



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Patchogue-Medford Union Free 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 9

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 14

 Preparation 14

 Recruitment and Placement 15

 Induction and Mentoring..... 16

 Evaluation 16

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 17

 Performance Management 19

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 19

 Other 21

 Issues of Equity..... 21

 Sustainability..... 22

Section VIII – Methodology 23

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Michael J. Locantore	Martha Kennelly
Phone	(631) 987-6380	(631) 987-9727
Email	mlocantore@pmschools.org	infomestruct@gmail.com

Section I – District Description

Source: All district description data comes from the Patchogue-Medford School District 2012-2013 New York State School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

Most current information as of: August 8, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Nassau Suffolk	Eastern Suffolk BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
7857	2592	883	829	921	3397

Racial/Ethnic Origin					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
18%	4%	32%	3%	60%	1%

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
95%	5%

Teacher Qualifications				
# Teachers	Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate	Percent Teaching Out of Certification	Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years' Experience	Turnover Rate all Teachers
518	0%	0%	55%	20%

Need Status
Average Need

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Patchogue-Medford UFSD Central School District 2012-2013 New York State School Report Card except where otherwise noted.

Most current information as of: August 8, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	48	9	7	31
3(2012-13)	21	0	1	10
4(2011-12)	53	11	9	37
4(2012-13)	20	4	1	13
5(2011-12)	54	12	6	37
5(2012-13)	18	2	0	9
6(2011-12)	51	10	2	38
6(2012-13)	21	2	0	10
7(2011-12)	51	11	5	31
7(2012-13)	26	0	0	16
8(2011-12)	43	5	3	31
8(2012-13)	28	5	0	16
District Wide (2011-12)	50	10	6	34
District Wide (2012-13)	22	2	0	12

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	53	18	17	38
3(2012-13)	20	1	2	10
4(2011-12)	61	26	19	47
4(2012-13)	20	1	4	14
5(2011-12)	57	29	11	41
5(2012-13)	21	3	2	10
6(2011-12)	60	14	18	47
6(2012-13)	17	5	0	9
7(2011-12)	59	21	12	42
7(2012-13)	17	1	0	8
8(2011-12)	56	16	26	48
8(2012-13)	16	3	0	10

District Wide (2011-12)	58	20	17	44
District Wide (2012-13)	19	2	2	10

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	88	82	53	80
4(2012-13)	91	76	60	87
8(2011-12)	78	45	37	70
8(2012-13)	75	49	29	65
District Wide (2011-12)	84	64	49	76
District Wide (2012-13)	84	62	49	77

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	88	39	56	6
Integrated Algebra	82	12	48	2
Geometry	84	20	61	11
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	53	17	50	10
Global History and Geography	85	42	47	9
U.S. History and Government	94	68	75	25
Living Environment	83	31	63	11
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	91	48	60	15
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	71	13	42	17
Physical Setting/ Physics	67	26	None tested	None tested

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	86	41	87	37
SWD	53	4	46	4
ELL	36	0	29	4
ED	79	26	77	16

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	87	18	88	13
SWD	48	0	49	1
ELL	42	3	38	0
ED	82	10	81	6

2012-13 New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA)						
Grades 3-8						
	Grade	n Tested	Number of students scoring at:			
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
English Language Arts	3	5	1	0	0	4
	4	6	0	1	2	3
	5	11	1	2	5	3
	6	5	0	3	1	1
	7	3	-	-	-	-
	8	8	0	0	1	7
Mathematics	3	5	0	1	1	3
	4	6	0	1	3	2
	5	11	0	3	3	5
	6	5	0	3	2	0
	7	3	-	-	-	-
	8	8	0	0	5	3
Science	4	6	0	0	0	6
	8	8	1	0	2	5

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

2012-13 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)					
	n Tested	Percent of students scoring in each performance level:			
		Beg.	Int.	Ad.	Prof.
Kindergarten					
All Students	120	3	22	58	18
General Education	110	2	19	60	19
SWD	10	20	50	30	0
First Grade					
All Students	125	4	44	38	14
General Education	113	4	42	41	14
SWD	12	8	67	8	17
Second Grade					
All Students	102	4	18	55	24

Patchogue-Medford Union Free School District STLE 1 Report (2012-2014)

