



**New York State Education Department**

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

**Monticello Central School District**

**Table of Contents**

**Contents**

District Contact Information ..... 3

Section I – District Description..... 3

Section II – Academic Performance ..... 4

Section III – District Schools Profile ..... 8

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 10

Section V – Monitoring History ..... 10

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile ..... 11

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis ..... 15

    Preparation ..... 15

    Recruitment and Placement ..... 16

    Induction and Mentoring..... 17

    Evaluation ..... 17

    Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth ..... 17

    Performance Management ..... 20

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

    Other ..... 22

    Issues of Equity..... 22

    Sustainability..... 23

Section VIII – Methodology ..... 24

**District Contact Information**

	<b>Superintendent</b>	<b>STLE Grant Manager</b>
<b>Name</b>	Daniel A. Teplesky	Tammy Mangus
<b>Phone</b>	(845) 794-7700 #70910	(845) 794-7700 #70928
<b>Email</b>	dteplesky@k12mcsd.net	tmangus@k12mcsd.net

**Section I – District Description**

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

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

<b>District Location</b>	
<b>Region</b>	<b>BOCES</b>
Mid-Hudson	Sullivan 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>
3070	1606	219	122	422	1865

<b>Racial/Ethnic Origin</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%	22%	24%	2%	49%	3%

<b>Attendance/Suspension Rates</b>	
<b>Annual Attendance Rate</b>	<b>Student Suspensions</b>
94%	33%

<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>
282	0%	0%	4%	11%

<b>Need Status</b>
High Need/Resource Rural Districts

## Section II – Academic Performance

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

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

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12 &amp; 2012-13 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)	26	7	0	18
3(2012-13)	13	0	0	7
4(2011-12)	42	17	18	31
4(2012-13)	11	0	0	6
5(2011-12)	47	0	22	36
5(2012-13)	13	0	0	7
6(2011-12)	36	6	0	24
6(2012-13)	16	0	n<5	9
7(2011-12)	42	9	0	32
7(2012-13)	19	0	0	11
8(2011-12)	43	3	n<5	32
8(2012-13)	20	2	0	12
<b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12&amp; 2012-13 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)	33	3	16	23
3(2012-13)	11	5	0	4
4(2011-12)	55	29	46	49
4(2012-13)	12	0	0	5
5(2011-12)	60	14	44	49
5(2012-13)	13	0	0	9
6(2011-12)	45	6	13	35
6(2012-13)	8	0	n<5	4
7(2011-12)	55	19	29	49
7(2012-13)	9	0	0	5
8(2011-12)	50	10	n<5	44
8(2012-13)	8	0	0	4

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

<b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>Student Performance: 2011-12&amp; 2012-13 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)	87	75	67	83
4(2012-13)	76	42	50	71
8(2011-12)	59	34	n<5	54
8(2012-13)	48	30	0	44
<b>District Wide (2011-12)</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>District Wide (2012-13)</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>59</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	70	17	38	0
Integrated Algebra	73	6	27	0
Geometry	61	21	56	0
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	51	22	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	48	9	13	1
U.S. History and Government	70	31	30	9
Living Environment	79	34	37	0
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	43	10	24	11
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	69	13	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/ Physics	83	26	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>	79	35	73	31
<b>SWD</b>	51	4	20	0
<b>ELL</b>	n<5	n<5	14	0
<b>ED</b>	78	20	68	19

<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>	78	10	82	11
<b>SWD</b>	32	0	28	0
<b>ELL</b>	n<5	n<5	43	14
<b>ED</b>	76	6	77	5

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

<b>2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA)</b>						
<b>Grades 3-8</b>						
	Grade	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	3	5	0	1	0	4
	4	5	0	1	1	3
	5	2	-	-	-	-
	6	3	-	-	-	-
	7	9	1	1	0	7
	8	7	0	0	2	5
Mathematics	3	5	0	0	1	4
	4	5	0	1	1	3
	5	2	-	-	-	-
	6	3	-	-	-	-
	7	9	0	0	6	3
	8	7	0	0	2	5
Science	4	5	0	0	2	3
	8	7	0	0	1	6

