New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Hudson City 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 10
Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile 10
Section V – Monitoring History 11
Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 12
Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 15
- Preparation 15
- Recruitment and Placement 16
- Induction and Mentoring 16
- Evaluation 17
- Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 19
- Performance Management 21
- Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals 22
- Other 24
- Issues of Equity 24
- Sustainability 26

Section VIII – Methodology 27

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Maria Suttmeier	April Prestipino
Phone	(518) 828-4360 ext. 2101	(518) 828-4360 ext. 2109
Email	suttmeiermj@hudsoncityschooldistrict.com	prestipinoa@hudsoncityschooldistrict.com

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: June 30, 2014

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

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	**Eligible for Free Lunch**	**Eligible for Reduced Lunch**	**Limited English Proficient**	**Students with Disabilities**	**Economically Disadvantaged**
1861	1020	187	125	322	1203

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	**Black or African American**	**Hispanic or Latino**	**Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander**	**White**	**Multiracial**
0	25	12	9	49	4

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	**Student Suspensions**
94%	36%

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**
164	0	0	23	8

Need Status
High Need/Resource Rural District

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: March 20, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
3(2011-12)	37	6	0	31
3(2012-13)	9	0	0	6
4(2011-12)	40	0	0	34
4(2012-13)	16	0	0	13
5(2011-12)	49	13	60	41
5(2012-13)	11	0	0	6
6(2011-12)	47	5	25	38
6(2012-13)	17	4	n<5	11
7(2011-12)	37	0	n<5	31
7(2012-13)	13	0	n<5	9
8(2011-12)	34	10	n<5	26
8(2012-13)	13	0	n<5	11
District Wide (2011-12)	**41**	**6**	**16**	**33**
District Wide (2012-13)	**13**	**1**	**n<5**	**9**

Student Performance: 2011-12 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
3(2011-12)	39	5	0	30
3(2012-13)	11	0	0	3
4(2011-12)	44	9	8	35
4(2012-13)	13	0	0	13
5(2011-12)	54	9	67	44
5(2012-13)	9	0	0	6
6(2011-12)	52	5	38	48
6(2012-13)	12	4	n<5	12
7(2011-12)	32	0	n<5	24
7(2012-13)	10	0	n<5	7
8(2011-12)	25	6	n<5	19
8(2012-13)	2	0	n<5	2
District Wide (2011-12)	**41**	**5**	**23**	**33**

District Wide (2012-13)	**10**	**1**	**n<5**	**7**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
4(2011-12)	60	48	54	74
4(2012-13)	82	43	75	79
8(2011-12)	54	26	n<5	46
8(2012-13)	50	12	n<5	45
District Wide (2011-12)	**57**	**35**	**54**	**60**
District Wide (2012-13)	**66**	**26**	**60**	**62**

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	**All Students**		**Students With Disabilities**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
Comprehensive English	81	17	37	0
Integrated Algebra	53	2	14	0
Geometry	58	6	n<5	n<5
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	63	10	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	56	16	18	3
U.S. History and Government	72	38	44	12
Living Environment	71	26	40	3
Physical Setting/Physical Earth	35	4	5	0
Physical Setting/Chemistry	67	4	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/Physics	77	38	None tested	None tested

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		**2009 Cohort**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
All	65	26	69	27
SWD	15	0	24	0
ELL	38	0	50	0
ED	71	28	59	18

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		**2009 Cohort**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
All	66	4	70	7
SWD	15	0	14	0

ELL	63	13	75	0
ED	71	7	65	6

2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) Grades 3-8						
	Grade	**n Tested**	**Number of students scoring at:**			
			Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
English Language Arts	3	2	-	-	-	-
	4	2	-	-	-	-
	5	3	-	-	-	-
	6	2	-	-	-	-
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	0	1	4
Mathematics	3	2	-	-	-	-
	4	2	-	-	-	-
	5	3	-	-	-	-
	6	2	-	-	-	-
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	1	2	2
Science	4	2	-	-	-	-
	8	5	0	0	2	3

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

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	23	13	39	43	4
General Education	18	6	39	50	6
SWD	5	40	40	20	0
First Grade					
All Students	23	0	35	48	17
General Education	20	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-