General Education	84	0	10	62	29
SWD	18	22	56	22	0
Third Grade					
All Students	86	8	40	37	15
General Education	73	5	38	40	16
SWD	13	23	46	23	8
Fourth Grade					
All Students	78	9	24	50	17
General Education	66	5	21	55	20
SWD	12	33	42	25	0
Fifth Grade					
All Students	86	3	12	53	31
General Education	71	0	7	58	35
SWD	15	20	33	33	13
Sixth Grade					
All Students	42	14	10	55	21
General Education	36	11	8	56	25
SWD	6	33	17	50	0
Seventh Grade					
All Students	39	23	15	36	26
General Education	26	27	12	23	38
SWD	13	15	23	62	0
Eighth Grade					
All Students	46	20	20	35	26
General Education	37	22	19	32	27
SWD	9	11	22	44	22
Ninth Grade					
All Students	42	31	17	31	21
General Education	35	37	17	23	23
SWD	7	0	14	71	14
Tenth Grade					
All Students	28	21	18	39	21
General Education	23	26	17	35	22
SWD	5	0	20	60	20
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	37	14	30	46	11
General Education	32	16	34	41	9
SWD	5	0	0	80	20
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	15	7	33	47	13
General Education	12	-	-	-	-

SWD	3	-	-	-	-
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	709	85	710	90
Students With Disabilities	101	60	87	68
Limited English Proficient	40	48	41	66
Economically Disadvantaged	220	73	231	87

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not Meet AYP</u> in 2011-12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students with Disabilities • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Limited English Proficient • Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students with Disabilities • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Limited English Proficient • Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged • Secondary-Level Math – All Students • Secondary-Level Math – White • Graduation Rate (4 or 5-Year Graduation Rate) – Students with Disabilities • 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Black or African American • 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities • 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Economically Disadvantaged • 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Hispanic or Latino • 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Students with Disabilities • 5-Year Graduation- Rate – Limited English Proficient

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

- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Students with Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- 4-Year Graduation- Rate – Limited English Proficient
- 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: August 7, 2014

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)
Barton ES	Judy Soltner	2006-14	Con	K-5	554	551	1P	1P	45	47
Bay ES	Rui Mendes	2001-14	Con	K-5	383	373	1P	1P	27	28
Canaan ES	Robert Epstein	2008-14	Con	K-5	515	519	1P	1P	31	33
Eagle ES	Erin Skahill	2010-14	Con	K-5	592	591	1P	1P	45	45
Medford ES	Maria Andreotti	2011-Feb. 2014	Original	K-5	604	600	1P	1P	38	38
	Margheritataa Proscia	Feb. 2014-present	Other New							
River ES	Tania Dalley	2010-14	Con	K-5	365	353	1P	1P	24	28
Tremont ES	Joey Cohen	2006-14	Con	K-5	525	522	1P	1P	41	39
Oregon MS	James Bertsch	2010-13	Original / Other New	6-8	577	560	1P, 1AP	1P, 1AP	41	42
	Bryan Lake	2013-14								
Saxton MS	Manual Sanzone	2006-14	Con	6-8	743	721	1P, 1AP	1P, 1AP	56	54
South Ocean MS	Linda Pickford	2006-14	Con	6-8	479	474	1P, 1AP	1P, 1AP	36	33
Patchogue-Medford HS	Randy Rusielewicz	2006-14	Con	9-12	2520	2590	1P, 3AP	1P, 4AP	170	174

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
Current APPR Plan: : http://nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/patchogue-medford-appr-plan.pdf Most current version as of: June 26, 2014

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
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
Highly-Effective	116	70	240	180
Effective	340	336	230	300
Developing	37	47	21	10
Ineffective	0	40	2	3

Principal Evaluation (2012-13)				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State-provided growth or other comparable measures	Locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth	Other measures of principal effectiveness
Highly-Effective	0-10	-	-	-
Effective	0-10	-	-	-
Developing	0	-	-	-
Ineffective	0	-	-	-

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator	May 10, 2013

2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by July 15, 2013
2013-14	Year 1 Final Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	
2013-14	Site Visit	Julia Rafal-Baer, Assistant Commissioner; Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	January 7, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	May 8, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	Robert Hussain Project Assistant	August 8, 2014

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile

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

General Grant Information			
STLE #	Funding Amount	Implementation Dates	Individual or Consortium
5545-13-0035	\$918,870	10/31/2012 - 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. Preparation – Activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles: <i>The district partnered with the Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT), as the district develops a Peer Coaching Academy.</i>
2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>The district did not address this component in its STLE program.</i>
3. Induction and Mentoring – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: <i>The district did not address this component in its STLE program.</i>
4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>The district provided training on the teacher practice rubric used in the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan and has adopted the My Learning Plan platforms Observation and Appraisal Management System (OASYS) and Elevate to provide an integrated approach to professional development, teacher evaluation and evaluator training/certification.</i>