<b>2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA)</b>					
<b>Secondary Level</b>					
	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	10	0	0	0	10
Mathematics	10	0	0	1	9

<b>2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)</b>					
	n Tested	Percent of students scoring in each performance level:			
		Beg.	Int.	Ad.	Prof.
<b>Kindergarten</b>					
All Students	11	18	36	45	0
General Education	11	18	36	45	0
SWD	0				
<b>First Grade</b>					
All Students	17	0	41	35	24
General Education	13	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
<b>Second Grade</b>					
All Students	12	0	17	67	17
General Education	10	-	-	-	-

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

SWD	2	-	-	-	-
<b>Third Grade</b>					
All Students	13	8	23	46	23
General Education	12	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Fourth Grade</b>					
All Students	23	9	30	39	22
General Education	14	7	14	43	36
SWD	9	11	56	33	0
<b>Fifth Grade</b>					
All Students	11	18	27	27	27
General Education	7	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
<b>Sixth Grade</b>					
All Students	4	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	2	-	-	-	-
<b>Seventh Grade</b>					
All Students	15	0	27	60	13
General Education	8	0	25	50	25
SWD	7	0	29	71	0
<b>Eighth Grade</b>					
All Students	6	17	17	50	17
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
<b>Ninth Grade</b>					
All Students	4	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Tenth Grade</b>					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	0	-	-	-	-
<b>Eleventh Grade</b>					
All Students	7	14	29	29	29
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	4	-	-	-	-
<b>Twelfth Grade</b>					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	271	76	285	79
Students With Disabilities	53	53	55	53
Limited English Proficient	2	n<30	1	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	127	76	128	74

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2011-12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Limited English Proficient</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged</li> <li>• Secondary-Level Math – All Students</li> <li>• Secondary-Level Math – Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students</li> <li>• 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American</li> <li>• 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – White</li> <li>• 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities</li> </ul>

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Black or African American</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students with Disabilities</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient</li> <li>• Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged</li> </ul>

- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Hispanic or Latino
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Students with Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level ELA – All Students
- Secondary-Level ELA – White
- Secondary-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- 4-Year Graduation-Rate – Hispanic or Latino
- 4-Year Graduation-Rate – Students with Disabilities
- 4-Year Graduation-Rate – Economically Disadvantaged

### 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)
Monticello Central School District	Daniel Teplesky	2009-14	Con	2,956	2,970	5 P, 6 AP	5 P, 6 AP	292	297

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers* (2012-13)	# of Teachers* (2013-14)
Emma C. Chase Elementary School	William Frandino	2012-14	Con	K-5	367	362	1 P	1 P	32	25
George L. Cooke Elementary School	Sandra Johnson-Fields	2010-14	Con	K-5	571	553	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	52	45
Kenneth L. Rutherford Elementary School	Kimberly Patterson	1997-14	Con	K-5	499	528	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	50	43
Robert J. Kaiser Middle School	Nichole Horler	2012-14	Con	6-8	739	688	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	95	85
Monticello High School	Lori Orestano-James	2011-14	Con	9-12	894	883	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	77	111

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

Source: New York State Education Department as available

<b>APPR Plan</b>
<b>Current APPR Plan:</b> <a href="http://nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/monticello-appr-plan.pdf">http://nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/monticello-appr-plan.pdf</a> <b>Most current version as of:</b> October 7, 2013

<b>Performance Evaluation Rubric</b>	
<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Principal</b>
Marshall’s Teacher Evaluation Rubric	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

<b>Teacher Evaluation (2012-13)</b>				
Presented as % by rating category	<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 teaching effectiveness</b>
<b>Highly-Effective</b>	0	36	0	31
<b>Effective</b>	76	45	31	68
<b>Developing</b>	24	15	69	1
<b>Ineffective</b>	0	4	0	0

<b>Principal Evaluation (2012-13)</b>				
Presented as % by rating category	<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	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	June 4, 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, Project Coordinator; Megan Lee Collins, Project Assistant, April Marsh, Project Assistant	August 12, 2014
<b>2013-14</b>	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	December 10, 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, Project Coordinator	March 3, 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	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 31, 2014

