**New York State Education Department**

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

**Greenville Central School District**

**Table of Contents**

## Contents

## District Contact Information

|  | Superintendent | STLE Grant Manager |
|---|---|---|
| **Name** | Cheryl A. Dudley | Donna Accuosti |
| **Phone** | 518-966-5070 ext. 501 | 518-966-5070 ext. 525 |
| **Email** | dudleyc@greenville.k12.ny.us | accuostid@greenville.k12.ny.us |

## Section I – District Description

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

**Most current information as of:** March 20, 2014

| District Location | |
|---|---|
| **Region** | **BOCES** |
| Upper Hudson | Questar III BOCES (R-C-G) |

| 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** |
| 1219 | 374 | 127 | - | 209 | 236 |

| Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **American Indian or Alaskan Native** | **Black or African American** | **Hispanic or Latino** | **Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander** | **White** | **Multiracial** |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 96 | 0 |

| Attendance/Suspension Rates | |
|---|---|
| **Annual Attendance Rate** | **Student Suspensions** |
| 95% | 3% |

| 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** |
| 112 | 0 | 0 | 22% | 11% |

| Need Status |
|---|
| Average Need District |

## Section II – Academic Performance

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

**Most current information as of:** June 18, 2014

| Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | % Proficient All | % Proficient SWD | % Proficient ELL | % Proficient ED |
| 3(2011-12) | 45 | 6 | n<5 | 23 |
| 3(2012-13) | 21 | 0 | 0 | n<5 |
| 4(2011-12) | 49 | 0 | None tested | 39 |
| 4(2012-13) | 11 | 0 | None tested | 0 |
| 5(2011-12) | 65 | 17 | None tested | 55 |
| 5(2012-13) | 20 | 0 | None tested | 16 |
| 6(2011-12) | 52 | 5 | None tested | 18 |
| 6(2012-13) | 28 | 14 | None tested | 38 |
| 7(2011-12) | 53 | 82 | None tested | 100 |
| 7(2012-13) | 34 | 5 | None tested | 4 |
| 8(2011-12) | 56 | 4 | None tested | 42 |
| 8(2012-13) | 35 | 12 | None tested | 29 |
| **District Wide(2011-12)** | **53** | **17** | **n<5** | **43** |
| **District Wide(2012-13)** | **25** | **4** | **None Tested** | **14** |

| Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | % Proficient All | % Proficient SWD | % Proficient ELL | % Proficient ED |
| 3(2011-12) | 57 | 19 | n<5 | 43 |
| 3(2012-13) | 23 | 0 | 0 | n<5 |
| 4(2011-12) | 58 | 10 | None tested | 57 |
| 4(2012-13) | 35 | 6 | None tested | 10 |
| 5(2011-12) | 76 | 25 | None tested | 68 |
| 5(2012-13) | 29 | 5 | None tested | 24 |
| 6(2011-12) | 76 | 40 | None tested | 57 |
| 6(2012-13) | 42 | 0 | None tested | 27 |
| 7(2011-12) | 78 | 17 | None tested | 100 |
| 7(2012-13) | 34 | 10 | None tested | 19 |
| 8(2011-12) | 49 | 9 | None tested | 33 |
| 8(2012-13) | 6 | 0 | None tested | 14 |
| **District Wide (2011-12)** | **66** | **19** | **n<5** | **58** |

| District Wide (2012-13) | 28 | 5 | None tested | 18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | % Proficient All | % Proficient SWD | % Proficient ELL | % Proficient ED |
| 4(2011-12) | 87 | 55 | None tested | 79 |
| 4(2012-13) | 87 | 65 | None tested | 77 |
| 8(2011-12) | 88 | 57 | None tested | 100 |
| 8(2012-13) | 77 | 43 | None tested | 65 |
| District Wide (2011-12) | 87 | 56 | n<5 | 88 |
| District Wide (2012-13) | 82 | 55 | None tested | 73 |

| Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exam | All Students | | Students With Disabilities | |
| | % Proficient | % Mastery | % Proficient | % Mastery |
| Comprehensive English | 81 | 27 | 42 | 0 |
| Integrated Algebra | 83 | 13 | 25 | 0 |
| Geometry | 78 | 12 | 50 | 0 |
| Algebra 2/Trigonometry | 58 | 19 | n<5 | n<5 |
| Global History and Geography | 74 | 29 | 48 | 9 |
| U.S. History and Government | 91 | 64 | 63 | 37 |
| Living Environment | 82 | 32 | 45 | 5 |
| Physical Setting/Physical Earth | 47 | 5 | 17 | 0 |
| Physical Setting/Chemistry | 84 | 18 | n<5 | n<5 |
| Physical Setting/Physics | 92 | 58 | n<5 | n<5 |

| Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2008 Cohort | | 2009 Cohort | |
| | % Proficient | % Mastery | % Proficient | % Mastery |
| All | 75 | 28 | 78 | 29 |
| SWD | 48 | 7 | 16 | 0 |
| ELL | None tested | None tested | None tested | None tested |
| ED | 59 | 17 | 81 | 11 |

| Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2008 Cohort | | 2009 Cohort | |
| | % Proficient | % Mastery | % Proficient | % Mastery |
| All | 81 | 19 | 80 | 21 |
| SWD | 41 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| ELL | None tested | None tested | None tested | None tested |

| **ED** | 79 | 3 | 89 | 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| **2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA)** <br> **Grades 3-8** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Grade** | **n Tested** | **Number of students scoring at:** | | | |
| | | | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| English Language Arts | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| | 7 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| | 8 | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| | 7 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| | 8 | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | |
| Science | 8 | 3 | - | - | - | - |

| **2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA)** <br> **Secondary Level** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **n Tested** | **Number of students scoring at:** | | | |
| | | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| English Language Arts | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| Mathematics | 2 | - | - | - | - |

| **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 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| SWD | - | - | - | - | - |
| **First Grade** | | | | | |
| All Students | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| General Education | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| SWD | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Second Grade** | | | | | |
| All Students | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| General Education | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| SWD | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Tenth Grade** | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| General Education | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| SWD | - | - | - | - | - |

| Group | 2008 Cohort 4 Year | | 2007 Cohort 5 Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | Graduation Rate (%) | n | Graduation Rate (%) |
| All | 118 | 71 | 104 | 88 |
| Students With Disabilities | 29 | n<30 | 14 | n<30 |
| Limited English Proficient | 0 | n<30 | 0 | n<30 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | n<30 | 29 | n<30 |

| List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2011-12 |
|---|
| • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA –  Economically Disadvantaged |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities |
| • Secondary- Level ELA – All Students |
| • Secondary- Level ELA – White |
| • Secondary-Level Math – White |

| List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13 |
|---|
| • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA –  White |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Math –  Economically Disadvantaged |
| • Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White |
| • Secondary- Level ELA – All Students |
| • Secondary- Level ELA – White |
| • Secondary-Level Math – White |
| • 4- Year Graduation-Rate – All Students |
| • 4- Year Graduation-Rate – White |

# Section III – District Schools Profile

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

**Most current information as of:** April 4, 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greenville Central School District | Cheryl A. Dudley | 2005-14 | Con | 1,385 | 1,351 | 3 P | 3 P, 1 AP | 133 | 133 |

| School Name | School Principal | Time of Service | Status | Grades Served | # of Students (12-13) | # of Students (13-14) | # of Admin (12-13) | # of Admin (13-14) | # of Teachers (12-13) | # of Teachers (13-14) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scott M. Ellis | Peter Mahan | 2006-14 | Con | K-5 | 548 | 540 | 1 P | 1 P, 1 AP (shared) | 52 | 54 |
| Greenville Middle School | Brian Reeve | 2009-14 | Con | 6-8 | 284 | 281 | 1 P | 1 P, 1 AP (shared) | 27 | 25 |
| Greenville High School | Michael Laster | 2005-13 | Orig. | 9-12 | 391 | 370 | 1 P | 1 P, 1 AP (shared) | 54 | 54 |
| | Todd Hilgendorff | 2013-14 | Con | | | | | | | |

# Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

**Source:** New York State Education Department Analysis

| APPR Plan |
|---|
| **Current APPR Plan:** http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/greenville-appr-plan.pdf |
| **Most current version as of:** December 21, 2012 |

| Performance Evaluation Rubrics | |
|---|---|
| **Teacher** | **Principal** |
| Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* (2011 Revised Edition) | McRel Principal Evaluation System |

| 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** | 47 | 43 | 32 | 60 |
| **Effective** | 46 | 42 | 59 | 40 |
| **Developing** | 7 | 11 | 6 | 0 |
| **Ineffective** | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |

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

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

## Section V – Monitoring History

**Source:** New York State Education Department Files

| School Year | Type of Monitoring | NYSED Staff | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2012-13** | Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District | N/A | Submitted by April 1, 2013 |
| **2012-13** | Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call | Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; Amy Cox, Project Assistant | May 6, 2013 |
| **2013-14** | Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District | N/A | Submitted by July 15, 2013 |
| **2013-14** | Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call | Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant; Megan Lee Collins, Project Assistant | August 15, 2013 |
| **2013-14** | Site Visit | Carrie Smith, 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 | Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator | April 19, 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 | Jessica Benosky, Project Assistant | August 8, 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** |
| 5545-13-0016 | $156,125 | 10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014 | Individual |

| Key Program Design Elements |
|---|
| 1. **Preparation** – Activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles: ***The District worked with Questar III to provide training for new and veteran teachers on Student Learning Objective (SLO) development, Danielson 2011 rubric, and assessment creation.*** |
| 2. **Recruitment and Placement** – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them:  ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.*** |
| 3. **Induction and Mentoring** – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: ***The district created teacher and administrative mentor positions to provide support to newly hired teachers and principals.*** |
| 4. **Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: ***The district created an APPR Liaison position to support continued APPR implementation.*** |
| 5. **Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning:  ***Instructional Support Services Teacher Coaches, APPR Liaison and Leadership Facilitators acted as instructional coaches to teachers and principals to support improvement of instructional and professional practice.*** |
| 6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: ***Instructional Support Services Teacher Coaches, APPR Liaison and Leadership Facilitators were selected based upon data-driven criteria as it related to APPR.*** |
| 7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: ***The district established the positions of Instructional Support Services Teacher Coaches, APPR Liaison and Leadership Facilitators, who received stipends for the completion of additional responsibilities.*** |

| Program Goals (Taken from Year 2 interim Report) | Targets (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report) | Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report) |
|---|---|---|
| Goal I: Provide effective professional development/professional growth for APPR, Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM), students with disabilities (SWD), | SWD, STEM, ELL coaches and an APPR Liaison have been hired and have participated in an adult learning workshop. The coaches hold monthly office hours and are required to facilitate workshops | Five administrators collaborated and facilitated discussions around APPR, Response to Intervention (RtI), and |

| English Language Learners (ELL) and statement of practice (SOP) instructional strategies. | throughout the year.<br><br>ISS coaches met during our Annual Summer Institute as well as quarterly during the school year. | additional initiatives with faculty. APPR Liaison to support continued APPR implementation. Worked with Questar III to provide training for new and veteran teachers on SLO development, Danielson 2011 rubric, assessment creation. |
|---|---|---|
| Goal II: Performance Management will be ensured through the provision of peer assistance including mentoring, coaching and the development of smaller Professional Learning Communities. | All coaches attended a required adult learning workshop in which one of the topics will be building and supporting professional learning communities (PLCs). Building level PLCs will be established during the workshop. Coaches established office hours and will facilitate workshops.<br><br>Instruction Support Services (ISS) coaches provide support via office hours and workshops. | Five administrators collaborated and facilitated discussions around APPR, RtI, and additional initiatives with faculty. APPR Liaison to support continued APPR implementation. Worked with Questar III to provide training for new and veteran teachers on SLO development, Danielson 2011 rubric, assessment creation. Mentor worked with each of the principals to strengthen leadership skills.  Met with new principals twice a month for one and a half hours and veteran principals for an hour to an hour and a half once a month. |
| Goal III: Career Ladder opportunities will be provided for teachers and leaders in the areas of SWD, APPR, SOP, ELL, STEM and mentoring. | Job descriptions have been created for all of the positions. The positions have been posted in accordance with the district's human resources procedures.  All positions have been Board of Education approved. | 10 Instructional Support Services Coach positions: National Board (1), ELL (1), STEM (2), SWD (2), RtI (2), Mentor Coach (1), Mentor Coordinator |

