



**New York State Education Department**

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

**Mayfield Central School District**

**Table of Contents**

**Contents**

District Contact Information ..... 3

Section I – District Description..... 3

Section II – Academic Performance ..... 4

Section III – District Schools Profile ..... 7

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 7

Section V – Monitoring History ..... 8

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile ..... 9

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis ..... 12

    Preparation ..... 12

    Recruitment and Placement ..... 14

    Induction and Mentoring..... 14

    Evaluation ..... 16

    Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth ..... 16

    Performance Management ..... 18

    Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 18

    Other ..... 20

    Issues of Equity..... 20

    Sustainability..... 21

Section VIII – Methodology ..... 22

**District Contact Information**

|              | <b>Superintendent</b>         | <b>STLE Grant Manager</b>         |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Name</b>  | Joseph Natale                 | Nick Criscone                     |
| <b>Phone</b> | 518-661-8207                  | 518-661-8251                      |
| <b>Email</b> | natale.joseph@mayfieldcsd.org | criscone.nicholas@mayfieldcsd.org |

**Section I – District Description**

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

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

| <b>District Location</b> |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Region</b>            | <b>BOCES</b>                      |
| Upper Hudson             | Hamilton- Fulton-Montgomery BOCES |

| <b>District Designations (i.e. DTSDE School, TIF Recipient, etc.)</b> |
|---|
| Good Standing   |

| <b>Student Demographics</b> |                                |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Students</b>   | <b>Eligible for Free Lunch</b> | <b>Eligible for Reduced Lunch</b> | <b>Limited English Proficient</b> | <b>Students with Disabilities</b> | <b>Economically Disadvantaged</b> |
| 889                         | 230                            | 79                                | -                                 | 138                               | 376                               |

| <b>Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)</b>    |                                  |                           |   |              |                    |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------|--------------------|
| <b>American Indian or Alaskan Native</b> | <b>Black or African American</b> | <b>Hispanic or Latino</b> | <b>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> | <b>White</b> | <b>Multiracial</b> |
| 0  | 1                                | 1                         | 1   | 97           | 1                  |

| <b>Attendance/Suspension Rates</b> |                            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Annual Attendance Rate</b>      | <b>Student Suspensions</b> |
| 94%                                | 4%                         |

| <b>Teacher Qualifications</b> |  |  |   |                                   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b># Teachers</b>             | <b>Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate</b> | <b>Percent Teaching Out of Certification</b> | <b>Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience</b> | <b>Turnover Rate all Teachers</b> |
| 70                            | 0  | 0  | 25%   | 13%                               |

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| <b>Need Status</b>    |
| Average Need District |

## Section II – Academic Performance

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

**Most current information as of:** June 30, 2014

| <b>Student Performance: 2011-12 New York State ELA Examination</b> |                         |                         |                         |                        |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>   | <b>% Proficient All</b> | <b>% Proficient SWD</b> | <b>% Proficient ELL</b> | <b>% Proficient ED</b> |
| 3(2011-12)   | 67                      | 20                      | None tested             | 50                     |
| 3(2012-13)   | 21                      | 0                       | None tested             | 17                     |
| 4(2011-12)   | 80                      | 14                      | None tested             | 87                     |
| 4(2012-13)   | 13                      | 0                       | None tested             | 13                     |
| 5(2011-12)   | 64                      | 33                      | None tested             | 54                     |
| 5(2012-13)   | 28                      | 0                       | None tested             | 26                     |
| 6(2011-12)   | 62                      | 9                       | None tested             | 33                     |
| 6(2012-13)   | 31                      | 0                       | None tested             | 17                     |
| 7(2011-12)   | 44                      | 18                      | None tested             | 11                     |
| 7(2012-13)   | 20                      | 0                       | None tested             | 9                      |
| 8(2011-12)   | 45                      | 0                       | None tested             | 32                     |
| 8(2012-13)   | 26                      | 0                       | None tested             | 19                     |
| <b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>                                     | <b>59</b>               | <b>15</b>               | <b>None tested</b>      | <b>43</b>              |
| <b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>                                     | <b>23</b>               | <b>0</b>                | <b>None tested</b>      | <b>16</b>              |