## Section VI - STLE Grant Profile

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

<b>General Grant Information</b>			
<b>STLE #</b>	<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Implementation Dates</b>	<b>Individual or Consortium</b>
5545-13-0026	\$399,125	10/31/2012 - 6/30/2014	Individual

<b>Key Program Design Elements</b>
1. <b>Preparation</b> – Collaboration or formal partnership between the applicant and IHEs and/or other eligible partner: <i>The district developed a partnership for teacher leader training with a faculty member on sabbatical from Mt. Saint Mary’s College.</i>
2. <b>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>
3. <b>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>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i>

4. **Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: *This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.*
5. **Professional Development/Growth**- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: *Thinking Maps professional development was provided to coaches, who then conducted turnkey training of other teachers.*
6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: *This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.*
7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *The district paid stipends, with use of STLE grant funding, for career ladder positions of ThinkingMap Coach, Inclusion Steering Committee Member, and STEM Initiative Committee Member.*

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final)
<p>Goal I - Improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services.</p> <p>Objective #1: By June 30, 2014, 100% of Special Education students will receive instruction from trained Thinking Maps Teachers in order to increase the number of Special Education students receiving a Regents Diploma.</p>	<p>Highly effective and effective teachers will be selected to attend an in depth, interactive Thinking Maps (Training of Trainers) in district. Thinking Maps professional development (PD) will increase teacher and leadership effectiveness. It will help teachers and students move from basic knowledge and use to executive control.</p> <p>The PD is designed to help raise the level of discourse in collaborative problem-solving; increase critical thinking; develop skills for interdisciplinary reading, writing, speaking and listening; support acquisition and use of academic vocabulary. Upon completion of training leaders will be able to conduct introductory workshops for whole schools/content area groups; model Thinking Maps teaching demonstrations in classrooms; address differentiation strategies for</p>	<p>As a result of the Inclusion Co-Teaching Committee, the district had a vision and a mission for integrated co-teaching, and has 10 inclusion classrooms at the elementary level, 22 at the middle school and 37 at the high school. 231 teachers have been trained in use of ThinkingMaps for classroom support of struggling students.</p>

	<p>teachers using Think Maps in all grade levels; facilitate the development of interdisciplinary applications with Common Core state standards; lead schools in accessing student learning using Thinking Map Observe teachers' use of Thinking Maps in the classroom and provide non-evaluative specific targeted feedback for improvement or increased application.</p>	
<p>Goal II - Prepare Monticello students for today's changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in the Science, Technology, Engineering, mathematics (STEM) fields.</p> <p>Objective #2: By June 30, 2014, utilize the expertise of STEM teachers to support and increase students participating in STEM program.</p>	<p>Upon review of the Common Core expectations, it is clear that our staff needs to be further developed in these capacities and create strong Common Core project-based units that will enhance the abilities of our students to be successful in the STEM fields. All technology teachers will be trained in the creation of STEM project-based units that demand the skills required by the Common Core.</p> <p>Training attended by all technology teachers; STEM Project-Based Units created and implemented. Student work reviewed and rated for STEM and Common Core quality.</p>	<p>The STEM Committee Members worked to create a three-year plan for the District in terms of creating core values, a mission and annual action planning guide. Team members also created STEM associated units and lessons for their own classroom use as part of the committee.</p> <p>Specialist increased STEM Development through providing ongoing professional guidance and assistance to our teachers.</p>

<b>Total Grant Award</b>	<b>Year 1 Allocation</b>	<b>Year 2 Allocation</b>
\$399,125	\$134,995	\$366,873