Second Grade					
All Students	11	9	18	45	27
General Education	10	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	13	23	62	15	0
General Education	11	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	9	0	22	44	33
General Education	7	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	12	0	25	42	33
General Education	10	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
Sixth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	5	40	0	40	20
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Eighth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	0	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	9	0	33	44	22
General Education	9	0	33	44	22
SWD	0	-	-	-	-

Eleventh Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	8	25	25	38	13
General Education	8	25	25	38	13
SWD	0	-	-	-	-

Group	**2008 Cohort 4 Year**		**2007 Cohort 5 Year**	
	n	**Graduation Rate (%)**	**n**	**Graduation Rate (%)**
All	160	59	178	65
Students With Disabilities	39	26	40	43
Limited English Proficient	8	-	3	-
Economically Disadvantaged	71	62	92	62

List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2011-12

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Limited English Proficient
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science - Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary- Level ELA – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – White

- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – All Students
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – White
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged

List Any Measures Where the District Did Not Meet AYP in 2012-13

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary- Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – 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 (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers (2012-13)	# of Teachers (2013-14)
Hudson City School District	Maria J. Suttmeier	2012-present	Con	1861	1863	4P, 1 Dean	4 P, 1 Dean	164	153

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Stud (12-13)	# of Stud (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teach (12-13)	# of Teach (13-14)
John L. Edwards Primary School	Steven Spicer	2011-14	Con	PK-2	456	511	1P	1P	37	38
Montgomery C. Smith Intermediate School	Mark Brenneman	2009-14	Con	3-6	551	525	1P	1P	46	41
Hudson Jr/Sr High School	Derek Reardon	2009-14	Con	7-8 9-12	854	787	2P, 1 Dean	2P, 1 Dean	76	74
	Antonio Abitabile	2012-14								

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/hudson-appr-plan.pdf **Most current version as of:** December 14, 2012

Performance Evaluation Rubrics	
Teacher	**Principal**
Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model	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	52	56	47	6

Effective	42	23	43	92
Developing	6	16	8	2
Ineffective	1	5	1	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	April Marsh, Project Assistant	May 17, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by July 15, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	August 16, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	December 17, 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	February 20, 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	August 5, 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**
5545-13-0018	$234,604	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. **Preparation** – Activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
2. **Recruitment and Placement** – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
3. **Induction and Mentoring** – The district used grant funds to provide for individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: ***Highly effective and effective teachers were identified and selected as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs).***
4. **Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: ***The district used grant funds to provide that all administrators participated in professional development related to inter-rater reliability for the purposes of Annual Professional performance Reviews (APPR).***
5. **Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: ***The district supported the Building- and District-wide Improvement Plans that will be developed, including an embedded section on professional development, for the 13-14 school year.***
6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: ***The district used funds so that all administrators participated in professional development related to inter-rater reliability for the purposes of APPR and collected and analyzed teacher performance data using iObservation.***
7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: ***The district used grant funds to select and support highly effective and effective teachers who will be identified as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs). In addition, the Lead Evaluator position was created to oversee APPR and also the TLC's.***

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I: To Foster Mentoring through peer-education	Highly effective and effective teachers will be identified and selected as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs). These TLCs will facilitate instruction meetings; co-teach with other teachers for lesson development and implementation, model instruction, serve on leadership teams, present at conferences and workshops, and assist teachers in Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs). The Lead Evaluator will conduct pre and post meetings concerning teacher classroom observations, conduct teacher observations, provide support to teachers and teacher leaders, identify professional development requirements, coach/model for teachers in need of improvement.	Hudson CSD hired 4 TLCs. The Lead Evaluator conducted approximately 40 observations a year. She also facilitated professional development (PD) on the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and curriculum development every PD day. She met with TIP teachers as well.
Goal II: School- and district-wide coordination of evaluation	Observation data will be generated for 100% of teachers using the Marzano rubric. 100% of teachers found to be less than Effective will be offered follow-up modeling and coaching within 10 days of receiving final evaluation score.	159 teachers were observed annually using the Marzano rubric. 9 teachers had TIPs developed by September 20, 2014. List of teachers from iObservation. Lead Evaluator submitted evidence of meeting times with admin about TIP teachers.