| | The district continues to work with Capital Area School Development Association (not necessarily exclusively) to continue to support teacher leaders as well as educate all teachers about teacher leadership. | (1). |
|---|---|---|

| Total Grant Award | Year 1 Allocation | Year 2 Allocation |
|---|---|---|
| $156,125 | $60,346 | $95,779 |

| 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 | SWD, STEM, ELL Coaches, APPR Liaison, RtI Coaches | 15 | - | $45,425 | $22,652 | $66,850 |
| 16 | Clerical Support | 2 | - | $771 | - | $3,000 |
| 40 | D.Hamlin | 1 | - | - | - | $3,873 |
| 45 | Professional literature for PLC, coaching, etc. Data Driven Instruction, National Boards, Leadership Topics | - | $1,109 | - | - | $8,094 |
| 45 | ACSD, Barnes and Noble, Staples, Amazon | - | - | $4,083 | - | $596 |
| 80 | Employee Benefits | - | - | $10,067 | - | 13,241 |
| | **Total Actual Expenditures** | | **$1,109** | **$60,346** | **$22,652** | **$95,654** |

# Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

*Guiding questions to direct the review:*

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

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

*Preparation*

| Preparation | |
|---|---|
| **Standard** | The district is engaging in activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning |

| | |
|---|---|
| | opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district's career ladder. This can include encouraging and/or enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional certifications. |

**Summary:** The district has met this standard by having teachers on special assignment in the areas of curriculum, International Baccalaureate (IB), online learning, staff development and technology. Additionally, an ISS coach position was created to provide an avenue for new roles in a career ladder while still maintaining time in the classroom as a teacher.

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

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The district created several instructional support services positions. These teacher leaders participated in workshops on professional learning communities and data driven instruction.
- The district offered a five year tiered induction program with varying levels of support.
- The district hired two STEM coaches and they participated in an adult learning workshop. Smaller learning PLCs will be established.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The SWD, STEM, ELL coaches and an APPR liaison were hired and participated in an adult learning workshop. The coaches held monthly office hours and were required to facilitate workshops throughout the year.
- The ISS coaches met during the district's annual summer institute as well as quarterly during the school year.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- All coaches attended a required adult learning workshop in which one of the topics was building and supporting PLCs. Building level PLCs were established during the workshop.
- The district submitted a teacher leader survey to their instructional support services coaches in January and reported the results and the future of Greenville CSD beyond the life of the grant.

## *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 the STLE grant funded activities. |
|---|

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

## *Induction and Mentoring*

| Induction and Mentoring | |
|---|---|
| **Standard** | The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes. |
| **Summary:** The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators will have opportunities for mentoring.  The district was able to attain their Goal II: performance management will be ensured through the provision of peer assistance including mentoring, coaching and the development of smaller PLCs.<br><br>The ISS coach positions act as both a mentor leader and mentor coordinator.  In addition, a principal mentor service was created to meet with four principals. | |

| Short Description | Code | Type | Purpose | Provider | Budget Code | # Served | Total Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal Mentoring Program | P Mentor | Formal | Coach | BOCES - DS | 49 | 4 | $3,872.91 |
| Instructional Support Services Coach | T Mentor | Formal | Coach | District | 15 | 10 | $41,350 |

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

Evidence from Site Visit:
- The superintendent indicated that to increase the success of the mentoring program as well as provide continued support to new teachers, the district surveys new teachers asking about mentoring experiences, what can be done better, and suggestions to improve the program. The survey includes a question asking teachers what they would like to see in the coming year. There is much success with retention rates of new teachers to the district. Currently, the district has high retention rate as well as a high succession rate.
- The superintendent also stated that the strength of mentors has led to excellent pairings with mentor/mentees; that the program provided mentees with a high level of resources such as providing opportunities to visit classrooms, other schools, and conferences;   help with report cards, parent conferences, data collection for students, and helped with building assessments. The mentoring program is very individualized based on need of the mentee.
- A mentee indicated that, "I was able to have guidance with dealing with a difficult situation faced at the beginning of the year."