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

<b>Budget Code</b>	<b>Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)</b>	<b># In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased</b>	<b>Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)</b>	<b>Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)</b>	<b>Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)</b>	<b>*Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)</b>
45	Cadimensions	-	-	-	-	\$5,000
45	Purchased Thinking Maps manuals for trainings.	317	-	\$32,252	-	-
45	USGS	-	-	-	-	\$53
45	Electronix Express, Kelvin Electronics, Apple ComputerNERDS Inc., Dell, CDW-G Computer	-	-	-	-	\$60,581
45	Kristt Co., Shoprite, Walmart, Home Depot,	-	-	-	-	\$238
45	Shi Intl, Stratasys,CCS Express, Max Interactive	-	-	-	-	\$17,728
45	Carolina Biological	-	-	-	-	\$49
45	Staples	-	-	-	-	\$183
45	Annese & Associates Inc.	-	-	-	-	\$24,636
15	ThinkingMaps Training for Teachers	246	-	-	\$58,008	\$3,180
15	ThinkingMaps Coaches	3	-	-	-	\$7,500
15	Inclusion Steering Committee Member	11	-	-	-	\$27,500
15	STEM Committee Member	6	-	-	-	\$15,000
15	Curriculum Writing Teacher	2	-	-	-	\$4,778
15	Teacher Professional Development	238	-	-	-	\$67,896
40	ThinkingMaps Trainer, Designs for Thinking LLC	1	-	-	\$20,000	\$26,100
46	New Orleans NSTA STEM Forum & Expo	5	-	-	-	\$4,637
49	STEM Facilitator, Sullivan Co BOCES	1	-	-	\$1,500	\$15,849
20	Allegheny Educational Systems	-	-	-	-	\$54,707
80	Employee Benefits	-	-	-	-	\$29,281
	<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$32,252</b>	<b>\$79,508</b>	<b>\$364,896</b>

## 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**

<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.
<p>Summary: The district developed a partnership for teacher leader training with a faculty member on sabbatical from Mt. Saint Mary’s College. This partnership and turnkey training by the Inclusion Coaches supported the district in attaining its Goal I: to have an impact on special education success rates through the use of inclusive co-teaching and training for all teachers in ThinkingMaps.</p> <p>Training included co-teaching, universal design for learning to meet the needs of all students, best ways to work with teachers to increase buy in and implementing co-teaching models with the implementation of Common Core.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Inclusion Coaches - Integrated (collaborative) co-teaching team member responsible for developing collaborative co-teaching protocols for the district.	New Role	T - CL	SWD, Coach	District	15	297 – Entire Faculty	\$30,000

### **Supporting Evidence:**

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

#### Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent reported that training from Dee Berlinghoff has been wonderful (on sabbatical from Mt. Saint Mary’s College). Dee first looked at the instructional model with a focus on Students with Disabilities (SWD); focusing on sessions using explicit instruction-researched based in SWD. Work continues on what good teaching looks like;

gaining a deeper knowledge of effective instruction and the role of the co-teacher in the co-teaching model. This work is based on the Vanderbilt model; providing case studies based on real students in order to better inform instructional practice and to help teachers choose the best strategy based on the individual student. Dee is working with teachers on talking with each other; that professional “argue” in order to find the best solution for students.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The district indicated that the Inclusion Coaches will receive training to become leaders in Thinking Maps and provide a conduit for communication with colleagues in best practices and create communication forum amongst teachers to share ideas with one another. Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) Coaches will receive training to become leaders in STEM and provide a conduit for communication with colleagues in best practices and create communication forum amongst teachers to share ideas with one another.
- Highly Effective and Effective teachers will be selected to attend an in depth, interactive Thinking Maps (Training of Trainers) in district. Thinking Maps professional development (PD) will increase teacher and leadership effectiveness. It will help teachers and students move from basic knowledge and use to executive control.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that they are currently partnering with Ms. Berlinghoff from Mount Saint Mary's for their Inclusion Committee to train our Inclusion Coaches. Ms. Berlinghoff has met with the Inclusion team 3 times.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- As a result of the Inclusion Co-Teaching Committee, there is a vision and a mission for integrated co-teaching, and has incorporated 10 inclusion classrooms at the elementary level, 22 at the middle school and 37 at the high school.
- The Inclusion Coaches have been responsible for integrated (collaborative) co-teaching team member responsible for developing collaborative co-teaching protocols for the district.

