



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Rochester City School District

Table of Contents

Contents

District Contact Information	3
Section I – District Description.....	3
Section II – Academic Performance	4
Section III – District Schools Profile	11
Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile.....	14
Section V – Monitoring History	15
Section VI - STLE Grant Profile	16
Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis	20
Preparation	20
Recruitment and Placement	22
Induction and Mentoring.....	23
Evaluation	24
Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	24
Performance Management	26
Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals.....	26
Other	26
Issues of Equity.....	26
Sustainability.....	27
Section VIII – Methodology	28

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dr. Bolgen Vargas	Carlos Leal
Phone	(585) 262-8379	(585) 262-8370
Email	Bolgen.Vargas@RCSDK12.ORG	Carlos.Leal@rcsdk12.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

District Location	
Region	BOCES
Genesee Finger Lakes	Monroe 1 BOCES

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

Student Demographics					
Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
29,197	23,260	914	3259	5244	24,892

Racial/Ethnic Origin (Percent)					
American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
0	61	25	3	10	0

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
87%	2%

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
2,726	0	3	28%	26%

Need Status
Large City

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: March 20, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	23	0	12	21
3(2012-13)	6	1	0	4
4(2011-12)	22	5	5	20
4(2012-13)	5	0	1	4
5(2011-12)	22	5	2	19
5(2012-13)	5	0	0	3
6(2011-12)	22	4	1	20
6(2012-13)	6	0	0	4
7(2011-12)	17	2	1	14
7(2012-13)	6	0	1	4
8(2011-12)	18	2	2	16
8(2012-13)	6	0	0	4
District Wide (2011-12)	21	3	4	18
District Wide (2012-13)	6	0	0	4

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	27	10	18	26
3(2012-13)	6	1	1	4
4(2011-12)	30	14	15	29
4(2012-13)	6	2	3	5
5(2011-12)	32	10	14	30
5(2012-13)	5	1	1	4
6(2011-12)	30	14	12	58
6(2012-13)	5	0	0	4
7(2011-12)	24	7	7	22
7(2012-13)	4	0	2	3
8(2011-12)	20	5	10	18
8(2012-13)	4	0	0	2
District Wide (2011-12)	27	10	13	25
District Wide (2012-13)	5	1	1	4

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	67	51	45	66
4(2012-13)	66	44	40	64
8(2011-12)	28	8	4	25
8(2012-13)	28	8	8	25
District Wide (2011-12)	50	32	29	48
District Wide (2012-13)	49	26	26	47

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	44	3	12	0
Integrated Algebra	41	1	16	0
Geometry	31	2	15	1
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	24	5	27	7
Global History and Geography	36	4	13	2
U.S. History and Government	34	5	10	1
Living Environment	43	4	23	1
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	29	3	12	1
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	25	1	7	0
Physical Setting/ Physics	33	7	None tested	None tested

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	56	10	52	8
SWD	16	1	16	0
ELL	25	0	20	2
ED	56	9	49	6

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	56	2	59	3
SWD	13	0	19	0
ELL	38	0	38	0
ED	57	1	56	2

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

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	29	0	3	2	24
	4	38	1	4	10	23
	5	34	0	2	12	20
	6	30	1	1	9	19
	7	28	1	0	8	19
	8	37	0	2	4	31
Mathematics	3	29	0	0	15	14
	4	38	0	3	20	15
	5	34	0	2	17	15
	6	30	0	6	9	15
	7	28	0	4	9	15
	8	37	0	3	18	16
Science	4	38	3	1	3	31
	8	37	3	2	6	26

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	53	4	5	15	29
Mathematics	53	0	4	25	24

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	197	26	52	20	2
General Education	179	25	51	22	2
SWD	18	33	61	6	0
First Grade					
All Students	240	23	53	18	5
General Education	212	20	53	20	6
SWD	28	43	54	4	0
Second Grade					
All Students	304	15	33	43	9