Goal III: Planning PD and Coaching/Mentoring School- and district-wide.	Building- and District-wide Improvement Plans will be developed, including an embedded section on professional development, for the 13-14 school year. The 13-14 district level PDP will be revised to contain measureable PD goals based on State level and local level student achievement data. Lead Evaluator and TLCs will assist with the implementation of the data-driven decision making process district-wide.	District Comprehensive Improvement Plan (DCIP) goals of providing continuous PD to teachers this year have been met. School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) goals are still ambiguous. The PDP has been revised to support District/Board of Education (BOE) goals and the DCIP and SCEPs. This goal has not been met yet. No evidence to submit. Not on track.
Goal IV: PD reaching into the classroom.	Identify teachers who are in need of improvement. Develop TIPs plan and develop embedded PD schedule with Lead Evaluator and/or TLC. Building administrators and district-level administrators develop informal observation/formal observation/walk-through schedule so that 100% of teachers are observed by at least two administrators. Using the Marzano rubric, identify "must-sees" when conducting formal and informal observations. Review with teachers.	9 teachers had TIPs developed by September 20, 2014. Non-tenured teachers are observed twice a year by two different administrators. Tenured teachers are split up between building and district level administrators. The K-12 “must-sees” are student engagement, higher-level questioning, learning goals, and rubrics. iObservation charts showing counts for each element.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
$234,604	$42,544	$193,306

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)
16	Administrative Assistant	1	$254	$1,847	$2,094	
45	Misc. supplies - Staples	N/S	-	$213	-	
80	Teacher Retirement System	1	-	$3,355	-	
80	Social Security	1	-	$2,309	-	
80	Workers Compensation	1	-	$302	-	
80	Health Insurance	1	-	$4,448	-	
80	Dental/Vision	1	-	$491	-	
49	Using iObservation to collect and analyze teacher performance data	N/S	-	-	$8,640	
15	Lead Evaluator Position	1	-	-	$42,500	
	Total Actual Expenditures		**$254**	**$12,965**	**$53,234**	

***Year 2 Financials are not available.**

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

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

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

Preparation

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

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

Recruitment and Placement

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools 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 advanced their professional practice and met its Goal III: to foster mentoring through peer-education.

Both the Lead Evaluator position and the Teacher and Learning Coaches were charged with both mentoring and induction, and provided individualized Professional Development (PD) to teachers at the beginning of the school year and while conducting observations. The Teaching and Learning Coaches offered one-on-one and small group PD to all teachers across the district.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Teacher and Learning Coach (4 positions)	T – Induct	Informal	Coach, DDI	District	15	All Teachers	$8,000

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:

- Hudson City School District (HCSD) already has an official New Teacher Mentor Plan; however, the Lead Evaluator has already offered individualized PD to teachers while conducting observations. HCSD amended their plan to create the position of Teacher and Learning Coach. The district's plan is to hire 4 or 5 coaches.
- Highly Effective and Effective teachers were identified and selected as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs). These TLCs facilitated instruction meetings; co-taught with

other teachers for lesson development and implementation, modeled instruction, served on leadership teams, presented at conferences and workshops, and assisted teachers in Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs).

- The Lead Evaluator conducted pre and post meetings concerning teacher classroom observations, conducted teacher observations, provided support to teachers and teacher leaders, identified professional development requirements, and coached/modeled for teachers in need of improvement.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The TLCs were hired and have started to receive coaching training. Based on their comfort level they are all engaged in some sort of one-on-one and/or small group PD at various levels across the district.
- HCSD has faced a few challenges in fully launching the TLC support, they are working to increase building administrators call on the TLCs for support as this was not done regularly.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports and Final Report Status Call:

- The Lead Evaluator facilitated PD on the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and curriculum development every PD day. She met with TIP teachers as well.
- The grant manager shared a success story of the Math TLC and work accomplished in the K – 2 building. Initially resistant, a team of second grade teachers chose to fully implement the Math Modules mostly because of their great experiences working with the Math TLC. The Grant Manager and the Math TLC described themselves as being pleasantly surprised, and that there was no expectation that this group would be in this direction; and all on their own.