***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 have effective or highly effective educators.
Summary: This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	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.
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							

***Evaluation***

<b>Evaluation</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	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: 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.
<p>Summary: The district made progress toward meeting this standard. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that Goal II: to prepare Monticello students for today’s changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in the STEM fields, is being accomplished by providing professional development related to the targets identified with this goal. The only evidence is that BOCES (budget code 49) was paid \$1,500 (Year 2 Interim Report) for a STEM Facilitator.</p> <p>In particular the Thinking Maps professional development provided to coaches, and their subsequent turn-key training of other teachers, is positively received and appears to be effective. This is helping the district realize the three targets associated with Goal I, to improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services.</p>	

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

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Thinking Maps training for all teachers	T-PD External	Group	CCLS-ELA, CCLS-Other	FP	15	247	2 days- (6hrs and 3hrs)	\$58,008
					40	240	317	\$20,000
Thinking Maps manuals for training	Material	Books	CCLS-ELA, CCLS-Other	N/A	45	287	N/A	\$32,252
Inclusion training	T-PD External	Group	SWD, Turnkey, D Strategy	FP	40	12	3 days	-
STEM Facilitator	T-PD External	Group	STEM, Turnkey	BOCES	49	6	2 times month for one hour, pushes into classes	\$1,500

**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:

- Highly Effective and Effective teachers will be selected to attend an in depth, interactive Thinking Maps (Training of Trainers) in district. All technology teachers will be trained in the creation of STEM project-based units that demand the skills required by the Common Core.
- PD is designed to help raise the level of discourse in collaborative problem-solving; increase critical thinking; develop skills for interdisciplinary reading, writing, speaking and listening; support acquisition and use of academic vocabulary. Upon completion of training, leaders will be able to conduct introductory workshops for whole schools/content area groups; model Thinking Maps teaching demonstrations in classrooms; address differentiation strategies for teachers using Think Maps in all grade levels; facilitate the development of interdisciplinary applications with Common Core state standards; and lead schools in accessing student learning using Thinking Maps.
- The district indicated that upon review of the Common Core expectations, it is clear that their staff needs to be further developed in these capacities and create strong Common Core project-based units that will enhance the abilities of their students to be successful in the STEM fields.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent reported that Thinking Maps training is provided to Thinking Maps coaches in order for them to turn key strategies, coach district teachers in best practices of Thinking Maps and create a forum among teachers to share ideas with each other. 83% of teachers have been trained in Thinking Maps, as of the date of the site visit. Elementary

teachers are seeing extreme success; Thinking Maps are seen all throughout the elementary school.

- The two Principals reported that Thinking Maps training has been the biggest emphasis in terms of professional development (PD). The Special Education Dept. is seeing great gains with their students. “Buy in” from teachers has been wonderful.
- A teacher leader reported that many teachers are using Thinking Maps on a more consistent basis to help implement Common Core modules.
- The partner indicated that she and the district have built a strong foundation for teachers in order to implement the co-teaching model. They have a deeper knowledge of specially designed instruction, role/responsibilities of the teacher and co-teacher. Teachers leave the training with the capacity to bring strategies back to the classroom to immediately implement.
- A principal indicated that the Director of Pupil Personnel Services is leading an integrated learning team. It includes teachers, a social worker and a psychologist. Team members become coaches to other teachers to provide immediate support to colleagues at each building level.
- A principal indicated that the program has built capacity to sustain the co-teaching model after STLE has concluded. PD has helped to increase the understanding of the importance of an integrated co-teaching model, and provides training on implementing strategies.

#### Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report and Call Notes

- The district has provided all teachers (287) with training in using Thinking Maps and two teachers are serving as Thinking Maps Coaches to support their fellow teachers in implementation (each receiving a \$2,500 stipend, to be paid at the end of year 2).
- The district provided 12 STLE funded inclusion coaches (\$2,500 stipends to be paid at end of year 2) with training by an STLE “partner”, a professor from Mount St. Mary’s College (on sabbatical), who specializes in special education. The 12 inclusion coaches are to then turnkey their training to other teachers. The goal is to create a district-wide vision of what inclusion should look like.
- The district provided 6 STLE STEM coaches (\$2,500 stipends to be paid at the end of year 2) with training through a BOCES provided STEM facilitator, with the goal of having the STEM coaches turnkey STEM techniques to all of the 7<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> grade math, science and technology teachers.
- The district indicated that the purpose of this training is to support the inclusion team in developing a district-wide vision of what effective inclusion looks like, and support the six inclusion coaches (career ladder positions) in effectively supporting the district in inclusion practices

#### Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 90% of teachers across the District received “ThinkingMaps” training. Additionally, three coaches were hired in order to guide teachers through questions and issues. “ThinkingMaps” Trainers were brought in to train coaches and teachers to enhance and encourage implementation in Special Education (SPED) and Inclusion areas of instruction.

- As a result of the Inclusion Co-Teaching Committee, the district has a vision and a mission for integrated co-teaching, and has 10 inclusion classrooms at the elementary level, 22 at the middle school and 37 at the high school.
- 231 teachers have been trained in use of “ThinkingMaps” for classroom support of struggling students.
- The Integrated Co-Teaching Team met regularly, partnered with the shared decision making team for the District to debrief the work completed and help professional development to build a District framework for Inclusion for Monticello.
- The STEM Committee Members worked to create a three-year plan for the District in terms of creating core values, a mission and annual action planning guide. Team members also created STEM associated units and lessons for their own classroom use as part of the committee. Additionally, the 3-year plan is part of the overall plan for instructional and budgetary purposes.

***Performance Management***

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

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Served	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>The district has successfully created and piloted career ladder positions for eligible effective or highly effective teachers. The evidence indicated that they received training to carry out their new roles and responsibilities and have been well received by staff. This was a key component for the district to accomplish both Goal I: to improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services, and Goal II: to prepare Monticello students for today’s changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in the STEM fields.</p> <p>Specifically, the district has developed three career ladder positions. ThinkingMaps Coaches worked with teachers throughout the district on implementing ThinkingMaps, which are visual representations of information that support learners in understanding content and concepts.</p> <p>Inclusion coaches worked to create a unified vision of how inclusion can be used in the district and supported teachers in effectively implementing inclusion.</p> <p>STEM Committee Members were tasked with creating a district-wide vision and 3 year plan for</p>	

STEM education in the district, and for creating STEM unit plans.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Thinking Maps Coach	T-FT	STLE1	CCLS- ELA, CCLS- Other	15	Stipend	2	-
Inclusion Coach	T-FT	STLE1	SWD	15	Stipend	12	-
STEM Committee Members	T-FT	STLE1	STEM	15	Stipend	6	-

**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 and Year 2 Interim Report:

The District indicated that it intends to pay \$2,500 stipends at the end of year 2 for positions of:

- ThinkingMap Coach (2)
- Inclusion Coach (12)
- STEM Initiative Committee Member (6)

Evidence from Site Visit Interviews:

- The superintendent indicated that the Thinking Map Coaches have become leaders in Thinking Maps, provide a conduit for communication for ideas and needs to be shared, coach teachers in best practices and create a communication forum among teachers to share ideas with one another. The superintendent went on to make the same comments about the Inclusion Coaches and STEM Initiative Committee Members. There is a high amount of respect for the coaching positions.
- A Principal indicated that the Thinking Map coach position is a great resource for staff and has taken some workload off of principals. Coaches are being used as a resource, helping teachers to look at Thinking Maps in different ways. The STEM coach position is helping to integrate STEM project based units that meet the rigor of Common Core. The high school now has a STEM lab, used for technological components, and they are looking to use it for tech science and tech math. The district had to get a clear understanding of college and career readiness components from start to finish and is trying to rebuild what has been lacking in this area. They are now moving toward an integrated learning approach. The district is better preparing students for science and math fields. The STEM coach is redesigning curriculum to better prepare students for project based learning.
- A Teacher Leader indicated that Thinking Maps is being implemented in the classroom. Students like making maps due to it being a hands-on approach to learning. Students are more engaged in learning.
- Teacher Leaders indicated that they play a role as liaison between building and district administrators and are becoming proficient as leaders. They are planning what co-teaching should look like. They received a great deal of training to prepare them for the role.