- Another mentee indicated that her mentor helped to integrate technology in her classroom, including posting homework, practice quizzes, practice tests, additional subject support online, supporting use of Quia a program used to create educational games, quizzes, surveys, and web pages. The mentee indicated this would not have been possible without the help of her mentor. The relationship led to increased student engagement, vocabulary and retention of subject material. The mentee stated that without confidentiality the relationship would have been a great deal different, as the mentee can share frustrations without apprehension. The relationship helped to communicate with district administration areas in need of improvement, and the mentee indicated that to be able to ask "stupid questions" is so helpful. The superintendent gives release time to the mentors and mentees to meet off campus in order to meet in a place with few school related distractions.
- The principal mentor reported that prior to STLE being able to find support and mentoring was difficult. Having a mentor for new leaders provides an avenue to discuss and work through areas of growth without fear of being looked down upon for having a weakness. Finally, mentoring is confidential so the mentor does not discuss with the central administration the issues and weaknesses of principals.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The district offered a five year tiered induction program with varying levels of support for teachers.
- The district offered a tiered induction program with varying levels of support for newer principals.
- As a result of two years of workforce reductions the district had fewer teachers than expected in their five year induction program. Also, the district did not hire a new cohort of interns. As a result, the district, with the agreement of the applicable bargaining units, changed the nature of the coaching positions. The mentor coordinator position will be able to support the remaining cohorts.
- The district was very supportive of those teachers interested in pursuing National Board Certification and currently there are four National Board Certified Teachers and another pursuing certification this year. The district also has one teacher working on the Take One! portfolio.
- The district anticipated more teachers pursuing National Board Certification during both years of the grant, but with APPR implementation, teachers decided to focus on APPR. The district reallocated funding from two mentor coaches and one National Board coach to support the addition of a second STEM coach and two RtI coaches. The Board of Education will approve all coaches. In anticipation of Board of Education approval many coaches and the APPR liaison were working within their respective areas beginning in September. All coaches and faculty were trained in the development of SLOs and assessment creation.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The principal mentor worked with each of the principals to strengthen leadership skills. They met with new principals twice a month for one and a half hours and veteran principals for an hour to an hour and a half once a month.

*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 demonstrated its commitment to ensuring the complete and successful implementation of APPR by using grant funds to support an APPR Liaison position as part of their career ladder.

The district attained its Goal II: performance management will be ensured through the provision of peer assistance including mentoring, coaching and the development of smaller Professional Learning Communities.

The district's administrative team, along with the APPR liaison, received professional development through Questar III to provide training for new and veteran teachers on SLO development, and Danielson 2011 rubric, assessment creation.

Administrators also collaborated and facilitated discussions around APPR for their respective faculty after receiving professional development from the district's APPR liaison.

| Short Description | Code | Type | Purpose | Provider | Budget Code | # Served | # Added | Total Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| APPR Liaison | P-Eval T-Eval | Pos - All | APPR – Obs, APPR - Other | District | 15 | **ALL** | 1 | $20,000 |

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

Evidence from Site Visit:
- The school principal indicated that the APPR liaison position's role has grown from what was proposed in the grant. She is in constant contact with faculty with regard to office hours and offered multiple opportunities at both schools to provide targeted support to teachers with writing SLOs. A Questar representative also attended these office hours to further support teachers.
- Principals across the district communicated with their staff information regarding the APPR liaison's office hours and additional resources available to assist with writing SLOs and navigating the APPR process.
- Principals sent e-mails regarding upcoming professional development opportunities and provided all new teachers with an APPR in-service. At the APPR in-service, principals discussed the specifics and nuances of APPR at the school level.
- The school principals indicated that the APPR liaison provided SLO guidance documents and state and district exemplars to better prepare teachers to write SLOs. The APPR

liaison was able to provide guidance to teachers on Danielson's domains, specifically evidence collection for Domain 4, and shared teacher exemplars with the school community.