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

General Education	242	13	32	45	10
SWD	62	26	39	34	2
Third Grade					
All Students	317	24	45	26	6
General Education	255	20	45	29	7
SWD	62	40	45	13	2
Fourth Grade					
All Students	313	28	31	29	12
General Education	251	26	29	32	13
SWD	62	37	40	16	6
Fifth Grade					
All Students	288	20	24	45	10
General Education	214	16	20	51	13
SWD	74	32	38	27	3
Sixth Grade					
All Students	252	26	28	38	8
General Education	181	24	25	41	9
SWD	71	32	34	31	3
Seventh Grade					
All Students	226	35	33	25	7
General Education	167	31	33	26	10
SWD	59	47	32	20	0
Eighth Grade					
All Students	263	26	35	30	8
General Education	200	28	30	34	10
SWD	63	22	54	19	5
Ninth Grade					
All Students	243	18	46	28	8
General Education	193	19	42	29	10
SWD	50	14	62	22	2
Tenth Grade					
All Students	192	27	39	29	6
General Education	156	26	38	29	6
SWD	36	28	42	25	6
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	123	26	39	26	9
General Education	94	21	41	27	11
SWD	29	41	31	24	3
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	121	22	36	31	11
General Education	88	13	36	38	14
SWD	33	48	33	15	3

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2009 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	2562	48	2836	55
Students With Disabilities	523	19	608	29
Limited English Proficient	253	26	195	42
Economically Disadvantaged	1967	48	1872	57

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

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

- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level Math – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – All Students
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged

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

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

- 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 – Black or African American
- Secondary- Level ELA – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary- Level ELA – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Secondary- Level ELA – White
- Secondary- Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary- Level ELA – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary- Level ELA – Economically Disadvantaged
- Secondary-Level Math – All Students
- Secondary-Level Math – Black or African American
- Secondary-Level Math – Hispanic or Latino
- Secondary-Level Math – White
- Secondary-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Secondary-Level Math – Limited English Proficient
- Secondary-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – All Students
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate: Total (4 and 5 Year) – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – White
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – All Students
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Black or African American
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Hispanic or Latino
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Students with Disabilities
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – Limited English Proficient
- Graduation Rate: 5-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – 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)
Rochester City School District	Dr. Bolgen Vargas	2011-14	Con	29,197	28,936	51 P, 83 AP	51 P, 92 AP	2,674	2,368

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)
# 1 - Martin B Anderson - ES	Kimberly Harris-Pappin	2008-14	Con	K-6	305	316	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	30	24
# 2 - Clara Barton - ES	Pamela Rutland	2008-14	Con	K-6	438	471	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	46	46
# 3 - Nathaniel Rochester - ES	Rodney Moore	2013-14	Con	K-8	646	655	1 P, 2AP	1 P, 2 AP	60	65
# 4 - George M Forbes - ES	Karon Jackson	2002-14	Con	K-8	452	447	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	54	50
# 5 - John Williams - ES	Joanne Wideman	2005-14	Con	K-8	602	580	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	60	52
# 7 - Virgil I Grissom - ES	David Lincoln	2010-14	Con	K-6	587	602	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 2 AP	50	49
# 8 - Roberto Clemente - ES	Christine Sickles	2013-14	Con	K-8	671	622	1 P, 3 AP	1 P, 3 AP	62	54
# 9 - Dr Martin L King Jr - ES	Sharon Jackson	2002-14	Con	K-8	744	767	1P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	65	69
#10 - Dr. Walter Cooper Acad-ES	Camaron Clyburn	2008-14	Con	K-6	258	318	1 P, 0 AP	1 P, 1 AP	28	28
#12 - James P B Duffy - ES	Michele Liguori-Alampi	2002-14	Con	K-6	727	708	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	65	60
#15 - Children's School - ES	Jay Piper	2009-14	Con	K-6	289	293	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	29	27
#16 - John W Spencer - ES	Matthew Laniak	2007-14	Con	K-8	496	519	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 1 AP	46	44

