



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District

Table of Contents

Contents

District Contact Information 3

Section I – District Description..... 3

Section II – Academic Performance 4

Section III – District Schools Profile 8

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 9

Section V – Monitoring History 9

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 10

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 13

 Preparation 13

 Recruitment and Placement 14

 Induction and Mentoring..... 14

 Evaluation 15

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 16

 Performance Management 18

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 20

 Other 21

 Issues of Equity..... 21

 Sustainability..... 22

Section VIII – Methodology 23

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Randy Squire	Kerry Houlihan
Phone	(518) 731-1729	(518) 731-1776
Email	rsquier@coxsackie-athens.org	khoulihan@coxsackie-athens.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: March 4, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Upper Hudson	Questar III BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
1481	383	83	8	153	586

Racial/Ethnic Origin					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
0	4	4	1	91	0

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
94	5

Teacher Qualifications				
# Teachers	Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate	Percent Teaching Out of Certification	Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience	Turnover Rate all Teachers
120	1	2	20	15

Need Status
Average Need District

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: March 4, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	60	13	None tested	53
3(2012-13)	23	0	None tested	6
4(2011-12)	61	8	n<5	48
4(2012-13)	24	0	0	15
5(2011-12)	54	0	n<5	41
5(2012-13)	15	0	n<5	7
6(2011-12)	62	14	n<5	36
6(2012-13)	29	0	n<5	16
7(2011-12)	54	0	None tested	35
7(2012-13)	31	0	n<5	12
8(2011-12)	55	15	None tested	33
8(2012-13)	41	0	None tested	33
District Wide (2011-12)	57	9	n<5	41
District Wide (2012-13)	27	0	Not available (n<5)	16

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	60	13	None tested	43
3(2012-13)	28	9	None tested	18
4(2011-12)	69	17	n<5	59
4(2012-13)	38	11	0	25
5(2011-12)	56	10	n<5	37

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

5(2012-13)	26	0	n<5	16
6(2011-12)	71	29	n<5	50
6(2012-13)	30	0	n<5	20
7(2011-12)	61	0	None tested	52
7(2012-13)	18	0	n<5	2
8(2011-12)	52	8	None tested	23
8(2012-13)	21	0	None tested	10
District Wide (2011-12)	61	14	n<5	44
District Wide (2012-13)	27	3	Not available (n<5)	15

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	89	55	n<5	79
4(2012-13)	93	44	0	92
8(2011-12)	90	55	None tested	81
8(2012-13)	89	50	None tested	89
District Wide (2011-12)	89	55	n<5	80
District Wide (2012-13)	91	47	None tested	91

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	86	33	44	0
Integrated Algebra	70	7	29	0
Geometry	71	22	0	0
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	78	34	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	75	29	21	0
U.S. History and Government	89	53	50	17
Living Environment	93	47	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physical Earth	70	26	33	7
Physical Setting/Chemistry	87	10	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physics	100	67	0	0

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	88	25	84	45
SWD	56	0	53	0
ELL	None tested	None tested	None tested	None tested

ED	90	12	79	32
-----------	----	----	----	----

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	89	16	87	23
SWD	50	0	47	7
ELL	None tested	None tested	None tested	None tested
ED	88	2	89	13

2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)					
	n Tested	Percent of students scoring in each performance level:			
		Beg.	Int.	Ad.	Prof.
Kindergarten					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
First Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Second Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Sixth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Eighth Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	-	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	144	85	138	83
Students With Disabilities	18	n<30	14	n<30
Limited English Proficient	0	n<30	0	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	41	83	36	75

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2011-12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities

- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary- Level ELA – All Students
- Secondary- Level ELA – White
- Secondary-Level Math – White

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities

Section III – District Schools Profile

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

Most current information as of: June 30, 2014

District Name	Superintendent	Time of Service	Status	# of Students (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers (12-13)	# of Teachers (13-14)
Coxsackie-Athens Central Schools	Randall Squier	2011-now	Original	1436	1420	4P 1 AP	4P 1 AP	120	118