| <b>Student Performance: 2011-12 New York State Mathematics Examination</b> |                         |                         |                         |                        |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>   | <b>% Proficient All</b> | <b>% Proficient SWD</b> | <b>% Proficient ELL</b> | <b>% Proficient ED</b> |
| 3(2011-12)   | 48                      | 11                      | None tested             | 30                     |
| 3(2012-13)   | 24                      | 0                       | None tested             | 17                     |
| 4(2011-12)   | 87                      | 57                      | None tested             | 86                     |
| 4(2012-13)   | 31                      | 8                       | None tested             | 25                     |
| 5(2011-12)   | 78                      | 42                      | None tested             | 65                     |
| 5(2012-13)   | 33                      | 0                       | None tested             | 35                     |
| 6(2011-12)   | 88                      | 45                      | None tested             | 81                     |
| 6(2012-13)   | 51                      | 18                      | None tested             | 34                     |
| 7(2011-12)   | 50                      | 18                      | None tested             | 32                     |
| 7(2012-13)   | 19                      | 0                       | None tested             | 9                      |
| 8(2011-12)   | 47                      | 0                       | None tested             | 40                     |
| 8(2012-13)   | 10                      | 0                       | None tested             | 4                      |

|                                |           |           |                    |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| <b>District Wide (2011-12)</b> | <b>66</b> | <b>25</b> | <b>None tested</b> | <b>56</b> |
| <b>District Wide (2012-13)</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>4</b>  | <b>None tested</b> | <b>20</b> |

| <b>Student Performance: 2011-12 Science Examination</b> |                         |                         |                         |                        |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>  | <b>% Proficient All</b> | <b>% Proficient SWD</b> | <b>% Proficient ELL</b> | <b>% Proficient ED</b> |
| 4(2011-12)  | 100                     | 100                     | None tested             | 100                    |
| 4(2012-13)  | 91                      | 67                      | None tested             | 91                     |
| 8(2011-12)  | 90                      | 20                      | None tested             | 58                     |
| 8(2012-13)  | 77                      | 60                      | None tested             | 65                     |
| <b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>                          | <b>95</b>               | <b>45</b>               | <b>None tested</b>      | <b>78</b>              |
| <b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>                          | <b>84</b>               | <b>63</b>               | <b>None tested</b>      | <b>80</b>              |

| <b>Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams</b> |                     |                  |                                   |                  |
|--|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Exam</b>  | <b>All Students</b> |                  | <b>Students With Disabilities</b> |                  |
|  | <b>% Proficient</b> | <b>% Mastery</b> | <b>% Proficient</b>               | <b>% Mastery</b> |
| Comprehensive English  | 73                  | 29               | 50                                | 8                |
| Integrated Algebra   | 92                  | 21               | 75                                | 0                |
| Geometry   | 89                  | 24               | 0                                 | 0                |
| Algebra 2/ Trigonometry  | 65                  | 11               | 0                                 | 0                |
| Global History and Geography                                     | 84                  | 39               | 60                                | 10               |
| U.S. History and Government                                      | 97                  | 56               | 92                                | 33               |
| Living Environment   | 86                  | 35               | 40                                | 0                |
| Physical Setting/ Earth Science                                  | 81                  | 36               | n<5                               | n<5              |
| Physical Setting/ Chemistry                                      | 64                  | 7                | 0                                 | 0                |
| Physical Setting/ Physics  | 100                 | 43               | 0                                 | 0                |

| <b>Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction</b> |                     |                  |                     |                  |
|--|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|  | <b>2008 Cohort</b>  |                  | <b>2009 Cohort</b>  |                  |
|  | <b>% Proficient</b> | <b>% Mastery</b> | <b>% Proficient</b> | <b>% Mastery</b> |
| <b>All</b>   | 86                  | 36               | 84                  | 36               |
| <b>SWD</b>   | 46                  | 0                | 46                  | 0                |
| <b>ELL</b>   | None tested         | None tested      | None tested         | None tested      |
| <b>ED</b>  | 82                  | 27               | 62                  | 12               |

| <b>Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction</b> |                     |                  |                     |                  |
|---|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|   | <b>2008 Cohort</b>  |                  | <b>2009 Cohort</b>  |                  |
|   | <b>% Proficient</b> | <b>% Mastery</b> | <b>% Proficient</b> | <b>% Mastery</b> |
| <b>All</b>  | 88                  | 15               | 86                  | 26               |
| <b>SWD</b>  | 46                  | 0                | 31                  | 0                |
| <b>ELL</b>  | None tested         | None tested      | None tested         | None tested      |
| <b>ED</b>   | 85                  | 9                | 69                  | 4                |

| 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   | 4     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 5     | 2        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 7     | 2        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 8     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
| Mathematics   | 4     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 5     | 2        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 7     | 2        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 8     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
| Science   | 4     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
|   | 8     | 1        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |

| 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  | 0        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |
| Mathematics  | 0        | -                              | -       | -       | -       |

| Group                      | 2008 Cohort 4 Year |                     | 2007 Cohort 5 Year |                     |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
|                            | n                  | Graduation Rate (%) | n                  | Graduation Rate (%) |
| All                        | 94                 | 85                  | 82                 | 88                  |
| Students With Disabilities | 13                 | n<30                | 10                 | n<30                |
| Limited English Proficient | 0                  | None tested         | 0                  | None tested         |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 33                 | 79                  | 20                 | n<30                |