**Other**

Other						
<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.					
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	
<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.
This standard is the direct focus of the district’s STLE grant program. The goals of the program were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services, and</li> <li>• To prepare students for today’s changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in the Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) fields.</li> </ul>	

**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 has identified the goals of the STLE grant as, to improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services and, to prepare Monticello students for today’s changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in the STEM fields.
- The District is paying \$2,500 stipends in year 2 for the career ladder positions:  
ThinkingMap Coach,  
Inclusion Steering Committee Member,  
STEM Initiative Committee Member

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent indicated that Inclusion Steering Committee Members and Teacher leaders of the STEM Initiative have become leaders in inclusion, provide a conduit for communication for ideas and needs to be shared, coach teachers in best practices and create a communication forum among teachers to share ideas with one another. The Director of Pupil Personnel Services is heading up an integrated learning team. They have found the district needs greater support with integrated co-teaching for students with

disabilities. Team members become coaches to other teachers to provide immediate support to colleagues at each building level.

- The district is in the process of completing an inclusion model for teaching in order to increase the achievement of students with disabilities. The roll out of this inclusion model has been slow in order to take into account a changing school culture as well as to increase the likelihood of the model's success. The district is taking great care in order to ensure successful implementation of the model and is preparing their staff well as co-teachers.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- All teachers have been trained in ThinkingMaps and Inclusion Coaches created a vision and protocol for successful inclusion classrooms.
- The district indicated that its focus is to improve learning by students receiving in-district special education services; with an objective being that within 5 years, 100% of in district students special education students will receive a Regents Diploma.
- The district indicated that it will prepare Monticello's students for today's changing job market, including the growing demand for workers in STEM fields with an objective being that within 5 years, 5% of Monticello students will enter one of the STEM fields after high school.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The STEM Committee Members worked to create a three-year plan for the District in terms of creating core values, a mission and annual action planning guide. Team members also created STEM associated units and lessons for their own classroom use as part of the committee.
- As a result of the Inclusion Co-Teaching Committee, the district has a vision and a mission for integrated co-teaching, and has 10 inclusion classrooms at the elementary level, 22 at the middle school and 37 at the high school.
- 231 teachers have been trained in use of “ThinkingMaps” for classroom support of struggling students.

***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.
The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant. Specifically, the district intends to continue all career ladder positions through its regular budgeting process, and to continue activities related to inclusion training by using Title II funds.	

<b>Short Description</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Type</b>
The district intends to continue career ladder positions through the budgeting process.	Personnel	Shift
The district intends to use Title II funders to continue inclusion activities.	Program	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 Year 1 Final Report:

- It is the districts intention to keep the positions of ThinkingMap coaches and also of the Inclusion Committee Coaches. The district stated that they will not continue with the STEM Coach positions.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report and Call Notes:

- The district responded YES to the question “Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/ stipend after the grant period?” for:  
ThinkingMap Coach,  
Inclusion Steering Committee Member,  
STEM Initiative Committee Member
- The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction indicated that, “we are working on this year’s budget to ensure that program activities can continue absent grant funds...” which will occur through the district’s budget. It was also indicated that the district will use Title II funds to continue inclusion co-teaching support.
- The district intends to use Title II funds for the 2014-15 school year to support professional development activities started with STLE funds.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district indicated that the STEM team created a three year plan. Budget will be built around this plan. Federal dollars in Title II will be used for professional development.
- The 5 positions on the Integrated Co-Teaching Team will continue to convene through District and Federal funding for professional development.

**Section VIII – Methodology**

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

Individuals interviewed

District Level:

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent and grant manager
- PPS Director

Building Principals:

- High School
- Elementary

Partnering Specialist:

- Inclusion Training

Career Ladder personnel:

- Inclusion Coach
- ThinkingMaps Coaches
- STEM Committee members

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

- Monticello Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Monticello Site Visit Notes
- Monticello Year 2 Interim Report and call notes
- Monticello Year 2 Final Report