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

#17 - Enrico Fermi - ES	Ralph Spezio	2013-14	Con	K-8	667	630	1P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	67	64
#19 - Dr Charles T Lunsford-ES	Eva Thomas	2011-14	Con	K-8	404	402	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 1 AP	49	43
#20 - Henry Lomb - ES	Donnarae Johnson	2003-14	Con	K-6	343	347	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	31	31
#22 - Abraham Lincoln - ES	Clinton Bell	2009-14	Con	K-6	483	485	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	49	50
#23 - Francis Parker - ES	Rhonda Morien	2010-14	Con	K-6	293	286	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	28	26
#25 - Nathaniel Hawthorne - ES	Deborah Lazio	2003-14	Con	K-6	290	302	1 P, 0 AP	1 P, 1 AP	42	37
#28 - Henry Hudson - ES	Susan Ladd	2006-14	Con	K-7	556	539	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	59	56
#29 - Adlai E Stevenson - ES	Tanya Wilson	2011-14	Con	K-8	437	453	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	53	48
#33 - John James Audubon - ES	Larry Ellison	1989-14	Con	K-6	1,091	1,079	1P, 4 AP	1 P, 4 AP	108	107
#34 - Dr Louis A Cerulli - ES	Carmine Peluso	2013-14	Con	K-6	469	465	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	42	42
#35 - Pinnacle School - ES	Anaida Gonzalez-Fortiche	2013-14	Con	K-6	447	423	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	39	39
#36 - Henry W Longfellow - ES	Bonnie Atkins	2003-14	Con	K-6	390	395	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	37	33
#39 - Andrew J Townson - ES	Jacquelyn C. Cox	2004-14	Con	K-6	584	593	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 2 AP	49	47
#41 - Kodak Park School - ES	Marion Whitfield	2010-14	Con	K-6	561	604	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 2 AP	48	46
#42 - Abelard Reynolds - ES	Beverley Pringle	2007-14	Con	K-6	454	480	1P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	42	41
#43 Theodore Roosevelt	Richard Smith	2010-14	Con	K-6	574	523	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	45	38
#44 -	Richard	2003-	Con	K-6		401	1 P, 2	1 P, 1	46	39

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

Lincoln Park - ES	Derose	14			434		AP	AP		
#45 - Mary McLeod Bethune - ES	Brenda Harrington	2013-14	Con	K-8	730	685	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 1 AP	67	69
#46 - Charles Carroll - ES	T'Hani Pantoja	2005-14	Con	K-6	303	310	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	32	31
#50 - Helen B Montgomery - ES	Sylvia Cooksey	2008-14	Con	K-8	500	621	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 2 AP	47	55
#52 - Frank Fowler Dow - ES	Denise Rainey	2001-14	Con	K-6	295	324	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	28	25
#53 - Montessori Academy	Shirley Green	2000-14	Con	K-6	160	194	1 P, 0 AP	1 P, 1 AP	21	23
#54 - Flower City School - ES	Lessie Hamilton-Rose	1995-14	Con	K-6	304	473	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	25	38
#57 - Early Childhood - ES	Roshon Bradley	2008-14	Con	K-2	213	216	1 P, 0 AP	1 P, 1 AP	24	20
#58 - World of Inquiry - ES	Sheelarani Webster	2010-14	Con	K-12	596	703	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	69	67
Charlotte High School - HS	Michael Allen	2011-14	Con	9-12	531	505	1 P, 4 AP	1 P, 3 AP	64	54
East High School - HS	Anibal Soler	2009-14	Con	7-12	1,720	1,851	1 P, 10 AP	1 P, 7 AP	174	168
Integrated Arts & Tech HS	Kevin Klein	2005-14	Con	7-11	268	374	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	31	36
James Monroe High School - HS	Armando Ramirez	2010-14	Con	7-12	1,109	1141	1 P, 5 AP	1 P, 5 AP	111	114
Jos. C. Wilson Found Academy	Deasure Matthew	2012-14	Con	K-3, 7-8	402	441	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	49	47
Jos. C. Wilson Magnet HS	Uma Mehta	2010-14	Con	9-12	1,005	941	1 P, 5 AP	1 P, 5 AP	114	96
Leadership Acad. for Young Men	Wakili Moore	2002-14	Con	7-12	158	333	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	20	32
Northeast College Prep HS	Linus Guillory	2013-14	New	9-12	544	499	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	54	66