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

| List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not Meet</u> AYP in 2012-13   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary-Level ELA – White</li> <li>Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Economically Disadvantaged</li> <li>4- Year Graduation-Rate – Economically Disadvantaged</li> </ul> |

### 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) |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Mayfield CSD  | Paul Williamsen | 2008-13         | Original | 987                     | 961                     | 2 P, 1.5 AP          | 2 P, 1 AP            | 74                      | 72                      |
|               | Joe Natale      | 2013-14         | New      |                         |                         |                      |                      |                         |                         |

| School Name         | School Principal | Time of Service | Status | Grades Served | # of Stud (2012-13) | # of Stud (2013-14) | # of Admin (2012-13) | # of Admin (2013-14) | # of Teach (2012-13) | # of Teach (2013-14) |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Mayfield Jr. Sr. HS | Rob Husain       | 2001-13         | Orig   | 7-12          | 485                 | -                   | 1 P, 1 AP            | -                    | 37                   | -                    |
|                     | Chris Wojeski    | 2013-14         | New    |               | -                   | 431                 | -                    | 1 P, 1 AP            | -                    | 36                   |
| Mayfield ES         | Nick Criscone    | 2004-13         | Con    | P-6           | 502                 | 506                 | 1 P, 0.5 AP          | 1 P                  | 37                   | 36                   |

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

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

| APPR Plan   |
|---|
| <b>Current APPR Plan:</b> <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/mayfield-appr-plan.pdf">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/mayfield-appr-plan.pdf</a> |
| <b>Most current version as of:</b> October 26, 2012   |

| Performance Evaluation Rubrics                                   |   |
|--|---|
| Teacher  | Principal                                     |
| Danielson's <i>Framework for Teaching</i> (2011 Revised Edition) | Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric |

| Teacher Evaluation (2012-13)      |                  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Presented as % by rating category | Composite Rating | State-provided growth or other comparable measures | Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth | Other measures of teaching effectiveness |
| <b>Highly-Effective</b>           | 51               | 35   | 65   | 78                                       |
| <b>Effective</b>                  | 49               | 57   | 33   | 22                                       |
| <b>Developing</b>                 | 0                | 2  | 2  | 0  |
| <b>Ineffective</b>                | 0                | 6  | 0  | 0  |

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

\*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

| <b>School Year</b> | <b>Type of Monitoring</b>                   | <b>NYSED Staff</b>   | <b>Date</b>                   |
|--------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>2012-13</b>     | Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District | N/A  | Submitted by April 1, 2013    |
| <b>2012-13</b>     | Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call    | Aviva Baff,<br>Project Coordinator   | May 20, 2013                  |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District   | N/A  | Submitted by July 15, 2013    |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call      | Carrie Smith,<br>Project Coordinator;<br>April Marsh,<br>Project Assistant;<br>Megan Lee Collins,<br>Project Assistant | August 27, 2013               |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Site Visit                                  | Carrie Smith,<br>Project Coordinator   | October 24, 2013              |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District | N/A  | Submitted by February 7, 2014 |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call    | Carrie Smith,<br>Project Coordinator   | May 20, 2014                  |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District   | N/A  | Submitted by June 30, 2014    |
| <b>2013-14</b>     | Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call      | Robert Husain,<br>Project Assistant  | August 21, 2014               |

**Section VI –Grant Profile**

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

| <b>Grant Information</b> |                       |                             |                                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>STLE #</b>            | <b>Funding Amount</b> | <b>Implementation Dates</b> | <b>Individual or Consortium</b> |
| 5545-13-0024             | \$121,125             | 10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014      | Individual                      |