- Principals reported that the APPR liaison created an APPR timeline for principals to ensure goals are met. She also created a FAQ for principals, a teacher and administrator APPR binder for each teacher and principal using the Danielson Framework, Guidance Document (purple memo), and roadmaps for SLOs, EngageNY resources, and provided teachers with resources *The Core Six* and *The Handbook for Professional teaching*.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The APPR liaison established office hours for assessment creation. At the March, 2013 Superintendent's Conference Day, time was dedicated to SLO/local assessment creation. The APPR liaison developed, in collaboration with Questar III, an adult learning workshop for all coaches.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- Administrative opportunities included the creation of an APPR liaison and support for building level administrators to create PLCs within their buildings.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The APPR liaison met with the teacher leaders on a consistent basis, conducted a survey in December, and spoke with administrators to get a sense of where they were regarding implementation.

## *Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth*

| Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth | |
|---|---|
| **Standard** | The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development. |
| **Summary:** The district used grant funds to successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. Teachers and principals had opportunities to participate in professional development in the areas of APPR, SLOs, and Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). Areas of focus included instructional strategies for subgroups of students such as, ELL's, SWD's, and those classified according socio-economic opportunities.<br><br>Evidence suggests that the district undertook grant funded activities to meet its Goal I: to provide effective professional development/professional growth for APPR, STEM, SWD, ELL and SOP instructional strategies.<br><br>Teachers and principals attended multiple professional development opportunities including, but not limited to, Questar III training on APPR, an adult learning workshop focused on PLC's, and training for the implementation of eDoctrina. | |

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

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

Evidence from Site Visit:
- A teacher leader reported that they attended five - two hour professional development sessions at the end of last school year on leadership and eDoctrina. Coaches were given resources and books on data analysis, the leadership framework and the team approach. ISS coaches met in the summer for the eDoctrina training, and that turnkey training in eDoctrina, RTI, SLOs, assessment writing and individualized support to teachers as needs were identified.
- Another teacher leader reported that ISS coaches received professional development in what it means to be a teacher leader as well as eDoctrina to better assist teachers as they implement the program. It was stated that because there are few teachers with ELL needs, providing whole faculty professional development in that area is not necessary. ISS coaches offered individual professional development to teachers based on the individual needs of the ELL student.
- A principal reported that topics vary based on categories of specialty some examples include RTI professional development and using My Learning Plan to set up individual professional development based on individual need. There was coaching support for teachers to help with documenting and progress monitoring struggling students. It was also reported that all coaches have office hours to make better use of time and provide specific targeted support on a consistent basis.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The district discussed student learning at administrative cabinet meetings, with additional resources purchased, and presenters were invited to cabinet meetings.
- The district offered weekly APPR office hours to support implementation of the new procedures. The district has an extensive in-house professional development program, and a professional library in each of the buildings. Finally, the district focused on topics of need during Superintendent Conference Days.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The district continued to work with the Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA) to continue to support teacher leaders as well as educate all teachers about teacher leadership.
- The district had their coaches complete training with a Questar III analyst. There were a total of six workshops on topics including data driven instruction, facilitation of professional learning communities and adult learning strategies. Coaches continued to meet with the Questar III analyst and the APPR liaison quarterly.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The district hired ten coaches and participated in an adult learning workshop. Smaller learning PLCs were established.

- The district indicated that the key accomplishments for year two would be the work of their ISS coaches in various capacities – individual office hours and the facilitation of workshops. The district's administrative leaders facilitated several large group and small group discussions around instructional best practices and collaboration to increase student achievement.

## *Performance Management*

| Performance Management | |
|---|---|
| **Standard** | The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions. |

| **Summary:** The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions.<br><br>Additionally, through these activities, the district achieved its Goal II target: performance management will be ensured through the provision of peer assistance including mentoring, coaching and the development of smaller PLCs.<br><br>ISS coach and principal leader positions were recruited and selected based upon data driven criteria connected to the teacher and principal evaluation system index of meeting or exceeding standards. |
|---|

| Short Description | Code | Type | Purpose | Compensation | Budget Code | # Hired/ Developed | Total Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional Support Services Coaches | T-PM | Develop | Coach | Stipend | 15 | 10 | $41,350 |
| Principal Mentoring Program | P-PM | Develop | Coach | ISC | 49 | 4 | $3,872.91 |
| APPR Liaison | T-PM P-PM | Develop | APPR – Obs APPR - SLO | Stipend | 15 | 1 | $20,000 |