- 5. Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: *Every teacher/observer received training in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model. Coaches worked with teachers in development and implementation of lessons that contained clear learning and language objectives aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and provided support to students with disabilities.*
- 6. Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: *The district indicated that decisions regarding placement and retention were made using the data gathered from the evaluation platforms the district is using.*
- 7. Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *Five career ladder teacher coaches were appointed and each received a stipend funded by the STLE grant. The coaches were provided professional development in CCLS and instructional strategies to support English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students With Disabilities (SWDs) student populations.*

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
<p>Goal I - To strengthen teachers' instructional strategies when working with English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs).</p>	<p>100% of all K-5 teachers will be trained in SIOP strategies.</p> <p>80% of K-5 teachers will develop clear Learning Objectives and Language targets in student friendly “I can” statements.</p> <p>50% of teachers will increase questioning skills.</p> <p>All schools will see a 2% increase in the percentage of students meeting their rate of improvement targets on AIMSweb.</p>	<p>170 teachers in elementary schools were trained in SIOP and Five coaches in the areas of K-5 ELA, ELL and Math were appointed.</p> <p>All teachers are posting clear learning and language targets in child friendly language.</p> <p>Five out of seven schools saw an increase in student performance on the AIMSweb probes administered in the fall and spring. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding their rate of improvement target ranged from 3.2% to 16.1%</p> <p>The district was unable to determine the increase in grade 3-5 assessment scores since data was not available at the time the report was</p>

		submitted.
Goal II - To increase the use of technology in strengthening instructional practices.	The district purchased iPads and the My Learning Plan platform for data tracking and collection. iPads will be used to help teachers and administrators reflect on instructional practice and as a vehicle to inform all stakeholders regarding best practices in instruction for high needs students.	Administrators new to the district received iPads to conduct informal and formal teacher evaluations.
Goal III - To ensure the district's curriculum is aligned with New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and that all classrooms throughout the district "look" like CCLS classrooms.	100% of all K-5 teachers will participate in Math Module 10% of K-5 teachers will participate in curriculum writing to make enhancements and modifications to meet the needs of ELL and SWD	100% of classroom teachers attended training throughout the school year. 23% of K-5 teachers participated in curriculum work (30 out of 132 teachers). 138 classroom teachers attended training throughout the school year.
Goal IV - For teachers to become more comfortable with peer visitation and self-analysis of their own teaching and the teaching of their colleagues.	At least 25% of teachers will participate in school-based Learning Walks	30% of teachers participated in learning walks during the 2013-14 school year. Every teacher/observer received 18 hours of training in order to follow through with the SIOP model.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$918,870	\$60, 478	\$858,392

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)
45	Purchasing of the iPads	44	\$22,428	\$22,420	-	\$2,312
15	Peer Coaches - Training	5 Coach Stipends & Salaries for 5 Replacement teachers	-	\$4,320	\$302,744	\$339,235
15	Subs to conduct Learning Walks,	87	-	-	\$66,301	\$82,445

Patchogue-Medford Union Free School District STLE 1 Report (2012-2014)

	SIOP, and CCLS Training					
46	Peer Coaching Training	5	-	\$39	-	-
40	Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT) Professional Development Peer Coach support & materials	5	-	\$9,573	\$15,495	\$48,000
45						
40	MyLearningPlan licensing fees	All Teachers	-	\$20,460	-	-
40	SIOP Coaching and Training - Andrea Honigsfeld and Maria Dove	22 Days	-	-	\$18,700	\$26,800
40	Kim Yaris ELA CCLS Training	30 Sessions	-	-	\$25,000	\$30,000
40	Joan Daly-Lewis Training for Peer Coaches	5	-	-	\$24,700	\$42,300
40	Technology Integration Support Services; Donna Fisher	185 Days	-	-	\$28,800	\$62,800
45	Professional Texts – Heinemann, (80 & 190) Fountas & Pinnell (7 kits) and Baum & Beaulieu (575)	Varies – SEE to Left	-	\$1,374	\$9,416	\$35,720
45	Instructional Resources to Support Instructional Strategies - ASCD	SEE above Left	-	\$388	-	\$1,901
45	B & H Photo Video Pro Audio	N/A	-	-	-	\$320
45	Follett Educational Service	N/A	-	-	-	\$3,665
45	Posters & various supplies - School Specialty	33 Posters	-	-	-	\$815
46	Travel Expenses for Peer Coaches	4	-	\$43	\$44	\$1,208
40	Michael Joseph Math Common Core Training	27 Sessions	-	-	\$11,940	\$4,700
49	Training/Conferences at BOCES	53 Conferences	-	-	\$3,024	\$19,395
80	Employee Benefits – TRS, SS, Health, Dental, Life, Disability	97	-	-	-	\$144,160
90	Indirect Cost	97	-	-	-	\$14,021
	Total Actual Expenditures			\$22,428	\$58,617	\$506,164
					\$860,292	