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 is meeting its Goals I and II: to foster mentoring through peer-education, and school and district-wide coordination of evaluation The district provided for training so that all administrators participated in professional development related to inter-rater reliability for the purposes of Annual Professional performance Reviews (APPR). There were two sessions with the Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA) facilitator throughout the school year.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Using iObservation to collect and analyze teacher performance data	T – Eval	Resource	DDI, APPR - SLO	BOCES - DS	49	All Teachers and Principal	N/A	$8,640
Lead Evaluator Position	T –	Pos - All	Coach,	District	15	All	1	$42,500

	Eval, P – Eval		APPR – All			Teachers and Principals		

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

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent reported that the Lead Evaluator has helped to relieve some of the anxiety of the APPR process. Additionally, she has helped to take some of the observation duties away from K – 12 principals; working to improve inter-rater reliability.
- A building principal reported that the Lead Evaluator conducted some teacher evaluations in each building and provided feedback to principals to prepare them for informal, pre and post conferences. The Lead Evaluator offered PD to staff, helping to orient those teachers recalled to the Marzano rubric.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The observation data will be generated for 100% of teachers using the Marzano rubric. 100% of teachers found to be less than effective were offered follow-up modeling and coaching within 10 days of receiving final evaluation score.
- Teachers who were in need of improvement were identified; developed TIPs and developed embedded PD schedule with Lead Evaluator and/or TLC.
- The building administrators and district-level administrators developed informal observation/formal observation/walk-through schedule so that 100% of teachers were observed by at least two administrators. Using the Marzano rubric, evaluators identified "must-sees" when conducting formal and informal observations, and reviewed with teachers.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- All administrators received inter-rater reliability training throughout the school year.
- The Lead Evaluator conducted pre and post meetings concerning teacher classroom observations, conducted teacher observations, provided support to teachers and teacher leaders, and identified professional development requirements, coached/modeled for teachers in need of improvement.
- .
- The Lead Evaluator identified teachers who were in need of improvement. She developed TIPs plan and developed embedded PD schedule with Lead Evaluator and/or TLC.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The Lead Evaluator conducted approximately 40 observations a year. She also facilitated PD on the CCLS and curriculum development every PD day. She met with TIP teachers as well, providing similar support and individualized coaching in areas of need.

- The district has identified 9 teachers who have had TIPs developed by September 20, 2014. Non-tenured teachers were observed twice by two different administrators. Tenured teachers were split up between building and district level administrators.

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.
Summary: Evidence suggests that the district used grant funded activities to meet its STLE Goals I, III & IV: to foster mentoring through peer-education, planning professional development opportunities and coaching/mentoring school- and district-wide, and professional development that is reaching into the classroom. The district used grant funds to successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. Teachers and principals had opportunities to engage in professional development. Both the Lead Evaluator (Administrative) and Teacher Leader Coach positions were created in such a way as to offer both embedded professional development and or mentor opportunities for teachers who were rated as either Developing or Ineffective.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
CASDA PD for TLCs	PD - External	Group, Individual	Grant, Turnkey	FP - DS	40	4	3, with individual follow up	$6,600
CASDA PD for teachers	PD – External	Group, Individual	DDI, APPR - SLO	FP - DS	40	30 Teachers	1, with individual follow up	$9,213
CASDA PD for administrators	PD – External	Group, Individual	DDI, APPR - Obs	FP – DS	40	8 Principals	2, and throughout school year	$3,575
Teacher Observations using “iObservation”	PD – External	Individual	DDI, APPR - Obs	BOCES - DS	49	155 Teachers	1 observation with Pre and Post meetings	$8,640
Questar III PD for teachers on Phonic Awareness	PD - External	Group	CC – ELA, CC – Other	District	15	16 Teachers	1, and throughout school year	$9,312
2014 Summer Institute by CASDA facilitators	PD – Internal	Group	CC - Other	FP - DS	40	40 Teachers	3 Days	$4,400
Stipends for teacher attending 2014 Summer Institute	PD – Internal	Group	CC – Other	District	15	40 Teachers	3 Days	$9,030