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The building principals had deep meaningful discussions with teachers around observations, instructional strategies, assessments etc. Additionally, the superintendent met with building principals to discuss data driven instruction via individual evaluation meetings.
- All coaches began the first of six professional development workshops on April 11, 2013 on topics including data driven instruction, facilitation of PLCs and adult learning strategies. Additionally, during March 1 - June 30, 2013, coaches completed training with the Questar III analyst.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The superintendent met with the building principals to discuss data driven instruction via individual evaluation meetings. Discussions with principals continued around student achievement and supporting teachers in data analysis.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- Five administrators collaborated and facilitated discussions around APPR, RTI and other district initiatives with faculty.
- The instructional coaches worked with Questar III to provide training for new and veteran teachers on SLO development, the Danielson 2011 rubric, and assessment creation. In addition, they held weekly office hours and provided APPR reminders and updates.
- The principal mentor coach worked with each of the principals to strengthen leadership skills. This person met with new principals twice a month for one and a half hours and veteran principals for an hour to an hour and a half once a month.

## *Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals*

| Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals | |
|---|---|
| **Standard** | Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions. |

**Summary:** The district effectively used grant funds to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities had the training and preparation needed to fulfill career ladder positions.

Efforts toward meeting this standard supported the district in meeting its Goal III: teacher leaders and lead principals will be identified and selected based on criteria indicating their history of successful practice.

The district created a total of ten teacher leader positions, their titles were ISS, and they worked in the areas of mentoring, mentor coordinator, students with disabilities, ELL, RTI, STEM and also one teacher worked as a National Board certification coach. One administrative coach was selected to serve as an APPR liaison between the district and the teacher's association.

| Short Description | Code | Type | Purpose | Budget Code | Compen-sation | # On Ladder | Total Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional Support Services Coaches | T-FT | STLE 1 | Coach | 15 | Stipend | 10 | $41,350 |
| APPR Liaison | P-FT | STLE 1 | APPR – Obs APPR - SLO | 15 | Stipend | 1 | $20,000 |

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

Evidence from Site Visit:
- The superintendent reported that she noticed an intense passion for the roles of the teacher leader, that the district is running workshops for teachers on National Board certification, STEM and SWD. The mentor coach and coordinator were in the process of developing an in-service on becoming a mentor.
- A principal reported that teachers were speaking with teachers in order to grow and develop as professionals. Coaches work closely with the school psychologist. Veteran teachers are seeking out coaching help. Because the district selected the right people for the positions, push back from teachers was low. The district was looking at ways to support teachers with Domain 4 of the Danielson rubric and coaches helped with this.
- The special education coach reported that more teachers were going to her for guidance. The coach was helping teachers with keeping track of their Teach Hours in order to keep up their certification. The coach wanted to start doing more with curriculum development with an emphasis on collegiality. The coach helped teachers working less as independent teachers and more with a common purpose.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:
- The ISS coaching positions were created to increase student learning. The coaches participated in workshops on the topics of DDI, PLCs and more.
- The district developed a training program with CASDA to train administrators in facilitating PLCs.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- ISS coaches concentrate in several administrative areas as an APPR liaison and as support for building level administrators to create PLCs within their buildings.
- As a result of two years of workforce reductions the district had fewer teachers than expected in their five year induction program. Also, the district did not hire a new cohort of interns. As a result, the district, with the agreement of the applicable bargaining units, changed the nature of the coaching positions. The mentor coordinator position will be able to support the remaining cohorts.
- The district was very supportive of those teachers interested in pursuing National Board Certification and currently there are four National Board Certified Teachers and another pursuing certification this year. The district also has one teacher working on the Take One! portfolio.
- The district anticipated more teachers pursuing National Board Certification during both years of the grant, but with APPR implementation, teachers decided to focus on APPR. The district reallocated funding from two mentor coaches and one National Board coach to support the addition of a second STEM coach and two RtI coaches. The Board of Education will approve all coaches. In anticipation of Board of Education approval many coaches and the APPR liaison were working within their respective areas beginning in

September. All coaches and faculty were trained in the development of SLOs and assessment creation.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The district has teachers on special assignment in the areas of curriculum, IB, online learning, staff development and technology. They did not previously have teacher leaders in these specific areas.
- The district created the positions and followed district recruitment procedures based on the guidelines put forth by the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the STLE grant.