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

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

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

Preparation

Preparation	
Standard	The district is engaging in activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles within a district’s career ladder. This can include encouraging and/or enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional

certifications.
The district worked closely with the Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT) to develop a best practices model that resulted in accomplishment of Goal I: to strengthen teachers' instructional strategies when working with English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD).
The district partnered with MESTRACT in developing its Peer Coaching Academy (PCA) to strengthen teacher and leader effectiveness.

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

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- MESTRACT indicated that SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) training was provided. The model looked at the classroom in a targeted way that aligns with Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). Structures were designed specifically for each elementary school. There were two different structures, each with a SIOP-coaching model with a strong peer component, where a teacher is visited by coaches as well as other teachers.
- Every teacher/observer received 18 hours of training in order to follow through with the SIOP model. Coaches met once per week to enhance cohesiveness and share ways in which to help teachers improve. The district is looking to develop a video protocol for reflective purposes with MESTRACT, which includes coaches and teachers.
- The Superintendent indicated that teachers feel safe with this observation model because a peer coach is providing the observation. The observation model helped to make a cultural shift throughout the elementary schools. The grant has helped to grow coaches' skills as leaders. The district has shifted to a co-teaching model to better support ELL students. Teachers on Special assignment (TOSAs) worked with those who were co-teaching. Two of the 5 TOSAs were ELL coaches.

Recruitment and Placement

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools 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

Induction and Mentoring	
Standard	The district provides individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes.
Summary: 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

Evaluation	
Standard	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
<p>The activities associated with this standard supported Goal II: to purchase iPads and MyLearningPlan platforms for data tracking and collection, resulting in the use of iPads to reflect upon instructional practice and as a vehicle to inform all stakeholders regarding best practices in instruction for high needs students. Additionally, these activities addressed Goal IV: for teachers to become more comfortable with peer visitation and self-analysis of their own teaching and the teaching of their colleagues.</p> <p>The district addressed this standard through training on the teacher practice rubric used in APPR, implementation of peer observations, adoption of the MyLearningPlan platforms Observation and Appraisal Management System (OASYS) and Elevate; in an effort to provide an integrated approach to professional development, and teacher evaluation and evaluator training/certification.</p>	

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

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Training was conducted on the Danielson rubric, peer observations, and MyLearningPlan platforms (OASYS and Elevate).
- Every teacher/observer received 18 hours of training in order to follow through with the SIOP model.

- The Superintendent indicated that TOSA coaches supported the training received by teachers. Walkthroughs were used along with a check list to document observation of SIOP strategies.
- Teacher leaders indicated that support from Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT) was invaluable. Through MESTRACT training, teacher leaders were in classrooms, completing observations to better inform coaching so they are better able to help teachers. MESTRACT was looking at ways to spend more focused time in the classrooms to provide more targeted support. Some teachers reached out to a coach to help improve their APPR rating.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- Classroom walkthroughs were quite successful by providing teachers throughout the district with enhanced professional development in effective instructional strategies. Teacher leaders reported how their support has helped teachers create CCLS aligned lessons containing clear learning objectives. Through collaboration and conversations with colleagues, teacher leaders were also able to help bring about greater awareness of the APPR process.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Administrators new to the district received iPads to conduct teacher informal and formal evaluations.
- SIOP consultants conducted SIOP walks in each of the seven elementary schools.
- A peer coach trainer worked with peer coaches on how to effectively conduct and plan learning walks.