| <b>Key Program Design Elements</b>  |
|---|
| <p><b>1. Preparation</b> – 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: <i>Mayfield CSD partnered with Rochester Institute of Technology in providing Project Lead the Way training to a new technology teacher. The STEM and Literacy coaches have provided guidance and training in the development of STEM courses and a “Reading Workshop” course for targeted 7th and 8th grade students.</i></p>               |
| <p><b>2. Recruitment and Placement</b> – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>3. Induction and Mentoring</b> – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: <i>The Coaches and Turnkey Trainers guided new teachers in new instructional strategies and curriculum approaches to build their toolbox of techniques.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>4. Evaluation</b> – The new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) system based on Education Law §3012-c: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>   |
| <p><b>5. Professional Development/Growth-</b> Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>The district has undertaken grant funded activities to meet all of its STLE Goals by offering professional development in the areas of Literacy, Special Education and STEM. Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA) offered professional development to the Coaches and Turnkey Trainers, who in turn, trained the faculty and staff within the district.</i></p> |
| <p><b>6. Performance Management</b> – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i></p>  |
| <p><b>7. Career Ladder</b> – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>The district created a total of 11 teacher leader positions. 5 have been selected as Coaches in the areas of Literacy, Special Education and STEM. 6 others served as turnkey trainers in the area of Literacy and Special Education.</i></p>  |

| <b>Program Goals<br/>(Taken from year 1 Final Report)</b>   | <b>Targets<br/>(Taken from year 1 Final Report)</b>   | <b>Outcomes<br/>(Taken from Year 2 Final Report)</b>   |
|---|---|--|
| Goal I: Improve teacher and leader effectiveness and thereby increase student achievement by developing | We have hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a STEM Coach. | The district has hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>and implementing training, support and coaching program related to meeting the needs of students with disabilities with a K through 8th grade focus.</p>   | <p>We have also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education. Annual and triennial CSE have resulted in reduction of services for students who have demonstrated success in grades 9 – 12</p> <p>SPED Coaches along with Turnkey Trainers will analyze NYS assessment scores in ELA and Math to determine strategies for 2013-2014 and inclusion in Literacy models being developed for implementation in September</p> <p>Rochester Institute of Technology (Project Lead the Way training for 6th-8th grade technology teacher)</p> | <p>STEM Coach.</p> <p>The district also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education.</p> <p>The district indicated that it is important to note the increase of co-teaching environments for their students with disabilities, creating a less restrictive environment (as compared to 15:1 classes for ELA, math and content areas).</p> <p>The district now has 2 co-teaching classes in the elementary school and 2 in the Jr/Sr HS with 2 more being added next school year. Creating these less restrictive environments provides greater opportunities for special education students and their success has been monitored and greater progress has occurred according to our standardized assessments and curriculum based assessments. Mayfield partnered with Rochester Institute of Technology in providing Project Lead the Way training to a new technology teacher.</p> |
| <p>Goal II: Improve teacher and leader effectiveness and thereby student achievement by developing and implementing a literacy coaching program (district-wide) and a literacy class (7/8) in the district.</p> | <p>We have hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a STEM Coach. We have also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in</p>  | <p>The elementary coaches worked consistently with their colleagues, new teachers in providing turnkey training to improve instructional strategies in ELA.</p>  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education.</p> <p>Literacy coaches, scores from 2012-2013 and performance on diagnostic testing (STAR - Renaissance Learning) to identify target group for literacy courses in grades 7 &amp; 8 CASDA trainer, Angie Camarata worked with SPED teacher doing literacy course with SWD's to create course materials, goals and outcomes.</p>  | <p>The district Literacy Coaches identified students in need of further ELA instruction in grades 7 &amp; 8. The development of the Reading Workshop has better prepared these students for the NYS 3–8 testing.</p>  |
| <p>Goal III: Improve teacher and leader effectiveness and thereby increases student achievement by developing and implementing a STEM infusion program in the district with a 6th through 8th grade focus.</p> | <p>We have hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a STEM Coach. We have also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education.</p> <p>Hired new technology teacher to work with STEM coaches/turnkey trainers to implement a new STEM program while infusing STEM district wide</p> <p>Sent new technology teacher to Project Lead the Way training at Rochester Institute of Technology during July of 2013... specifically the Gateway Program (Grades 6 - 8)</p> | <p>The hire of a Technology teacher, has been a positive for the district. He is trained the Gateway Program of Project Lead the Way, and is offering STEM courses such as Design and Drawing for Production and Introduction to Engineering which have been popular offerings.</p> |

| <b>Total Grant Award</b> | <b>Year 1 Allocation</b> | <b>Year 2 Allocation</b> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| \$121,125                | \$41,482                 | \$82,954.00              |