## *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 teachers working with high needs students in the areas of STEM and focusing on ELL and students with disabilities. The district attained its Goal I - Provide effective professional development/professional growth for APPR, STEM, SWD, ELL and SOP instructional strategies and Goal III: career ladder opportunities will be provided for teachers and leaders in the areas of SWD, APPR, SOP, ELL, STEM and mentoring. | |

**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 ELL coach reported that they have been able to create greater awareness among teachers on the specific needs of ELL students. The coach was able to work with teachers to develop cultural awareness of ELL student needs/traditions.
- The ELL coach also remarked that they have been able to increase interactions with ELL parents in order to involve them more in student education. The coach helped with the

RTI process; trying to identify areas where behavior is the cause of the instructional gaps or is it due to an academic/language barrier. The coach reported that elementary teachers were very willing for the ELL coaching assistance. The school counselor was very helpful in gaining the acceptance of other teachers.
- The superintendent reported the teacher leaders demonstrate increased passion for their roles and are running workshops on National Board certification, STEM, and SWD.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:
- The district recruited and hired nine coaches to begin work in each of their respective areas:  ELL Coach, National Boards Coach, Mentor Coordinator, Mentor Coach, two STEM Coaches, two SWD Coaches, two RtI Coaches, and an APPR Liaison. Each coach attended the required adult learning workshop.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The Principal Mentor Program worked with each of the principals to strengthen leadership skills.  This program met with new principals twice a month for one and a half hours and veteran principals for an hour to an hour and a half once a month.
- The report indicates that the district supports 10 ISS Coach positions:  National Board (1), ELL (1), STEM (2), SWD (2), RtI (2), Mentor Coach (1), Mentor Coordinator (1). Coaches held Office Hours and facilitated workshops within their content area.

## *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 used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact.

The district is engaged in ongoing discussion on sustainability.  The district is reviewing and revising their job descriptions to potentially include the work of their teacher leaders.  The principals will continue to facilitate discussions and collaborate within their buildings.  The district will continue to work with CASDA with regard to strengthening teacher and leader effectiveness.  The APPR Liaison position will continue beyond life of the grant, but in a slightly modified format.

| Short Description | Code | Type |
|---|---|---|
| Partnership with CASDA | Partnership | Shift |
| APPR Liaison | Personnel | SF |

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

Evidence from Site Visit:
- The superintendent reported that in order to further support district initiatives as well as to increase the likelihood of sustaining work that done through STLE, the district will

create PLCs. Creating PLC's, led by STLE coaches would allow for greater collaboration and for colleagues to share best practices.

- The superintendent further reported that the district created an APPR liaison position to support K-12 educators within the district. The APPR liaison created an APPR resources binder for each teacher and principal that gave them an array of information outlining the APPR process. Through STLE, the liaison purchased two books to better inform staff on the APPR process and Danielson rubric. Many teachers throughout the district took advantage of the APPR liaison's office hours and were much more at ease with the observation process given the variety of supports offered to them.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:
- The district reported they lost $5 million in state aid over the last several years. As such, sustainability of STLE programs and initiatives is very difficult. They are looking at ways to redefine the roles of department head within the teacher's contract in order to incorporate some roles once completed by STLE coaches.
- The district is engaged in ongoing discussion on sustainability.  The district is reviewing and revising their job descriptions to potentially include the work of their teacher leaders.  The principals will continue to facilitate discussions and collaboration within their buildings.  The district will continue to work with CASDA with regard to strengthening teacher and leader effectiveness.  The district's hope is to shift funds and or create new funding streams to sustain these positions.


# 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 Leve*l
- Superintendent
- Grant Manager

*Building Level*
- Middle School Principal
- Elementary School Principal
- ELL Coach
- NBPTS Coach
- Principal Mentor
- High School Principal
- Assistant District Principal
- First Year Special Education Teacher
- SWD Coach

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
- Greenville Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Greenville Year 2 Interim Report
- Greenville Year 2 Final Report
- Greenville Site Visit Notes