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.
The district used STLE grant funding to successfully provide differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice. Every teacher/observer received training in the SIOP model. Professional development from the Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT) helped teacher coaches acquire skills necessary for the coaching role and has helped other teachers with adapting CCLS modules. Coaches supported the training received by teachers, and walkthroughs were used along with a check list to document observation of SIOP strategies. Coaches worked with teachers in development and implementation of lessons that contain clear learning and language objectives aligned to the CCLS and support SWD. The following district goals are being addressed through the professional development provided to teachers and leaders: Goal I: to strengthen teachers' instructional strategies when working with English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities, Goal III: to ensure the district's curriculum is aligned with New York State P-12 CCLS and that all classrooms throughout the district "look" like CCLS classrooms, and Goal IV: for teachers to become more comfortable with peer visitation and self-analysis of their own	

teaching and the teaching of their colleagues. It cannot yet be determined if this is leading to improvement in student learning as the evidence necessary to make such a conclusion is not available at this time.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
District-Wide Professional Development	T – PD External	Group	ELL, Coach, APPR-Obs, CC-ELA, DDI, Turnkey, Grant	TC – Partner, FP-DS, District	40	District Teachers and Administrators	147 days of different development	\$226,300
Purchasing of Professional texts and iPads	Material	Books Create	ELL, SWD, Parent	FP-DS	45	District Teachers and Administrators	All	\$45,228
Travel Expenses for Peer Coaches and registration costs for conferences			SWD, ELL, Coach	FP-DS	46	Coaches	5	\$1,208
Contracted with BOCES to support professional development opportunities	T-PD External	Group	SWD, ELL, APPR	BOCES-Partner	49	Teachers and Peer Coaches	53 sessions	\$19,496

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The Superintendent indicated that there were 40 minutes of professional development every morning for teachers to work with students, participate in grade level meetings, and for teachers to receive assistance based on observations from walkthroughs. MESTRACT provided SIOP training and that it is helping with understanding the value of neutral language.
- The district worked with the MESTRACT and principals to develop focus questions for teachers.
- All elementary teachers (K-5) participated in SIOP training based on current knowledge and research-based practices for promoting learning with all students, especially English Language Learners (ELLs).
- The coaches worked with teachers in developing and implementing lessons that contain clear learning and language objectives aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) to further support students with disabilities (SWDs).
- The professional development from MESTRACT helped teacher coaches ease into the coaching role and helped other teachers with adapting CCLS modules.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Teachers participated in training on CCLS in ELA and math , SIOP, the Danielson rubric, peer visitations and self-analysis.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- SIOP consultants worked with grades 3-5 teachers and conducted 18 hours of training.
- MESTRACT met monthly with teachers on special assignment (TOSAs) and coordinated professional development opportunities for teachers outside of the instructional day.
- A technology integration specialist was hired to work with teachers on how to effectively integrate technology into daily instruction.

Performance Management

Performance Management							
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.						
The district indicated that decisions regarding placement and retention will be made using the data gathered from the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR).							
Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
N/A							

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Data from each teacher's final APPR score is being used to determine teacher effectiveness.
- Decisions regarding placement and retention will be made using the data gathered from the district's evaluation platforms.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district reported they are using the Danielson rubric for teacher observations. Data from each teacher's final APPR score is being used to determine teacher effectiveness. Decisions regarding placement and retention will be made using the data gathered from the district's evaluation platforms.

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

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

In Year 2, five career ladder teacher coaches were appointed and each received a \$500 stipend funded by the STLE grant. The coaches were provided professional development in Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and instructional strategies to support student populations of English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities (SWDs), consistent with STLE Goal I: to strengthen teachers' instructional strategies when working with ELLs and SWDs, and Goal III: to ensure the district's curriculum is aligned with New York State P-12 CCLS and that all classrooms throughout the district "look" like CCLS Classrooms.

In particular, support from Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT), with whom the district partnered, was beneficial to coaches, and they are better able to help teachers as a result. Goal IV: for teachers to become more comfortable with peer visitation and self-analysis of their own teaching and the teaching of their colleagues, is becoming a reality.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Stipends for teachers to become Peer Coaches- Five coaches in the areas of K-5 ELA, ELL and Math were appointed. 5 teacher salaries for leave replacements who Peer Coaches Substitute Teachers	T - TOSA	STLE 1	ELL, SWD, CC – ELA, CC - Math	15	Stipend, Salary	5	\$409,470
Cost of benefits for leave replacement teachers				80	Salary	5	\$137,329
Indirect Costs				90			\$12,746

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- A principal indicated that the career ladder program is helping to support the demands of Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) as teachers are having conversations with each other and with coaches about how to improve.
- A principal indicated that there was a huge shift based on the work teachers on special assignment (TOSAs) coaches are doing with teachers. TOSAs helped teachers create learning goals and engaged teachers in self-reflective conversations about teaching practice, which is resulting in more engaging lessons and more active participation from students.
- Teacher leaders indicated that there was good communication regarding the role of the coaches. Teacher leaders are focused on SIOP professional development with teachers to prepare teachers for the observation process. Also, teacher leaders helped teachers create learning goals and strategies for accomplishing them. They are looking at ways to help all levels of teachers collaboratively.
- Teacher leaders indicated that teachers, especially veteran teachers, are trying alternate, “outside of the box” instruction to reach all learners, including more technology integration in instruction.

