New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Rotterdam-Mohonasen Central School District

Table of Contents

Contents

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dr. Kathleen Spring	Dr. Kathleen Spring
Phone	(518) 356-8200	(518) 356-8200
Email	kspring@mohonason.org	kspring@mohonason.org

Section I – District Description

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

Most current information as of: February 19, 2014

District Location	
Region	**BOCES**
Upper Hudson	Capital Region 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**
2924	706	276	20	405	987

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	4	3	2	89	1

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	**Student Suspensions**
95%	7%

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**
208	0	1	22%	16%

Need Status
Average Need/Resource Capacity

Section II – Academic Performance

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

Most current information as of: June 18, 2014

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State ELA Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
3(2011-12)	59	13	n<5	45
3(2012-13)	28	3	n<5	16
4(2011-12)	64	4	n<5	56
4(2012-13)	28	4	n<5	22
5(2011-12)	58	17	None tested	43
5(2012-13)	27	4	n<5	18
6(2011-12)	60	17	None tested	45
6(2012-13)	26	6	None tested	14
7(2011-12)	49	4	None tested	37
7(2012-13)	23	0	n<5	12
8(2011-12)	55	7	None tested	46
8(2012-13)	32	4	None tested	26
District Wide (2011-12)	**57**	**11**	**Cannot be calculated***	**45**
District Wide (2012-13)	**27**	**3**	**Cannot be calculated***	**18**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
3(2011-12)	66	13	n<5	51
3(2012-13)	24	6	n<5	13
4(2011-12)	80	38	n<5	60
4(2012-13)	32	0	n<5	24
5(2011-12)	67	33	None tested	49
5(2012-13)	34	4	n<5	23
6(2011-12)	69	19	n<5	57
6(2012-13)	31	9	None tested	18
7(2011-12)	66	18	None tested	58
7(2012-13)	20	0	n<5	8
8(2011-12)	47	3	None tested	40
8(2012-13)	17	0	None tested	6

District Wide (2011-12)	**65**	**21**	**Cannot be calculated***	**52**
District Wide (2012-13)	**26**	**3**	**Cannot be calculated***	**15**

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	**% Proficient All**	**% Proficient SWD**	**% Proficient ELL**	**% Proficient ED**
4(2011-12)	97	79	n<5	95
4(2012-13)	94	59	n<5	89
8(2011-12)	87	48	None tested	83
8(2012-13)	83	46	None tested	75
District Wide (2011-12)	**91**	**62**	**n<5**	**88**
District Wide (2012-13)	**88**	**53**	**Cannot be calculated***	**82**

*Although the district tested a total of five or more students in the subject area, the number cannot be calculated because there were less than five students tested in the subject area at each grade level.

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	**All Students**		**Students With Disabilities**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
Comprehensive English	78	23	45	5
Integrated Algebra	92	22	68	0
Geometry	91	23	n<5	n<5
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	62	20	n<5	n<5
Global History and Geography	75	23	31	11
U.S. History and Government	86	47	73	27
Living Environment	87	29	52	10
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	91	41	100	50
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	81	8	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/ Physics	57	13	n<5	n<5

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		**2009 Cohort**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
All	89	41	84	33
SWD	21	0	23	0
ELL	n less than 5	n less than 5	None tested	None tested
ED	82	22	73	28

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		**2009 Cohort**	
	% Proficient	**% Mastery**	**% Proficient**	**% Mastery**
All	91	36	90	23
SWD	26	0	33	0

ELL	n less than 5	n less than 5	None tested	None tested
ED	88	25	82	16

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	3	-	-	-	-
	4	3	-	-	-	-
	5	2	-	-	-	-
	6	3	-	-	-	-
	7	3	-	-	-	-
	8	3	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	3	3	-	-	-	-
	4	3	-	-	-	-
	5	2	-	-	-	-
	6	3	-	-	-	-
	7	3	-	-	-	-
	8	3	-	-	-	-
Science	4	3	-	-	-	-
	8	3	-	-	-	-

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

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	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
First Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-

Second Grade					
All Students	5	0	20	60	20
General Education	4	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Third Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	-	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-

Group	**2008 Cohort 4 Year**		**2007 Cohort 5 Year**	
	n	**Graduation Rate (%)**	**n**	**Graduation Rate (%)**
All	266	89	286	85
Students With Disabilities	19	n<30	24	n<30
Limited English Proficient	1	n<30	0	n<30
Economically Disadvantaged	72	83	62	81

List Any Measures Where the District <u>Did Not</u> Meet AYP in 2011-12

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – 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
• Secondary-Level ELA - White

Section III – District Schools Profile

Source: Information in the following table was provided by the district.