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent reported that Questar III has helped to drive the growth of the teachers; meeting weekly with staff to provide input as to what further development is needed as well as areas district and building administrators have identified as areas of need.
- A Coach reported that teachers are surveyed on what further PD they want which helped to increase buy in and acceptance of changes in education. Coaches provided feedback during the observation process based on PD that was given. A pre-conference discussion entails what PD has occurred and what observer expects to see based on this PD.
- Another Coach reported that they met with teachers individually as well as by grade level to asses where further support is needed. Further support is needed with close reading, based on observations (non-evaluative) and discussion feedback was given to administration as to where further teacher development was needed.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The Lead Evaluator has conducted individualized PD to teachers while conducting observations, as well as district-wide PD. The Master Teachers were set up to do this as well in Year 2.
- The 2013 Summer Institute was organized as planned.
- Highly Effective and Effective teachers were identified and selected as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs). These TLCs facilitated instruction meetings; co-taught with other teachers for lesson development and implementation, modeled instruction, served on leadership teams, presented at conferences and workshops, and assisted teachers in Teacher Improvement Plans.
- Building- and District-wide Improvement Plans were developed, including an embedded section on professional development, for the 2013-2014 school year. The 2013-2014 district level Professional Development Plan (PDP) was revised to contain measureable PD goals based on State level and local level student achievement data.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district identified teachers who were in need of improvement; developed TIPs plan and developed embedded PD schedule with Lead Evaluator and/or TLC.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The Lead Evaluator conducted approximately 40 observations a year. She also facilitated PD on the CCLS and curriculum development every PD day. She met with TIP teachers as well.
- The Professional Development Plan was revised to support District/BOE goals and the District Comprehensive Improvement Plan (DCIP) and School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEPs). The goals previously did not align to the BOE/District goals as there weren't any official goals before the 2012-13 school year. The improvement strategies in the DCIP and SCEPs were not part of the PD plan as these documents did not exist prior to the 2012-13 school year. The PD plan how reflects the BOE/District goals and highlights the activities in the DCIP and SCEPs.
- The Hudson CSD reported that DCIP goals of providing continuous PD to teachers this year have been met. SCEP goals are still ambiguous.

- The 4 TLCs benefited from coaching sessions with the CASDA facilitators. Approximately 30 teachers participated in PD sessions with the CASDA facilitator; they continued to follow-up with the facilitator as needed. The 30 teachers were part of the Summer Institute. 8 administrators participated in two different sessions that were at least an hour long each; the 8 administrators participated in APPR inter-rater reliability training.
- Approximately 16 teachers worked on creating Phonemic Awareness strategies at the primary level or worked to combine the math modules and envisions at the intermediate level.
- Approximately 40 teachers received PD on improving student engagement in specifically social studies and science, or in their content area in general.
- Approximately 40 teachers participated in PD on improving student engagement within the classroom.

Performance Management

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

Summary: Through these activities the district has achieved its Goals I and III target: to foster mentoring through peer-education and planning professional development and coaching/mentoring school- and district-wide.

The Lead Evaluator and the Teacher Leader Coaches were recruited and selected based upon data driven criteria connected to the teacher and principal evaluation system index of meeting or exceeding standards, and also because of qualitative data that indicated a long history of successful practice both instructionally and within the classroom.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compen-sation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
CASDA PD for teachers	T – PM	Develop	DDI, APPR - SLO	ISC	40	30 Teachers	$9,213
CASDA PD for administrators	P - PM	Develop	DDI, APPR - Obs	ISC	40	8 Principals	$3,575
Teacher Observations using "iObservation"	PD – External	Individual	DDI, APPR - Obs	ISC	49	155 Teachers	$8,640

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

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent reported that the Lead Evaluator is very up to speed with CCLS and Rubicon and curriculum mapping. She worked with special area teachers to help with implementing CCLS into their curriculum. Teachers were very receptive to the help. This has helped to relieve some of the anxiety of the APPR process. In addition, the Lead Evaluator helped to take some of the observation duties away from k – 12 principals; working to improve inter-rater reliability.