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report and Year 2 Interim Report:

- Each coach was provided with enhanced professional development in effective instructional strategies for ELLs and SWDs. Coaches worked with teachers in development and implementation of lessons that contain clear learning and language objectives aligned to the CCLS and support ELL and SWD.
- Career ladder positions were not implemented in Year 1 but during Year 2: five coaches were appointed and received a \$500 stipend. The coaches were selected to focus on the areas of K-5 ELA, ELLs and math.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Five stipends for teachers to become peer coaches were paid.
- Five teacher salaries for leave replacements for peer coaches were paid.
- A technology integration specialist was hired to work with teachers on how to effectively integrate technology into daily instruction.
- Teachers were hired to be one-year leave replacements in the classrooms vacated by the selected peer coaches.

Other

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

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

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), English Language Learners (ELLs), bilingual and/or special education.
<p>The district used STLE funds to focus on the equitable distribution of highly effective and effective teachers working with ELLs and SWDs and is providing support to teachers, by providing grant funded professional development, and creating teacher coach career ladder positions, to help accomplish Goal I: to strengthen teachers' instructional strategies when working with ELLs and SWDs.</p> <p>In particular, training in the SIOP model supported the effort to improve instruction for ELLs. Coaches worked with teachers in the development and implementation of lessons that contain clear learning and language objectives that are aligned to the CCLS and better support instruction</p>	

for students with disabilities. Evidence that would indicate whether or not improved student outcomes for ELL and SWD populations is not yet available.

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center (MESTRACT) indicated they provided SIOP training to district teachers. The model looks at the classroom in a targeted way that aligns with Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS).
- The Superintendent indicated that the district shifted to a co-teaching model to better support ELLs. Two of the 5 TOSAs are ELL coaches, and worked with those who are co-teaching. Coaches worked with teachers in the development and implementation of lessons that contain clear learning and language objectives aligned to CCLS to support SWDs.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated it is focusing on ELLs, SWDs and “Learning Walks”. Grant funded activities that addressed these areas of focus included SIOP training, professional development for coaches on how to analyze best instructional practices and modeling how to effectively conduct learning walks with teachers.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Peer coaches conducted SIOP walks with teachers and consultants to access the enhancement of SIOP strategies being incorporated to meet the needs of SWDs and ELLs.
- Peer coaches worked in collaboration with classroom teachers on curriculum projects that focused on enhancing the CCLS math modules to meet the needs of the SWDs and ELLs.

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
	The district plans to seek additional grant funding to continue STLE funded programs, but has indicated that they will not continue STLE funded positions since the district’s priorities are to reduce class sizes.
	The professional development being delivered should have a lasting impact for teachers and leaders currently employed by the district. It is not clear how these activities will continue for new teachers unless there is additional grant funding. Although the district initially indicated that it intended to continue career ladder positions, recent information suggests that this will not be possible.

Short Description	Code	Type
Continuation of 5 STLE funded positions will not be continued	Position	NC
Continuation of STLE funded program can only continue with grants, though these grants have not yet been secured.	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 Interim STLE and Year 1 Final Report:

- The district responded “Yes” to the question “Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/ stipend after the grant period?”

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that it is seeking grant funds, and that STLE related activities will not continue without funding outside of the regular budget. The district also indicated that its priority is addressing large class sizes (up to 35 students).
- The district responded “No” to the question “Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/ stipend after the grant period?”

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district responded “N/C” to the question “Does your district have long-term plans to continue this position/stipend after the grant period?”, indicating that they will not continue the STLE-funded position.

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 for Curriculum and Instruction
- Grant Coordinator (Mid East Suffolk Teacher Center)
- Professional Development Provider

Eagle Elementary School

- Principal
- Peer coach

River Elementary School

- Principal

- Peer coach

Canaan Elementary School

- Principal
- Peer coach

Other

- Peer coaches and teachers who have been receiving training.

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Year 1 FS 10-F Report
- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Year 1 Interim STLE Report
- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Site Visit Notes
- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Patchogue-Medford UFSD Year 2 Final STLE Report