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

Northwest College Prep HS	Mary Aronson	2007-14	Con	7-8	502	573	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	51	46
Rob't Brown HS of Constr & Des	David Grant	2011-14	Con	9-12	510	625	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 2 AP	51	62
Roch. Early College Intrntnl HS	Marlene Blocker	2002-14	Con	9-12	271	333	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	35	31
Roch Science, Tech, Math HS	Kathleen Denaro	2010-14	Con	9-12	483	616	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 3 AP	56	62
School of the Arts - HS	Brenda Pacheco	2003-14	Con	7-12	1,119	1143	1 P, 6 AP	1 P, 5 AP	103	107
School Without Walls - HS	Idonia M. Owens	2008-14	Con	9-12	458	351	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	26	38
Vanguard Collegiate HS	Carol Jones	2010-14	Con	9-12	275	392	1 P, 2 AP	1 P, 1 AP	38	34

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
Current APPR Plan: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/districts/rochester-city-school-district.html
Most current version as of: November 22, 2013

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
Highly-Effective	47	40	47	776
Effective	1370	1257	1588	1432
Developing	895	815	706	144
Ineffective	56	256	27	16

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	-	-
Effective	-	10-20	40-50	30-40
Developing	30-40	10-20	-	-
Ineffective	-	20-30	-	-

*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	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	May 30, 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	September 9, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Rebecca Coyle, Project Coordinator	November 22, 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	April Marsh, Project Assistant Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	May 13, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2104
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 16, 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
5545-13-0038	\$3,871,750	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 Nazareth College to prepare teachers to obtain their bilingual extension. Special education teachers currently teaching in an autism classroom received an in district Autism Endorsement.</i>
2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>The district hired a full time Director of Recruitment.</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>Human Capital Initiatives (HCI) and peer mentors initiated new teachers and leaders into the system.</i>
4. Evaluation – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant activities.</i>
5. Professional Development/Growth- Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: <i>All eligible teachers were paid an incentive for professional development activities.</i>
6. Performance Management – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i>
7. Career Ladder – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: <i>This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.</i>

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I (Preparation): Highly qualified candidates will be prepared to fill teacher and leader vacancies as they occur, including shortage areas (i.e., ELL and SWD).	Teachers will be able to receive a Bilingual Extension through an in-District program. Teachers will be able to receive an Autism Endorsement through an in-District program. The Leadership Empowerment Aspiring Principals Program	STLE1 supported 17 candidates and all completed the program successfully. There are now 40 teachers out of 132 (30%) with a bilingual extension. A difference of 13% exceeding the 10% goal. STLE1 supported candidates and all completed the program successfully. There are now

	<p>(LEAPP) will address the needs of English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD).</p>	<p>40 teachers out of 132 (30%) with a bilingual extension. A difference of 13% exceeding the 10% goal.</p> <p>The District has determined that LEAPP will be discontinued. Emphasis will be placed on SUPES (leadership preparation program for upcoming superintendents) Academy. A partnership with the SUPES Academy prepares current administrators to enter various leadership roles within the organization.</p>
<p>Goal II (Recruitment and Placement): Human Capital Initiatives (HCI) will develop and execute comprehensive plans to hire the right people and provide them with orientation into the system.</p>	<p>Recruitment efforts will strategically recruit minority candidates.</p> <p>eRecruit will facilitate recruitment and placement efforts.</p>	<p>1 Director and 1 Secretary have focused 100% of their time to this effort. 5 advertisements were purchased with national exposure.</p> <p>17 teachers pursued a bilingual extension and 5 were recruited with the extension as an incentive. The candidate pool increased by 45%. The minority candidate pool alone increased 20%</p>
<p>Goal III (Induction and Mentoring): HCI and peer mentors will initiate new teachers and leaders into the system.</p>	<p>New hires will participate in a formal orientation program, Preparing Recent Employees Purposefully (PREP).</p> <p>One-on-one mentoring and professional support will continue to be provided through Career in Teaching (CIT), a collaborative effort of Rochester CSD and Rochester Teachers Association (RTA). One-on-one mentoring and professional support will continue to be provided</p>	<p>All new employees completed an orientation after hire.</p> <p>1 Director and 1 Secretary have focused 100% of their time to this effort. 2 HCI (Human Capital Initiatives) Directors assisted with the development.</p> <p>This effort was institutionalized requiring minimal support. 1 mentor received a partial stipend.</p>