- A Principal reported that the Lead Evaluator conducted some teacher evaluations in each building and provided feedback to principals to prepare them for informal, pre and post conferences. The Lead Evaluator offered PD to staff, helping with recall teachers to catch them up on Marzano rubric.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The Lead Evaluator used evaluation data to determine one-on-one professional development needs of teachers.
- The Lead Evaluator conducted pre and post meetings concerning teacher classroom observations, conducted teacher observations, provided support to teachers and teacher leaders, and identified professional development requirements, coached/modeled for teachers in need of improvement.
- The Lead Evaluator identified teachers who are in need of improvement.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- TIPs were written for those teachers who scored at Developing or Ineffective.
- Teachers in general have been working with a CASDA Data Analyst to improve the quality of their assessments and to better understand and utilize the student assessment data in Link - It and Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).
- Secondary teachers benefited from full-day, small group work that allowed them to focus on assessments and data.
- The district identified teachers who were in need of improvement. Developed TIPs plan and developed embedded PD schedule with Lead Evaluator and/or TLC. Building administrators and district-level administrators developed informal observation/formal observation/walk-through schedule so that 100% of teachers were observed by at least two administrators.
- The district administration used the Marzano rubric; identified "must-sees" when conducting formal and informal observations, and then a formal review with teachers.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 100% of all teachers were observed annually using the Marzano rubric. It was reported that 9 teachers had TIPs developed by September 20, 2014. Non-tenured teachers were observed twice a year by two different administrators. Tenured teachers were split up between building and district level administrators.
- Approximately 155 teachers have been observed and evaluated using iObservation as the data collection platform. They have pre- and post-meetings with administrators and discussed strengths and areas for improvement. iObservation calculates the teachers' final APPR scores and provided data to the administrators on overall strengths and weaknesses within their building.

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: Efforts toward meeting this standard supported the district in meeting its Goal III: to foster mentoring through peer-education.

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

Teacher Leaders were recruited and selected based upon data driven criteria connected to the teacher evaluation system index of meeting or exceeding standards. The district created a total of 4 Teacher Leader Coach positions and 1 administrative leader position; a Lead Evaluator.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Lead Evaluator Position	P – POSA	STLE 1	Coach, APPR - Obs	15	Stipend	1	$42,500
Teacher and Learning Coach	T – FT	STLE 1	Coach, DDI	15	Stipend	4	$8,000

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

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent reported that it's about finding the right fit. One has to meet the coaches where they are, and provide training to become a coach; one cannot ignore PD. The district must be very specific with roles and monitor their progress. They must know exactly the expectations of their coaching role. Districts must ask what the coaches can bring to the position and to the district. Coaches should have an E/HE rating and a certain number of years within the district.
- A principal reported that as the year progresses and Teacher Leaders roles are in full implementation; Teacher Leaders provide staff with the PD staff is asking for and administration will provide time for Teacher Leaders to present PD topics. The coaches will work with teachers on the Common Core (CC) shifts and providing a deeper level of understanding within the shifts. One of the major goals of coaching is having them able to implement data to help inform instruction.
- The Teacher Leaders reported that the triumphs are that some teachers are very interested in improving their teaching. Another reported that the triumphs associated with being a TLC are interacting with staff across the district and sharing information and seeing its benefit in the classroom.
- A mentee reported that the mentor has helped her to understand "Daily 5" and offered suggestions on how to get started. "When I do get parts of it started in my classroom, the children will be engaging in reading and writing activities a little more during the week than we are currently. The partnership has been very positive. I have been enjoying the

conversations and feedback my mentor has given me. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with her."

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The Highly Effective and Effective teachers were identified and selected as Teaching and Learning Coaches (TLCs).

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The TLCs were hired and received coaching training. Based on their comfort level they were all engaged in some sort of one-on-one and/or small group PD at various levels across the district.
- The TLCs worked with teachers, K-12, on how to bring CC instruction into their classrooms. The TLCs focused on target areas when providing this support - data, technology, math, and ELL students. The TLCs received regular coaching and mentoring time with CASDA facilitators. Lead Evaluator conducted observations of teachers across K-12 and professional development on Common Core instruction in the technical subjects.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The four TLCs received coaching training from two CASDA facilitators. They met three times as a whole group and have had on-going, one-on-one communication with the CASDA facilitators.
- The districts states that key accomplishment is seeing how well the TLCs have adapted to their new role as a coach within their buildings/across the district. The TLCs did not start this work until late fall/winter time but were already seen as independent and willing to take risks and put themselves in the spot light when helping teachers.