| Budget Code | Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives<br><i>(This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)</i> | # In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased | Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported<br><i>(10/31/12 – 3/1/13)</i> | Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F<br><i>(10/31/12 – 6/30/13)</i> | Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported<br><i>(7/1/13 – 12/31/13)</i> | Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F<br><i>(7/1/13 – 6/30/14)</i> |
|-------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 15          | Stipends for Career Ladder Positions  | 11                                   | -   | \$23,500  | -   | \$35,469  |
| 40          | Professional Development from CASDA   | 11                                   | \$12,192  | \$12,192  | -   | \$29,535  |
| 40          | Bureau of Education and Research  | 1                                    | -   | \$225   | -   | -   |
| 45          | Apple, Inc. – Purchase of Mini iPad and covers  | 11                                   | \$2,202   | \$2,202   | -   | -   |
| 45          | Amazon.com/GE Capital   | 1                                    | -   | \$52  | -   | -   |
| 40          | Create and Implement New Courses (STEM and Reading)   | 2                                    | -   | -   | \$29,064  | -   |
| 45          | Create and Implement New Courses (STEM and Reading) Supplies  | 2                                    | -   | -   | \$12,569  | \$16,545  |
|             | <b>Total Actual Expenditures</b>  |                                      | <b>\$14,394</b>   | <b>\$38,171</b>   | <b>\$41,633</b>   | <b>\$81,549</b>   |

## Section VII –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**

| <b>Preparation</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Standard</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Summary:</b> The district has met this standard by preparing existing district educators for new roles within the district’s career ladder.  |  |
| The district incorporated grant funded activities to attain its Goal II: to develop courses in Literacy and STEM where most needed to better advance our student opportunities in these |  |

areas, leading to increased student achievement.

Mayfield partnered with Rochester Institute of Technology in providing Project Lead the Way training to a new technology teacher. The district recruited and selected STEM and Literacy coaches through data driven criteria connected to the teacher evaluation system index of meeting or exceeding standards. These coaches have provided guidance and training in the development of STEM courses and a “Reading Workshop” course for targeted 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students.

| Short Description                                   | Code     | Type   | Purpose               | Provider | Budget Code | # Served   | Total Amount |
|---|----------|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|--|--------------|
| STEM and Literacy Coaches                           | New Role | T – CL | STEM, CC – ELA, Coach | District | 15          | 72 Teachers                                      | \$8,000      |
| Create and Implement New Courses (STEM and Reading) | N/A      | N/A    | STEM, CC – ELA        | District | 40          | 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Students | \$29,064     |
| Create and Implement New Courses (STEM and Reading) | N/A      | N/A    | STEM, CC- ELA         | District | 45          | 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Students | \$12,569     |

**Supporting Evidence:**

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

Evidence from the Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent and Grant Coordinator reported that they have developed a relationship with Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) to build upon future trainings in STEM. More Mayfield students are going to RIT/showing interest in attending. The Technology teacher has been able to bring computer software to the district through STLE that district could not have afforded otherwise, and is using that software for grades 7-12.
- The Technology teacher reported that students are very excited to be using technology in advanced ways. Student engagement is high, with high interest in the robotics and computer code writing in class. He hopes to see increase in science and math grades; more students going into science and engineering fields. The program is helping to train students with higher level thinking; students will be better prepared to excel in college level courses.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The recently hired Technology teacher is registered for and attending Project Lead the Way Training (Gateway - grades 6 - 8) at Rochester Institute of Technology during July of 2013. The STEM Coach has certification in Information Technology and will provide mentoring and support to new teachers.
- The district has hired a new technology teacher to work with STEM coaches/turnkey trainers to implement a new STEM program while infusing STEM district wide.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- This district has participated in in-depth workshops with Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA) to build capacity in developing an effective Response to Intervention Team based on the problem solving approach, which revolves around data.
- The district with CASDA developed their first ever Co-Teaching program to add to their continuum of Special Education services to increase effectiveness in this area.
- The district indicates that it has continued training for Project Lead the Way at the University of Rochester.

Evidence from Mayfield Year 2 Final Report:

- The hire of the Technology teacher, has been a positive for the district. He is trained in the Gateway Program of Project Lead the Way, and is offering STEM courses such as Design and Drawing for Production and Introduction to Engineering which have been popular offerings.