	through Career in Administration and Supervision (CIAS), a collaborative effort of RCSD and Association of Supervisors And Administrators (ASAR).	
Goal IV (Evaluation): Teachers and leaders will be evaluated by highly qualified individuals using procedures that ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability.	Evaluators will be trained to ensure inter-rater reliability. Peer Reviewers will be available for all teachers if requested. ePerformance and Student Performance Analytics will be integrated.	This effort was institutionalized requiring minimal support. 1 mentor received a partial stipend. 1 employee received compensation for analytics.
Goal V (Professional Development/Growth): Teacher and leader performance data will drive professional learning.	The Performance Management System, Performance, and Professional Learning Management System, AVATAR, will be linked with Student Performance Analytics. Responsive Professional Learning Opportunities will be provided. Job-embedded professional learning will be delivered by instructional coaches. The RCSD Leadership Academy delivers professional learning to leaders. Eligible teachers will receive a Professional Development Incentive	3,227 teachers and 464 administrators have access to a Learning Management System (AVATAR) linking professional learning to the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) process of goal setting. Administrators and teachers can review historical documents within the system to review evaluation data to plan professional growth pathways. 110 professional development (PD) sessions were offered to school teams and offered as AVATAR courses. 334 teachers received PD incentive for participation. 110 PD sessions were offered to school teams and offered as AVATAR courses. 208 teachers received PD incentive for participation. 82 Instructional Coaches

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

		provided 70, 2012 contact hours. The work of the Directors resulted in bi-weekly school visitations. 516 teachers received PD incentive for participation.
Goal VI (Performance Management): Evaluation data will be used to make development decisions.	CIT will prescribe professional supports to teachers. CIAS will prescribe professional supports to school leaders. Individual performance will be linked to targeted professional supports.	26 mentors were activated to support RTA members. 1 mentor was activated to support ASAR members. In accordance with the RCSD - ASAR contract, performance data is continuously reviewed at CIAS - Career In Administration and Supervision meetings
Goal VII (Career Ladder): Educators identified as Effective and Highly Effective will have opportunities for advancement.	Highly Effective and Effective teachers and leaders in schools participating in NYS's Teacher Incentive Fund grant will be eligible for leadership roles and financial awards.	In accordance with the TIF Grant, effective and highly effective administrators are eligible for leadership roles.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
5545-13-0038	\$1,024,124	\$3,010,638

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)	# In Position/ # Served/ # Purchased	Year 1 Interim Report – School Reported (10/31/12 – 3/1/13)	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (10/31/12 – 6/30/13)	Year 2 Interim Report – School Reported (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	*Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. Per FS-10 F (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)
15	Coordinating Director of Job Embedded and Expanded Learning Professional Development Opportunities	0.25	-	\$14,655	-	\$75,288.58
15	Coordinating Director of Instructional Coaches	0.25	-	\$9,565	-	\$75,288.59
15	Bilingual Lead Teacher	0.33	-	\$30,007	-	\$68,493.90
15	Professional Development Incentive	-	-	\$192,000	-	\$659,600
15	Peer Reviewer Stipends	-	-	\$204,756	-	\$213,752.46
15	RTC Substitute Teacher Bank	-	-	\$1,243	-	\$140,400
15	RTC Course Instructors	-	-	\$6,526	-	\$68,387.84
15	RTC Collegial Learning Circle Facilitators	-	-	\$6,526	-	\$15,250