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (13-14)	# of Students (14-15)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Admin (14-15)	# of Teachers (13-14)	# of Teachers (14-15)
Edward J Arthur	Jim Martino	2009-now	Original	K-4	240	236	1 P	1P	23	23
Coxsackie Elementary	Karen Miller	2012-now	Original	K-4	255	263	1 P	1 P	24	24
Coxsackie-Athens Middle School	David Proper	2010-now	Original	5-8	435	420	1P .5 AP	1 P .5 AP	32	32
Coxsackie-Athens High School	Heath Hanley	2011-now	Original	9-12	445	430	1 P .5 AP	1 P .5 AP	36	35

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
Current APPR Plan: http://usny.nysed.gov/rtt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/coxsackie-athens-appr-plan.pdf Most current version as of: January 8, 2013

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
Teacher	Principal
Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)	Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

Teacher Evaluation (2012-13)				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State-provided growth or other comparable measures	Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth	Other measures of teaching effectiveness
Highly-Effective	74	69	89	59
Effective	25	18	9	40
Developing	1	9	2	1
Ineffective	0	3	0	0

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

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	May 30, 2013

2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by July 15, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	August 23, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Courtney Jablonski, Project Coordinator	December 12, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call	April Marsh, Project Assistant	April 14, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2014
2013 -14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	Robert Husain, Project Assistant	July 22, 2014

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile

Source: District STLE Grant Application, interim reports, and year end final reports.

General Grant Information			
STLE #	Funding Amount	Implementation Dates	Individual or Consortium
5545-13-0010	\$191,250	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. Preparation – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and IHEs and/or other eligible partner: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>
2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>
3. Induction and Mentoring – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: <i>The district created the position of master teacher to help in the mentoring of teachers in need of improvement, new hires, or self-identifying as in need of help.</i>
4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>The district initiated the development of a data dashboard and online testing program to further improve implementation of the district’s Annual Professional Performance Review Plan.</i>
5. Professional Development/Growth- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>The district offered stipends for master teachers who provide embedded staff development. Portions of two Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) teachers’ salaries were used to compensate for</i>

<i>the provision of STEM Professional Development at the elementary school and middle school.</i>
6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>This component was not addressed by STLE grant funded activities.</i>
7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>The district created the position of master teacher/coach who was assigned a caseload of struggling teachers and who model lessons in the teacher's classroom as well and open their own master classroom to be observed by fellow staff.</i>

Program Goals (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I- Selection of master teachers who are highly effective- to support the faculty in order to improve student outcomes and provide those staff members with a stipend in addition to their salary (career ladder)	<p>Highly effective teachers will be identified and selected as master teachers. These teachers will receive training as teacher coaches and will work to improve teacher performance through embedded staff development.</p> <p>Master teachers/Coaches will be assigned a "caseload" of struggling teachers and will model lessons in the teacher's classroom as well as open their own master classroom to observation by fellow staff.</p> <p>Master teachers will also provide department/grade specific professional development on Common Core for all staff members.</p>	<p>13 teachers and 2 STEM teachers selected to provide embedded staff development. In July 2013, coaches attended a five day summer institute with Ann Delehant (Learning Forward) to learn the skills required to be an effective coach. Topics included principles of giving feedback, coaching behavior, communication and facilitation, resistance and change, team and trust, decision making, conflict resolution, problem solving, coaching roles and strategies, ethics, professional learning.</p> <p>Individual coaching session happened throughout the year. Master Teachers facilitated a classroom rubric training to all staff through department and grade level meetings. At the last conference day, at the request of staff, the Master Teachers continued this work. The result is that within the Elementary and Middle Schools, teachers expressed having drastically improved the rubrics within their classrooms.</p>