***Recruitment and Placement***

| <b>Recruitment and Placement</b>   |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Standard</b>  | 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. |
| <b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by the Strengthening Teacher Leader Effectiveness (STLE) grant funded activities. |  |

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

***Induction and Mentoring***

| <b>Induction and Mentoring</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Standard</b>   | The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes. |
| <p><b>Summary:</b> The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators have mentoring. Additionally in meeting this standard, the district achieved its Goal II: to develop courses in Literacy and STEM where most needed to better advance our student opportunities in these areas, leading to increased student achievement.</p> <p>The district created the position of Coaches to mentor newly hired teachers,</p> <p>The Coaches guided new teachers in new instructional strategies and curriculum approaches to build their toolbox of techniques.</p> |  |

| Short Description             | Code       | Type            | Purpose                    | Provider | Budget Code | # Served | Total Amount |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Literacy, SPED & STEM Coaches | T – Mentor | Group, Informal | SWD, Coach, CC – ELA, STEM | District | 15          | 9        | \$13,000     |

**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 the Year 1 Final Report:

- The Literacy, STEM and SPED coaches were responsible for aid in the planning of instruction, collaborating with teachers, planning for professional development opportunities, facilitating opportunities for reflection, be a reference point for resources, develop trusting relationships and communication with teachers, provided assistance with accumulation and analysis of data and work within the intervention model created by the district.
- The district indicates that the turnkey trainers collaborated with teachers to implement common core, work directly with teachers in coordinating professional development opportunities, facilitate opportunities for reflection, be a reference point for resources within Literacy, SPED and STEM, provide assistance in the accumulation and analysis of data and assist each coach in the specific area in which they were assigned.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The teachers paid under the STLE grant worked closely with new teachers. They held professional learning circles with them, were observers in their classrooms, and recommended instructional techniques for them to implement.
- The selected coaches and trainers held Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to guide new teachers in new instructional strategies and curricular approaches to build their toolbox of techniques. Teachers gathered monthly to read and discuss professional learning articles and other professional materials and discuss what it looks like in the classroom. Coaches go into the new teachers’ classrooms to observe them as they begin trying new techniques. They coached the new teachers in real-time and followed up with reflective practice and feedback. 8 Coaches and Turnkeys involved; New or Developing Teachers impacted: 1 PK, 1 Grade 1, 2 Grade 3, and 1 Grade 8, 9 and the entire HS English Dept.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The five Coaches provided professional development experiences for turnkeys in areas specific to their assignment (ELA, Math, STEM, Special Educations as well as Data Driven Instruction (DDI)).
- The 6 individuals charged with turn keying the sessions worked with entire staff on topics brought to them by coaches. STEM teachers worked with 6th grade teachers on how to use the new Project Lead the Way STEM software that junior high schools students will

use every day. Sixth grade teachers will begin teaching the foundations of this in their program next school year.

- The 11 Coaches and Turnkeys also sat on building leadership committees, such as Shared Decision Making and Response to Intervention to give direction, study data, develop new programs, and observe students and peers.
- The Mentoring and Coaching Project has been quite successful as stated by the district. Teachers selected as coaches and a turnkey worked in PLC's to help new and developing teachers become effective. The mentoring teachers met with teachers bi-monthly to read and discuss professional articles.

**Evaluation**

| <b>Evaluation</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Standard</b>   | The district is fully implementing an Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan that complies with Education Law §3012-c and is approved by the commissioner. Through the evaluation system the district has a common language to discuss effective teaching and leadership practices |
| <b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities. |  |

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

**Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth**

| <b>Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Standard</b>  | 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. |
| <b>Summary:</b> 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.  |   |
| Evidence suggests that the district has undertaken grant funded activities to meet all of its Strengthening Teacher Leader Effectiveness (STLE) Goals by offering professional development in the areas of Literacy, Special Education and STEM. Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA) offered professional development to the Coaches and Turnkey Trainers, who in turn, trained the faculty and staff within the district. |   |

| Short Description                                | Code            | Type  | Purpose                    | Provider | Budget Code | # Served | Frequency  | Total Amount |
|--|-----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Literacy, SPED and STEM Coaches-Turnkey Trainers | T – PD Internal | Group | SWD, STEM, Coach, CC – ELA | District | 15          | 72       | Monthly    | \$9,000      |
| Professional Development from CASDA              | T – PD External | Group | Coach                      | District | 40          | 11       | 6 Sessions | \$12,192     |

**Supporting Evidence:**

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

Evidence from the Site Visit Interviews:

- In this report the grant coordinator stated, “Our coaches and turnkeys are working very closely with new and developing teachers to expand their instructional repertoire. Our RTI Data team meets about twice per month to carefully analyze data to make instructional and programmatic recommendations while assisting teachers in carrying out the plans we set forth. Our new reading course is servicing many struggling students that would have otherwise been very difficult to reach and our STEM program is at an all-time high with the addition of several new and engaging courses for our students. These programs reverberate through our district as our projects provide models of new possibilities and ways to increase opportunities for student success.”