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

15	RTC Teacher/Action Research Stipends	-	-	\$12,177	-	\$14,156
15	RTC Instructional Cohort Facilitators	3	-	\$6,526	-	211,682.84
15	RTC Institute on Teaching and Learning Informed by Cultural Knowledge	-	-	\$6,526	-	-
15	Programmer Analyst Trainee	0.42	-	\$12,620	-	\$7,999.36
15	HCI Director	0.432	-	\$28,846	-	\$52,217.40
15	Managing Director of Recruitment	-	-	\$12,115	-	\$25,598.10
15	Secretary	-	-	\$12,404	-	\$31,853.92
15	Secretary I	0.38	-	\$24,107	-	\$114,710.33
15	Labor Relations	-	-	\$7,673	-	\$19,073.09
15	Custodial Assistants	3	-	\$5,925	-	\$11,350.81
40	RTC Presenters	-	-	\$36,750	-	\$248,164.90
45	Recruitment Postage	-	-	\$1,840	-	-
45	Recruitment Printing	-	-	\$1,849	-	-
45	Recruitment Advertising (Monster Worldwide Inc., Universal Creations)	-	-	\$6,919	-	\$30,265.70
45	RTC Instructional Materials (Barnes and Nobles)	-	-	\$9,163	-	\$28,507.59
45	RTC Office Supplies	-	-	\$259	-	\$31,720.49
46	RTC Travel	-	-	\$2,190	-	\$954.98
46	Professional Learning Travel	-	-	\$1,402	-	\$44,719.63
80	Employee Benefits	-	\$27,398	\$170,575	-	\$601,889.10
90	Indirect Costs	-	\$5,031	\$30,724	-	\$104,609.64
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$142,464	\$861,112	\$875,356	\$3,010,433

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

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

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

Preparation

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

Summary: The established partnership with Nazareth College is preparing teachers to obtain their bilingual extension. The district is working in partnership with the University of Rochester to develop an Autism Endorsement. The district in meeting this standard achieved its Goal I (Preparation): highly qualified candidates will be prepared to fill teacher and leader vacancies as they occur, including shortage areas (i.e., ELL and SWD).

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
17 teachers took part in the Bilingual Extension Program.	Pre-Service	T-PS	ELL	IHE-Partner	40	17	\$221,380
69 teachers participated in the formal Autism training.	Pre-Service	T-PS	SWD	IHE-Partner	N/A	69	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:

- Met with the Office of Specialized Services to discuss working in partnership with the University of Rochester to develop an Autism Endorsement.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- An RCSD participant in the Autism Program reported that the classes she has attended have been very beneficial. She is looking forward to the upcoming topics as she feels they are all relevant to her work in the classroom. She is able to see the impact of applying what she has learned within her own classroom through the positive response of her students.
- Based on participant feedback, the Bilingual Extension Program has been well received. Educators are grateful to have this program offered to them to support their development within their profession, while having the convenience of the classes conducted at district facilities.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Year 2 Final Update Status Call:

- There are now 40 teachers out of 132 (30%) with a bilingual extension. A difference of 13% exceeding the 10% goal.
- Sixty-Nine teachers participated in the formal Autism training. There was an increase of teacher knowledge by 9% (from 76% to 85%). There was an increase of TA and para knowledge by 5% (from 67% to 72%).
- The call notes indicated the district was out of compliance with the ratio of autism certified teachers to students 8:1 and now it is 12:1.

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.
<p>Summary: The district hired a full time Director of Recruitment. The activities have assisted the district in meeting is Goal II (Recruitment and Placement): human capital initiatives will develop and execute comprehensive plans to hire the right people and provide them with orientation into the system.</p> <p>The district has made multiple efforts to increase recruitment efforts. The district has spent funds on recruitment materials and online accounts to publicize current openings.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Recruit/ Transfer	Total Amount
Expenditures included Career Builder, NY Times advertisement, Monster.com, and ALAS.	Teacher	Recruit	APPR, ELL, SWD, Grant	N/A	40	5 were recruited with the bilingual extension as an incentive	\$208,325

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/Visit Debrief Letter:

- The Director of Recruitment indicated during the site visit that he is changing the way the applicant pool is utilized and tracked; tracking the universities giving RCSD the best candidates; using career builder; utilizing the HCI website to recruit; utilizing data to drive recruitment efforts and working with realtors for transfers coming to the area.
- In the letter it was indicated that the changes the district has implemented to enhance their recruitment efforts have been successful. The district was able to increase the depth and variety of their applicant pool through the use of data to drive recruitment, establishing candidate tracking systems, modifying the Human Capital Initiatives webpage, establishing an RCSD presence through advertisement and working with realtors for recruiting transfers into the Rochester area.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The Recruitment Director continued to make connections with organizations with access to underrepresented candidates.
- The recruitment efforts for school leaders have been extended to provide opportunities for individuals outside the district to join RCSD.
- The efforts for the 2013-2014 school year will focus on increasing the candidate pool by 50%.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 1 Director and 1 Secretary have focused 100% of their time to this effort. 5 advertisements were purchased with national exposure. 17 teachers pursued a bilingual extension and 5 were recruited with the extension as an incentive.
- 3 local Institute of Higher Education (IHE) visitations and planning for recruitment took place.
- The candidate pool increased by 45%. The minority candidate pool alone increased 20%.
- Funds have been spent on recruitment materials and online accounts to publicize current openings.

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.
<p>Summary: New hires went through a formal orientation program. The activities assisted the district in meeting its Goal III (Induction and Mentoring): human capital initiatives and peer mentors will initiate new teachers and leaders into the system.</p> <p>New hires orientation program is named Preparing Recent Employees Purposefully (PREP). In partnership with Systemic Supports for the District and the School Turnaround Grant, supports to mentor leaders are being provided by Executive Coaches. The Career in Teaching (CIT) Panel, collaboration with the Rochester Teachers Association (RTA), provided one-on-one mentoring and engaged new teachers in learning-focused conversations.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
1 mentor received a partial stipend.	T-Mentor	Formal	Coach	District	15	all	\$844.00
1 Director and 1 Secretary have focused 100% of their time to this effort. 2 HCI (Human Capital Initiatives) Directors assisted with the development.	T-Mentor	Formal	Coach	District	15	all	\$13,235

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- The Career In Administration and Supervision (CIAS) Panel, a collaboration with the Association of Supervisors and Administrators of Rochester (ASAR), provided one-on-one mentoring and engaged new leaders in learning-focused conversations.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- The formal mentoring program has been expanded. Peer reviews have been added as Lead Teachers to Career In Teaching (CIT). One on one mentoring through CIT continues.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Final Status Call Year 2 Notes:

- 1 Director and 1 Secretary have focused 100% of their time to the mentoring effort. 2 HCI (Human Capital Initiatives) Directors assisted with the development.
- The mentoring efforts continued with minimal support from the STLE grant.
- 26 mentors were activated to support RTA members. 1 mentor was activated to support ASAR members.
- 87 mentors were activated to support teachers in need.

Evaluation

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

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

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth

Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth	
Standard	The district provides differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness based on evidence of practice and student learning. Teachers and principals have opportunities to engage in professional development.
Summary: ePerformance and RCSD’s Professional Learning Management System (AVATAR) was linked to provide analysis of teacher performance to inform the development of professional learning experiences. These activities assisted the district in meeting its Goal V (Professional Development/Growth): teacher and leader performance data will drive professional learning.	
Initial customization has occurred that now allows the system to match offered professional learning sessions with each domain of the Danielson Framework. Professional learning is strategically aligned with performance-based need, expected outcomes identified in the Framework for Teaching Rubric, and teacher interest. All eligible teachers were paid a Professional Development Incentive (PDI) stipend.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
The original proposed position of PeopleSoft System Analyst was replaced with two Program Analyst Trainees positions. 1 employee received compensation for these efforts.	T-PD Internal	Group	APPR-other Grant	District	15	1		\$11,548
All eligible teachers will be paid a Professional	T-PD Internal	Group		District	15	516		\$620,259

Rochester City School District STLE 1 Summary Report (2012-2014)