		120 staff received some training from teacher coaches/master teacher. All staff worked with coaches on the following days: Sept 3, 4, Oct 11, January 31 st , May 23 rd and common planning periods the months of November and March. Topics were Rubrics, Academic Vocabulary, Data Drive Instruction, Technology integration, classroom management
Goal II - Develop a data dashboard and online testing program to allow consistent, up to date, and timely feedback to all staff on student progress and needs	<p>EdVista will create a data dashboard for staff that will provide longitudinal data on students' performance and needs.</p> <p>Data Dashboard will also provide reports to administration on student need areas.</p> <p>Uploading and administration of online testing in the core subjects- to provide timely feedback on student performance.</p>	120 staff were trained to read and interpret the reports generated within the Data Dashboard based on the 150 online tests that were administered. The data was used to drive instruction and configure Annual Professional Performance Review scores. The 150 online tests given have provided reports to teachers to show areas of student strength and weakness, and administrators have also used reports to assess which teachers could use support based on the trends and patterns seen in student results. Additionally teachers used the EdVista reports to help write Student Learning Objectives.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$191,250	\$36,339	\$154,911

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)

15	Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) master teacher salary	2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,127
15	Identify Master teachers	13	\$0	\$0	\$26,000	\$52,000
15	Creation of STEM modules for grades K-5	N/A	\$0	\$22,796	\$22,796	\$0
40	Online testing pilot	N/A	\$400	\$5,053	\$8,735	\$0
40	Data warehouse	N/A	\$1,500	\$7,488	\$1,500	\$0
40	Educational Vistas, Inc.	N/A				\$27,369
45	Books for training, Advance Learning Centers		\$0	\$1,002	\$0	\$4,000
40	Learning Forward- Anne Delehant training for teacher coaches	13	\$0	\$0	\$11,525	\$28,046
15	Summer training for coaches	13	\$0	\$0	\$6,000.0	\$0
15	Substitutes for Professional Development during school year		\$0	\$0	\$3,120	\$7,369
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$1,900	\$36,339	\$79,676	\$154,911

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

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

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

Preparation

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

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

Recruitment and Placement

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

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

Induction and Mentoring

Induction and Mentoring	
Standard	The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes.
<p>Summary: The district has met its STLE Goal I- Selection of master teachers who are highly effective- to support the faculty to improve student outcomes and provide those staff members with a stipend in addition to their salary (career ladder). The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators advance and improve. The district has undergone selection of teacher coaches, known as master teachers to support staff. Master teachers (or coaches) have been providing embedded professional development to new teachers during their first year.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Master Teacher – formal mentoring for teachers	T – Mentor	Formal	Annual Professional Performance Reviews – Teacher Improvement Plans	District	15	All new teachers	\$95,496

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- 12 Master Teachers were identified.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The district has used the mentor program to promote the district during interviews with potential teacher candidates. In nearly every interview, prospective teachers ask about the supports available in the first year. It has been received very well by prospective teachers and is seen as an asset to the district.
- A teacher receiving mentoring by a master teacher reported feeling more prepared to teach. Although he acted as a substitute teacher in the district for several years, he noted

that being a teacher in his own classroom was a big change. He felt that the support provided by the mentors helps him to address challenges before they become more complex issues.

- In July 2013, coaches attended a five day summer institute with Ann Delehant (Learning Forward) to learn the skills required to be an effective coach. Topics included principles of giving feedback, coaching behavior, communication and facilitation, resistance and change, team and trust, decision making, conflict resolution, problem solving, coaching roles and strategies, ethics, professional learning.
- Teachers and principals both noted that although it is still early in the coaching program, the services provided by the coaches are proving effective in improving teacher instructional outcomes. An example provided was of a High School teacher who drastically improved her classroom management skills after working with a coach, which has increased her effectiveness as an educator.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- All teachers have been assisted by coaches through scheduled and voluntary Professional Development sessions. 7th Grade and 3rd and 4th grades were assisted by Science, Technology, and Engineering and Math (STEM) teachers.
- Individual coaching session happened in addition throughout the year