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 is using STLE funded activities to support the equitable distribution of	

high quality educators.

The district has focused mentoring and professional development through the Teacher Improvement Plans for the nine teachers identified as Developing or Ineffective that involved the alignment of the Common Core Learning Standards and modifying instruction based on Data Drive Analysis through the program "Link – It". Additionally, there has been a focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) through the use of STLE funds.

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

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- A Teacher Leader reported that the Lead Evaluator has done the following:
    - Found ways to implement cross curricula instruction at the primary and elementary level.
    - Integrated technology into the classroom.
    - Worked with principals for teachers on TIPS: using her as a resource for improvements, looking at trends among teachers to provide further development sessions, brainstorms with TIP teachers on ways in which to improves, provides further resources
    - Helped at all levels incorporating social studies and science into math and English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum, and seeing the carry over into music, art, and technology; also seeing paralleling of writing within ELA and social studies.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The Lead Evaluator facilitated a CCLS Literacy in the Technical Areas PD session for Special Area teachers in grades K-12. Lead Evaluator also provided on-the-spot PD when conducting post-observation conferences with teachers.
- Lead Evaluator conducted classroom observations as well as researching and developing Master Teacher criteria. Lead Evaluator also facilitated 1/2 PD session with all Special Area teachers K-12 on CCLS Literacy requirements in the Technical Subjects.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The CASDA Data Analyst worked with teachers on improving the quality of their assessments, aligning to CCLS, and with teachers on how to analyze assessment data in Link-It and SRI so that teachers know how to change instruction in the classroom.
- The TLCs worked with teachers, K-12, on how to bring Common Core instruction into their classrooms. The TLCs focused on target areas when providing this support; such as data, technology, math, and English Language Learners (ELL) students.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 9 teachers had TIPs developed by September 20, 2014.
- Non-tenured teachers were observed twice a year by two different administrators. Tenured teachers were split up between building and district level administrators.

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 has already been awarded STLE 3 which has allowed them to continue the STLE initiatives for another school year. The district is in the planning stages of re-allocating funds from other professional development sources or from the General Fund.

Short Description	Code	Type
Teaching and Learning Coach	Personnel	Grant
Lead Evaluator/Professional Developer	Personnel	Grant

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 Interview:

- The Superintendent reported that through STLE, the district created a Lead Evaluator position to assist with the APPR process. The Lead Evaluator completes observations, pre/post conferences as well as provides differentiated, targeted support for K-12 teachers. The Lead Evaluator assists principals across the district providing feedback as to areas where further professional development is needed. The Lead Evaluator is also conducting observations which have helped to lessen the workload of administrators. This has allowed for administrators to focus on other important school and district initiatives.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The district does have long-term plans to continue the position of Lead Evaluator after the grant period. The district has not specified how they will continue the position, nor have they made any other comment on sustainability within this report.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district has applied for STLE III to sustain the Lead Evaluator for another year and to support the stipend for the TLCs.
- The 1003a funds currently support other types of PD in the district. The district will closely monitor the effectiveness of all PD supported from all funds in order to prioritize what PD is continued and funded for next school year.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district has been awarded STLE 3 so they will continue to fund the Lead Evaluator and the TLCs through that until June 30, 2015. They will also revise the budget narrative

for STLE 3 for the 2014- 2015 school year to allow them to continue the work they have started with CASDA.

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

- Meet with Superintendent and Coordinator of School Improvement
- K-12 Literacy Coach

Building Level

- Intermediate School Principal
- Junior High School Principal
- Teaching and Leading Coach Members
- Teacher

Partnering organization

- Capital Area School Development Association

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

- Hudson Year 1 Final Report
- Hudson Site Visit Notes
- Hudson Year 2 Interim Report
- Hudson Year 2 Final Report
- Hudson Year 2 Final Call Notes