Development Incentive (PDI) stipend.								
RCSD Leadership Academy Coaches will provide job-embedded professional learning experiences and support leaders/teachers to be Effective and Highly Effective. Emphasis will be placed on appropriate use of additional time for adult learning within an expanded learning model.	T-PD	Group		District	15			\$345,861
110 PD sessions were offered to school teams and offered as AVATAR courses.	T-PD	Group		District	15	all		\$690,030

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 1 Final Report:

- Systemic Supports for District and School Turnaround Grant and the SUPES Academy has provided executive coaches to each building leader in RCSD. The two positions of Coordinating Director for Instructional Coaches and Coordinating Director for Job Embedded and Expanded Learning Professional Development Opportunities have been posted. Interviews are taking place the first and second week of April.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Improved efforts to train teachers on Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Data Driven Instruction (DDI) and performance rubric through intense training in partnership with SUPES partner.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Final Status Call Year 2 Notes:

- 3,227 teachers and 464 administrators have access to a Learning Management System (AVATAR) linking professional learning to the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) process of goal setting. Administrators and teachers can review historical documents within the system to review evaluation data to plan professional growth pathways.
- 110 PD sessions were offered to school teams and offered as AVATAR courses. 82 Instructional Coaches provided 70,201 contact hours. 2,300 teachers were supported. The work of the directors resulted in bi-weekly school visitations.
- 516 teachers received PD incentive for participation.
- A partnership with the SUPES Academy prepared current administrators to enter various leadership roles within the organization.
- Avatar was paid using Title IIA funds.

Performance Management

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

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

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals

Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals	
Standard	Effective and highly effective teachers and principals have opportunities for advancement. Teachers and principals with additional roles and responsibilities have the training and preparation needed to fulfill the career ladder positions.
Summary: This component was not addressed by the STLE grant activities. In accordance with the TIF Grant, effective and highly effective teachers/administrators are eligible for leadership roles.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
N/A							

Other

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

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

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including STEM, ELL, bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: The district has partnered with Nazareth College to prepare teachers to obtain their bilingual extension. Special education teachers currently teaching in an autism classroom received an in district Autism Endorsement.	

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:

- Met with the Office of Specialized Services to discuss working in partnership with the University of Rochester to develop an Autism Endorsement.

Evidence from Site Visit/Site Visit Debrief letter:

- The letter states an RCSD participant in the Autism Program reported that the classes she has attended have been very beneficial. She is looking forward to the upcoming topics as she feels they are all relevant to her work in the classroom. She is able to see the impact of applying what she has learned within her own classroom through the positive response of her students.
- The letter states it was reported that based on participant feedback, the Bilingual Extension Program has been well received. Educators are grateful to have this program offered to them to support their development within their profession, while having the convenience of the classes conducted at district facilities.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Reports/ Final Update Status Call:

- STLE1 supported 17 candidates and all completed the program successfully. There are now 40 teachers out of 132 (30%) with a bilingual extension. A difference of 13% exceeding the 10% goal.
- Sixty-Nine teachers participated in the formal Autism training. There was an increase of teacher knowledge by 9% (from 76% to 85%). There was an increase of TA and para knowledge by 5% (from 67% to 72%).
- The district was out of compliance with the ratio of autism certified teachers to students 8:1 and now it is 12:1.

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
Summary: The district has used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district.	

Short Description	Code	Type
Bilingual Extension	Program	SF

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from Year 2 Final Update Status Call:

- Brockport is creating a bilingual extension for RCSD to participate. This will increase access for the district to prepare students. Title IIA can cover the cost as it is a state college. The district will also now cover the entire cost as they will get the state rate. Prior at Nazareth College the district prorated the cost of the program and people were excluded because of the costs not covered.

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

Nazareth College

Director, Graduate TESOL Program and Bilingual Extension Program

District Level

Superintendent

Grant Manger

Director of Recruitment and Leader Teacher for Professional Learning, HCI

1 teacher receiving job embedded professional learning

1 teacher receiving dual certification

Instructional Coach

1 Peer Reviewer

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

Rochester Site Visit Debrief Letter

Rochester Site Visit Notes

Rochester Year 1 Final Report

Rochester Year 2 Interim Report

Rochester Year 2 Final Report

Rochester Year 2 Final Update Status Call notes