Evaluation

Evaluation	
Standard	The district is fully implementing an APPR plan that complies with Education Law §3012-c and is approved by the commissioner. Through the evaluation system the district has a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices
Summary: The district has met its STLE Goal II- Develop a data dashboard and online testing program to allow consistent, up to date, and timely feedback to all staff on student progress and needs. The district initiated the development of a data dashboard and online testing program to further improve implementation of the district’s Annual Professional Performance Review Plan. The grant further provided the monetary resources to provide Professional Development surrounding Annual Professional Performance Review implementation.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
EdVista – Data Dashboard	T-Eval P – Eval	Resource	APPR – SLO DDI	FP – DS	40	ALL	N/A	\$1500
Online Testing	T-Eval P – Eval	Resource	APPR – SLO DDI	FP - DS	40	ALL	N/A	\$25,915

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The district worked with EdVista to upload pre-assessments as they were finalized.
- 5 years of data was uploaded into EdVista.
- In February teachers worked on the creation of post assessments.
- April 22nd a presentation by EdVista was held and discussed the plan for roll out of the data warehouse.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent reported that the grant was able to provide the monetary resources needed to hire a consultant to guide the development and leading the implementation of coaches and the subsequent Professional Development approaches coaches employed. Principal observations were noted as a mechanism used to identify areas in need of professional development for both building leaders and teachers. In addition, the coaches’ monitor for increased use of professional skills taught through the Professional Development. The Superintendent plans on monitoring student progress and teacher Annual Professional Performance Review scores.
- Principals reported that during teacher observations, they often suggest that a teacher speak with a coach for support with a specific area of need. It was shared that due to the dynamics of the district, principals cannot require or mandate a teacher to work with a coach or attend specific Professional Development unless it is necessitated by their Annual Professional Performance Review results. Principals believe it is in the best interest of a teacher to be proactive in requesting the assistance necessary to improve and the district operates under the assumption that they will do so.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- In October 2013- EdVista Dashboard was used by teachers in creation of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- An anecdotal remark was provided in the report stating, “the services provided by the coaches are showing to be effective in improving teacher outcomes as the only factor that has changed is having a coach available to assist teachers in need”.
- The district began the comparison of the coach caseloads to Annual Professional Performance Review observation scores. The move from individual Student Learning Objectives to building SLOs made the composite scores not usable.

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.
Summary: The district has met its STLE Goal I- Selection of master teachers who are highly effective- to support the faculty to improve student outcomes and provide those staff members with a stipend in addition to their salary (career ladder). The district has used grant funds to	

successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. Teachers and principals have a variety of opportunities to engage in professional development.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Training for Master Teachers/ Teacher coaches with Anne Delehant	T – Professional Development External	Group	Coach, D Strategy	FP – DS	40	13 - T 4 - P	5 days in summer and during school year	\$28,000
Master Teachers	T – Professional Development Internal	Group	Annual Professional Performance Review – Teacher Improvement Plan, Coach	District	40	All	Throughout school year	\$95,496
Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Materials - Robotics	Material	Books	STEM	FP – DS	45	All 7 th grade stud	Daily	\$2000

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Books were purchased for July training to work with Robotics.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- EdVista helped staff and administration to evaluate student performance and provided technical support.
- Teacher coaches provided embedded teacher support in instructional areas of need identified through analysis of results.
- During the month of October to further increase the Master Teachers exposure the Master Teachers facilitated a classroom rubric training to all staff through department and grade level meetings. At the last conference day, at the request of staff, the Master Teachers continued this work. The result is that within the Elementary and Middle Schools, teachers expressed having drastically improved the rubrics within their classrooms.
- The district engaged in Learning Forward based on the Anne Delehant training that was provided to teacher coaches. This training included five days of summer training and three days of training during the school year for the Teacher Coaches.
- The Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) teacher provided modeling of hands on STEM related activities for teachers by working on projects with students while the teachers observed.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent reported that the training on the use of rubrics, provided for all teachers in the district, had a profound impact. The Teachers within the elementary and middle schools expressed having drastically improved the quality of rubrics used within their classrooms.