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district indicated that CASDA trainer, Angie Camarata, worked with SPED teacher doing literacy course with SWD's to create course materials, goals and outcomes.
- The district indicated that teachers were given the opportunity to attend professional development opportunities within the district and at Herkimer Fulton Montgomery (HFM) BOCES in the areas of APPR (Danielson, 2011), Data Driven Instruction (DDI) and assessment and Common Core.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Interim Report:

- The Coaches and Trainers participated in workshops on how to effectively analyze data, develop data teams, use data to drive programs, and coaching techniques to assist teachers.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district created professional learning circles where professional teachers hosted a review of professional articles and videos and then discussion regarding teaching techniques. After their discussions, new teachers practiced implementing those techniques in their classroom. The professional teachers would then do a peer observation, offer feedback on the instructional strategies and/or classroom management topic being practiced in the classroom. This helped increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement as evident in testing results.
- The district indicated that it is important to note the increase of co-teaching environments for their students with disabilities, creating a less restrictive environment (as compared to 15:1 classes for ELA, math and content areas). The district now has 2 co-teaching classes in the elementary school and 2 in the Jr/Sr HS with 2 more being added next school year. Creating these less restrictive environments provides greater opportunities for special education students and their success has been monitored and greater progress has occurred according to our standardized assessments and curriculum based assessments.

- The 5 Coaches provided professional development experiences for the turnkeys in areas specific to their assignment (ELA, Math, STEM, Special Education as well as DDI).
- The 6 Turnkeys trainers worked with entire staff on topics brought to them by coaches. STEM worked with 6th grade teachers to teach them how to use the new Project Lead the Way (PLTW) STEM software that the Jr HS students will use every day. 6th grade teachers will begin teaching the foundations of this in their program next school year.
- The 11 Coaches and Turnkeys also sat on building leadership committees, such as SDM and RTI to give direction, study data, develop new programs, observe students and peers.

***Performance Management***

| <b>Performance Management</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Standard</b>   | The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions. |
| <b>Summary:</b> This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities. |   |

| Short Description | Code | Type | Purpose | Compensation | Budget Code | # Hired/ Developed | Total Amount |
|-------------------|------|------|---------|--------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| N/A               |      |      |         |              |             |                    |              |

***Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals***

| <b>Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Standard</b>   | 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. |
| <p><b>Summary:</b> The district effectively used grant funds to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation to fulfill the career ladder positions.</p> <p>Efforts toward meeting this standard supported the district in meeting its Goal I: to develop a career ladder which financially rewards effective and highly effective teachers and utilizes their expertise to support other faculty to improve student outcomes.</p> <p>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 has created a total of 11 teacher leader positions. 5 have been selected as Coaches in the areas of Literacy, Special Education and STEM. 6 others will serve as turnkey trainers in the area of Literacy and Special Education.</p> |  |

| Short Description                | Code   | Type   | Purpose             | Budget Code | Compensation | # On Ladder | Total Amount |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Literacy, SPED & STEM Coaches    | T – FT | STLE 1 | SWD, STEM, CC – ELA | 15          | Stipend      | 5           | \$13,000     |
| Literacy & SPED Turnkey Trainers | T – FT | STLE 1 | SWD, CC - ELA       | 15          | Stipend      | 6           | \$9,000      |

**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 the Site Visit Interviews:

- The Superintendent and Grant Coordinator reported that teachers who have great leadership qualities, but not willing to seek further administrative certification have the option under STLE to build teacher leadership without leaving the classroom. More of the faculty are going to teacher leaders for help and are helping to improve instruction; relying less on administrator help for leadership and more on teacher leaders. The coaching model has increased communication across all grade levels/disciplines. More teachers, not receiving STLE stipends are acting as teacher leaders because they have seen the value of the STLE programs/initiatives.
- Two Teacher Leaders reported that it is a huge benefit to get to see how other educators handle different students, teaching strategies and approaches. This has been a great learning experience, and has helped us to become better teachers. Being a part of the solution is wonderful. Being able to help fellow colleagues and at the end of the day, knowing that I helped students grow is amazing

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district indicated the desire is to continue with these positions beyond the years of the grant. In essence to replace the Department Heads that was reduced because of budget/fiscal crisis.
- The district hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a STEM Coach. The district also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education.
- The district Literacy Coaches, analyzed scores from 2012-2013 and performance on diagnostic testing (STAR - Renaissance Learning) to identify target group for literacy courses in grades 7 & 8.
- The SPED Coaches along with Turnkey will analyze NYS assessment scores in ELA and Math to determine strategies for 2013-2014 and inclusion in Literacy models being developed for implementation in September.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The teachers identified as effective and highly effective were given opportunities to "coach" new teachers so they are highly supported and begin their careers with a great deal of guidance.
- The district indicated that teachers paid under grant; worked closely with new teachers, they held professional learning circles with them, observed them in their classrooms, and recommended instructional techniques for them to implement.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district indicated that the Mentoring and Coaching Project has been quite successful.

