within the district so that all schools within the district become familiar with the DTSDE rubric and concepts.

Focus LEA Fiscal Requirements

- Title Parent Involvement \$11,549 to be used in Title Schools only
- ▶ Title Parent Engagement \$11,549 since Focus schools are NOT Title I buildings, the LEA must identify the 1% from other sources.
- School Improvement \$72,259

Since We Last Met

>>> Action Updates

What is New in the Template

Quick comparison – new philosophy of development

New Template

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 | 1.5 | | B. HEDI Rating: | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Tenet 1 as a whole | NA | | HEDINA | |
| C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: In the recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is the need is being addressed. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| D. Goal(s): Must be in direct alignment with the a and relevant to the recommendation. | chievement of the ma | jor recommendation | or identified need. They should be writ | ten as specific, meas | urable, attainable, |
| 1. | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | |
| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions that will take place in order to achieve the identified goal(s). Number the activities to match the number of the goal to which they correspond. | F. Fund Source(s): Identify all Federal, State, and Local fund sources that will be used for the completion of each activity. | G. District Cost(s): Identify the district cost associated with each fund source. | H. Improvement/Parent Engagement Set-Aside(PE): If the activity satisfies one of the mandated set-aside requirements check the appropriate box below. | I. Targeted Schools: Identify the school(s) targeted by each activity and their identification status. | J. Timeline: Identify the projected timeline for each activity which is to include a start and end date. |
| | | | Improvement PE NA | | |
| | | | Improvement PE NA | | |
| | | | Improvement PE NA | | |

Example

| A. Statement of Practice Addressed | 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 | B. HEDI Rating: |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| | Tenet 3 as a whole NA | HEDINA |

C. Major Recommendation(s)/Rationale: In the boxes below identify the major recommendation(s) and source citation; if a need that is not contained in a major recommendation but is aligned to the 6 tenets is identified, the district should address the identified need within the plan and provide a strong rationale explaining why the need is being addressed.

Per the Kenmore West School Review with District Oversight SOP 3.2 (HEDI rating E) and SOP 3.3 (HEDI rating D), the district curriculum maps (including units and sample lesson plans) will continue to be updated to reflect the CCLS in ELA and Math, and PD offered in translating CCLS into rigorous practice.

- **D. Goal(s):** Must be in direct alignment with the achievement of the major recommendation or identified need. They should be written as specific, measurable, attainable, and relevant to the recommendation.
- **1.** By July 2014, a maximum of six Curriculum Learning Specialists (teachers) will have attended the Network Team Institute sessions in Albany, representing K-12 ELA and Math, in order to turn-key information regarding the CCLS Curriculum modules.
- **2.** During the 2013-14 school year, we will increase the number of teachers who will pilot the ELA and math curriculum modules from 18 to at least 40.
- **3.**By June 2014, ELA and Math Curriculum maps will be again updated in NYLearns to reflect the new information regarding CCLS, regarding new information form SED and the COII curriculum projects.
- **4.** Through the recently approved QZAB, enter discussion with our match partner, A+ Educators, regarding professional development opportunities that accomplish the goals set forth in the Recommended Deliverables Proposal and the Professional Services Agreement for 2013-2016. (Cross Lipased work location, PD modules for SDC, job-embedded PD in CCLS, resources, etc.)

Example page 2

| E. Activity(ies): Must detail the actions that will | F. Fund Source(s): | G. District Cost(s): | H. Improvement/Parent Engagement | I. Targeted | J. Timeline: |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| take place in order to achieve the identified goal(s). | Identify all Federal, | Identify the district | Set-Aside(PE): If the activity satisfies | Schools: | Identify the |
| Number the activities to match the number of the | State, and Local | cost associated | one of the mandated set-aside | Identify the | projected |
| goal to which they correspond. | fund sources that | with each fund | requirements check the appropriate | school(s) targeted | timeline for each |
| | will be used for the | source. | box below. | by each activity | activity which is |
| | completion of each | | | and their | to include a start |
| | activity. | | | identification | and end date. |
| | | | | status. | |
| 1. Representative Curriculum Learning Specialists | General Fund | \$3,500 | Improvement PE NA | District Level | 7/8-12/13 |
| will register and attend the NYS Network Team | RTTT | \$20,000 | | | 11/12-15/13 |
| Institute in Albany as members of the Network | | | | | 2/4-7/14 |
| Team Equivalent Level 1 Team. | | | | | 5/13-16/14 |
| | | | | | 7/7-11/14 |
| 1.Information will be turn-keyed to the Elementary | General Fund | Not able to | Improvement PE NA | District Level | 9/4/13, 11/5/13, |
| and Secondary ELA and Math Committees, | | calculate; part of | | | and after each |
| Department and Grade Level Chairpersons, Building | | job duties | | | Institute |
| Literacy Teams; Professional Development will be | | | | | |
| held on the Superintendent's Conference Days | | | | | |
| 2.ELA (Secondary and Elementary) and Math | General Fund | Not able to | Improvement PE NA | District Level | By September 30, |
| (Secondary) Curriculum Learning Specialists will | | calculate; part of | | | 2013 |
| solicit additional teachers to pilot the curriculum | | job duties | | | |
| modules during the 2013-14 school year. | | | | | |
| 2.The district will schedule a two-day professional | Management | \$21,000 | Improvement PE NA | District Level | 8/28-29/13 |
| development opportunity for interested grades 3-8 | Efficiency Grant | | | | |
| ELA teachers with Expeditionary Learning, to give | | | | | |
| first-hand training the CCLS curriculum modules. | | | | | |
| 2.The Elementary and Secondary ELA Curriculum | General Fund | \$2,000 | Improvement PE NA | District Level | September – |
| Learning Specialists will provide follow-up | | | | | December 2013 |
| professional development through the Staff | | | | | |
| Development Center del | | | | | |

Today's Work

>>> What needs to be done....

Today's Work

- Work in small groups to discuss the documents that were previously sent
- Provide input for consideration

Next Steps

>>> What is left to be done?

Next Steps

- Complete and submit the 1003a grant for the DTSDE training and OEE costs - postmark by September 30, 2013 (submitted 9/23/13)
- Submission of the DCIP and SCEPs to the Board of Education for approval – Meeting September 30, 2013
- Submission of the three plans to SED