- Teachers within the elementary and middle schools expressed a drastic improvement in the use of rubrics within their classroom as the result of training turn-keyed by Teacher Coaches.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Final Status Call Notes:

- All teachers have been assisted by coaches through scheduled and voluntary Professional Development sessions.
- STEM master teachers assisted the third, fourth and seventh grade.
- All staff were trained to read and interpret the reports generated within the Data Dashboard based on the 150 online tests that were administered. The data was used to drive instruction and configure Annual Professional Performance Review scores.
- All staff worked with coaches on the following days: Sept 3, 4, Oct 11, January 31st, May 23rd and common planning periods in the months of November and March. Topics were Rubrics, Academic Vocabulary, Data Driven Instruction, Technology integration, and classroom management.
- The district began the comparison of the coach caseloads to APPR observation scores. The move from individual Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to building SLOs made the composite scores not usable.
- Coxsackie-Athens went back and formally mapped out the desired Professional Development, and then trained the coaches and finally had them lead and/or facilitate a district wide training (K – 12 faculty) on creating teacher rubrics.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
Summary: The district has met its STLE Goal II- Develop a data dashboard and online testing program to allow consistent, up to date, and timely feedback to all staff on student progress and needs. The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions. Online tests have provided reports to teachers to show areas of student strength and weakness, and administrators have also used reports to assess which teachers could use support based on the trends and patterns seen in student results. Additionally teachers used the EdVista reports to help write Student Learning Objectives.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
EdVista – Data Dashboard	T – PM P - PM	Develop	D Strategy	ISC	40	N/A	\$1,500
Online Testing	T – PM P – PM	Develop	D Strategy	ISC	40	N/A	\$25,915
Master Teachers	T – PM	Develop	Annual Professional Performance Review – Teacher Improvement Plan	Stipend	15	15	\$95,496

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The district worked with EdVista to upload pre-assessments as they were finalized.
- 5 years of data was uploaded into EdVista.
- In February teachers worked on the creation of post assessments.
- April 22nd a presentation by EdVista was held and discussed the plan for roll out of the data warehouse.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Master teachers/coaches (those identified will have to have been rated effective or highly effective) will be assigned a "caseload" of struggling teachers and will model lessons in the teacher's classroom as well and open their own master classroom to observation by fellow staff.
- In October 2013- EdVista Dashboard was used by teachers in creation of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Evidence from Site Visit:

- Principals report that during teacher observations, they often suggest that a teacher speak with a coach for support with a specific area of need. It was shared that due to the dynamics of the district, principals cannot require or mandate a teacher to work with a coach or attend specific Professional Development unless it is necessitated by their Annual Professional Performance Review results. Principals believe it is in the best interest of a teacher to be proactive in requesting the assistance necessary to improve and the district operates under the assumption that they will do so.
- A principal noted the impact of master teachers, specifically citing one example of a drastic improvement in one of his teachers who received coaching from a master teacher. According to the principal, the difference between an initial observation and a subsequent observation was night and day in regards to how she improved. The principal credits this to the coach and the targeted 1:1 professional development provided.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- All staff were trained to read and interpret the reports generated within the Data Dashboard based on the 150 online tests that were administered. The data was used to drive instruction and configure Annual Professional Performance Review scores.
- The 150 online tests given have provided reports to teachers to show areas of student strength and weakness, and administrators have also used reports to assess which teachers could use support based on the trends and patterns seen in student results. Additionally teachers used the EdVista reports to help write Student Learning Objectives.

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
Standard	Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions.
Summary: The district has met its STLE Goal I- Selection of master teachers who are highly effective- to support the faculty to improve student outcomes and provide those staff members with a stipend in addition to their salary (career ladder). The district effectively used the grant funds to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Selected master teachers were provided training and preparation in order to successfully fulfill the career ladder positions.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Master Teachers	T – FT	STLE 1	APPR - TIP	15	Stipend	15	\$95,496