**Other**

| <b>Other</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Standard</b>   | [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. |
| <b>Summary:</b> 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**

| <b>Issues of Equity</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Standard</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Summary:</b> The district is using STLE funded activities to support the equitable distribution of high quality educators. In particular, the district has hired and trained a technology teacher in area of STEM, focused on special education populations for areas where best teachers are needed and took an analytic approach to Literacy in creating the “Reading Workshop” course for 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students. |   |

**Supporting Evidence:**

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district hired coaches for Literacy (2 - 1 per building), Special Education (2 - 1 per building) and a STEM Coach. We have also hired turnkey trainers (2 per area) to help the coaches as they prepare to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education.
- The district hired a new technology teacher to work with STEM coaches/turnkey trainers to implement a new STEM program while infusing STEM district wide, and sent the new technology teacher to Project Lead the Way (PLTW) training at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) specifically the Gateway Program (Grades 6 -8).

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The STEM Coach and trainers work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in STEM. Professional Development is offered for teachers implementing new STEM courses in Project Lead the Way. Implementation of Drawing, Design & Production, Principles of Engineering & Residential Structures courses have begun in September, 2013.

- The Mentoring, PLC's, and non-evaluative classroom observations to assist new teachers are in place. Turnkey trainers worked with coaches as they prepared to work directly with teachers in both buildings to implement the initiatives in Literacy, STEM and Special Education. Bi-Weekly data meetings to analyze student data form a variety of sources to provide program recommendations to teachers of struggling students. (RTI Data Team).
- The 2 SPED, 2 Literacy and 4 Turnkey Trainers analyzed NYS assessment scores in ELA and Math to determine strategies for 2013-2014 and inclusion in Literacy models being developed for implementation in September 2013.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The 5 Coaches provided professional development experiences for the turnkeys in areas specific to their assignment (ELA, Math, STEM, Special Education as well as Data Driven Instruction).
- The 6 Turnkeys worked with entire staff on topics brought to them by coaches. STEM worked with 6th grade teachers to teach them how to use the new PLW STEM software that the Jr HS students will use every day. 6th gr. teachers will begin teaching the foundations of this in their program next school year.
- The 11 Coaches and Turnkeys also sat on building leadership committees, such as SDM and RTI to give direction, study data, develop new programs, observe students and peers.

***Sustainability***

| <b>Sustainability</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Standard</b>  | The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant. |
| <b>Summary:</b> The district has used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district. While it is not clear exactly how the district will sustain programs and personnel related to the Strengthening Teacher Leader Effectiveness (STLE) grant, the district has indicated that it is exploring sustainability options through the budget process. |   |

| <b>Short Description</b>   | <b>Code</b> | <b>Type</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| The district will continue with the Literacy, SPED and STEM Coaches through STLE 3 | Personnel   | Shift       |

**Supporting Evidence:**

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district indicated that it has plans to continue with the positions created under STLE 1, but gives no indication as to a method for doing so.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that it was recently notified that it will be awarded a STLE 3 grant. STLE 3 grant is being designed to elevate and enhance the work the district started under STLE 1.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district indicated that sustainability is major issue. STLE 3 has allowed the district to keep the instructional coaches in the areas of Literacy, STEM and Special Education. STLE 3 will lose the turnkey trainers, but will be replaced with a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Teacher on Special Assignment.

**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*

- Interim Superintendent
- Grant Coordinator & Elementary Principal

*Building Level*

- Jr. – Sr. High Principal
- Reading Coach
- SPED Coach
- SPED Turnkey Trainer
- Elementary Teachers/Mentees
- SPED Turnkey Trainers
- Jr. – Sr. High ELA Turnkey Trainer
- Technology Teacher

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

- Mayfield CSD Site Visit Notes
- Mayfield CSD Year 1 Final Report
- Mayfield CSD Year 2 Interim Report
- Mayfield CSD Year 2 Interim Report
- Mayfield CSD Year 2 Final Report