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- On March 21st the district rolled out the master teacher job description to curriculum leaders- they took the job descriptions back to their departments for feedback. On April 22nd the district had a follow up meeting with curriculum leaders on master teacher descriptions and added some more detail.
- Due to the concerns from the union the Superintendent addressed master teachers in his CAFEs- talks. These talks occurred March 27th, April 16th and May 23rd and were open to anyone with questions.
- On June 19th the district had another meeting to answer questions that selected master teachers might have.
- Career Ladder Master Teachers were selected based upon subject specific and topic specific qualities: Literacy, Special Education, Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM), Student centered instruction Domains 1, 2, or 3.
- 12 Master Teachers were identified.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- In July 2013, 13 Master teachers, 4 principals and Assistant Superintendent for instruction services attended a 5 day summer institute with Ann Delehant (Learning Forward) to learn the skills required to be an effective coach. Topics included: principals of giving feedback, coaching behavior, communication and facilitation, resistance and

change, team and trust, decision making, conflict resolution, problem solving, coaching roles and strategies, ethics, professional learning.

- Master Teachers were introduced September 3 during an all staff meeting; this was followed by additional introductions at building faculty meetings through September.
- In October 2013- Master teachers continued work and received more training.
- Master Teachers modeled strategies for struggling teachers in the struggling teacher’s classroom. Master Teachers opened their classroom for observation by other staff.
- The STEM master teacher provided modeling of hands-on STEM related activities for teachers by working on projects with students while the teachers observed.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- A teacher leader described the master teacher’s role as a model of good teaching, and a source of answers to teacher questions, as well as a resource that can help to address challenges and issues.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 13 master teachers have been identified throughout the grant period.

Other

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

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

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including STEM, ELL, bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: The district used STLE funded activities to support the equitable distribution of high quality educators in the areas of STEM and for students with disabilities.	

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- In January 2013 the district stated that their identified Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) teacher began work on STEM modules for the elementary.
- The creation of 10 STEM modules to implement at the elementary level was highlighted by the district as an achievement during the first year of the grant and the successful piloting on online testing in 7th grade ELA and 12th grade English.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Coaches provided support and strategies to staff to assist students who struggle, and Edvista provided easy to use data analysis to show what content strands students struggled with and how best to serve their needs, thus addressing those students with disabilities and those with low socio-economic status.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Final Status Call Notes:

- The district created opportunities for 150 tests to be given in an online format. The data was then used in Student Learning Objectives and driving instruction.
- The district supported a Data Dashboard which was created and used by teachers in Students Learning Objectives/local goal setting, driving instruction, Information Sciences and Technology meetings and with the Committee on Special Education.
- 100% of the teaching faculty used EdVista and it has created opportunities for teachers in grades 2 – 12 in core areas to gain access to, and use data to modify instruction.

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
Summary: The district has used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district. The district intends to continue all activities that began through STLE 1. The district is looking to partner with other districts to continue to fund the work and professional development with Ann Delehant.	

Short Description	Code	Type
The district intends to sustain the Master Teacher Positions	Personnel	Shift

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The district will sustain the coaching positions into the future through general funds. Although it is not known how many positions will be retained, it was stated that some are guaranteed to remain.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- At this time a general fund code has been created for the master teacher stipends. In addition, the district is looking to partner with surrounding schools to continue to provide the professional development with Anne Delehant. The district indicates that pooling their money will help make the costs sustainable. EdVista costs are also being placed in the general fund.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district will continue all activities by shifting funds within the general fund.

Section VIII – Methodology

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

Individuals interviewed

District Level:

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent

Elementary Coaches:

- 2nd Grade
- 4th Grade
- Music
- Kindergarten
- Kindergarten
- 1st Grade

Elementary/Middle Mentees:

- Kindergarten
- 2nd Grade
- MS ELA

Principals:

- HS
- MS
- CE
- EJA

Secondary Coaches:

- 6th Grade
- 7th Grade Social Studies
- 8th Grade Social Studies

- 7th Grade ELA
- MS Special Education
- MS Reading
- HS Math

3rd Party Vendors:

- Learning Forward
- Ed Vista

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

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report:

- Coxsackie – Athens Year 1 Final Report
- Coxsackie – Athens Year 2 Interim Report
- Coxsackie – Athens Year 2 Final Report
- Coxsackie – Athens Site Visit Notes
- Coxsackie-Athens Site Visit Debrief Letter
- Coxsackie-Athens Year 2 Final Status Call Notes