Most current information as of: April 4, 2014

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (2012-13)	# of Students (2013-14)	# of Admin (2012-13)	# of Admin (2013-14)	# of Teachers* (2012-13)	# of Teachers* (2013-14)
Bradt Primary School	Michele Whitley	2012-14	Original	K-2	567	615	1 P, 1/2 AP	1 P	40.3	40.6
Pinewood Elementary School	Deborah Kavanaugh	2010-14	Con	3-5	617	577	1 P, 1/2 AP	1 P	43.8	42.3
Draper Middle School	Debra Male	2009-14	Con	6-8	703	654	1 P, 1 AP	1 P, 1 AP	56.9	57.2
Mohonasen High School	David Collins	2010 - 14	Con	9-12	1015	957	1 P, 2 AP	1P, 2 AP	72	74.6

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile

Source: New York State Education Department Analysis

APPR Plan
Current APPR Plan: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/plans/docs/rotterdam-mohonasen-appr-plan.pdf **Most current version as of:** February 11, 2014

Performance Evaluation Rubric	
Teacher	**Principal**
Danielson's *Framework for Teaching* (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	109	130	66	102
Effective	82	55	129	92
Developing	4	6	0	1
Ineffective	0	4	0	0

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

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

Section V – Monitoring History

Source: New York State Education Department Files

School Year	Type of Monitoring	NYSED Staff	Date
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by April 1, 2013
2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; Amy Cox, Project Assistant	Aril 22, 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; Megan Collins, Project Assistant	August 12, 2013
2013-14	Site Visit	Courtney Jablonski, Project Coordinator; Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	October 16, 2013
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 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	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 21, 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**
5545-13-0039	$374,000	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
1. **Preparation** – Activities meant to prepare future educators to enter the profession through work-based pre-service learning opportunities or to prepare existing district educators for new roles: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
2. **Recruitment and Placement** – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
3. **Induction and Mentoring** – Individualized support for new and early career educators to advance their professional practice and improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes: ***Three Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) worked with teachers grades 3-8 to model lessons, facilitate curriculum work/ units and coach in classrooms***
4. **Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
5. **Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: ***The district used STLE grant funds to provide professional development and training, by consultants, in the areas of science, mathematics, interdisciplinary curriculum, special education and literacy. Teachers shared best practices, modeled successful lessons and there was a greater collaboration among staff. Teachers designed more inquiry based lessons and activities that were more hands on for students.***
6. **Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: ***This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.***
7. **Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: ***Teachers on special assignment (TOSA) positions afforded teachers the opportunity to take on a leadership role. Teacher leaders provided Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) assistance to teachers, and district wide.***

Program Goals (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from year 1 Final Report)	Outcomes (Taken from year 2 Final Report)
Goal I- To introduce, deconstruct and implement new learning standards, grades K-12.	Share Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) with faculty K-12 during opening staff development days and throughout Year 1 and 2 of STLE Grant. Train Administrators on Special Assignment, Teachers on Special Assignment. Creation of total of 4 units which integrate common core learning standards Create common assessments which align with CCLS and collaboratively agree to how they will be rated K-12.	CCLS was shared with faculty K-12 during opening staff development days and throughout Year 1 and 2 of STLE Grant. Training occurred for Administrators on Special Assignment, and Teachers on Special Assignment. Implemented co-taught mathematics classes 6-8. Embedded coaching and modeling by professors from St. Rose and Union College in grade 3-11 classrooms facilitated best instructional practices in literacy and interdisciplinary work. The TOSAs deconstructed common core learning standards and modules in order to present to faculty throughout the school year; they deconstructed CCLS in math, science, tech, English and created units integrating standards and modules. The TOSAs worked with 89 teachers.
Goal II- To assess/evaluate the district's special education program and determine strengths/weaknesses	Recruit and hire consultant to do a review/evaluation of district special education program. Create and administer survey, interview faculty, analyze student data to determine strengths, weaknesses of	Report completed with recommendations. 87teachers grades 4-8 were asked to participate in a survey through survey monkey to assess comfort with STEM and STEM instruction.

	district special education program. From program evaluation, provide list of recommendations that can be implemented in 13-14 school year.	Analyzed the surveys that were done and also encouraged others to complete the survey since the percentage of participation was relatively low (approx. 23%). Began planning for professional development, curriculum work and mentoring/modeling by TOSA's based upon surveys for implementation with teachers grades 4-8. Teachers on special assignment (TOSA) and administrator with some funding used to support the goals of this grant worked with 90 teachers grades 3-12 to implement some of the special education recommendations in the program review. In addition, worked with common core curriculum, literacy, interdisciplinary teaching, mathematics and instructional strategies for those students with challenging behaviors.
Goal III- To offer professional development opportunities as well as the opportunity to take college level courses in areas of mathematics, special education, science, technology, literacy, and instructional strategies	Recruit college level courses in specified areas to faculty Explore and offer professional development for teachers Grades 3-8 in specified areas. Revamp college course concept and create on-site college course offering to take place over a semester (survey course).	Methods course delivered. Embedded PD was beneficial and 94 teachers involved in curriculum and unit design as well as Data Driven Instruction (DDI) and integration of common core. Anticipated only 1 session of methods survey 1 but it was so successful that they offered 2 and also a methods survey 2. They budgeted for 50 total participants and reached 71.
Goal IV - To provide career	Post, recruit and hire	Three Teachers on Special

ladder opportunities for teachers and administrators.	teacher/leader on special assignment positions (3 and 1). Provide professional development and training for teachers/leaders on special assignment to enable them to model and coach for others. Provide training, mentoring, and coaching to teachers in areas of mathematics, science, English Language Arts (ELA), technology, special education, and instructional strategies.	Assignment. Reflections of TOSAS Involvement of 3 administrative leaders in grant implementation. The district had professors on site to teach a college level methods course and then also offer other types of professional development in the areas of STEM, interdisciplinary coursework and instruction, effective teaching strategies and working with special education populations effectively.
Goal V - To pilot a science lab model at grades 3-5.	Recruit and hire teacher assistant to work in science labs at grades 3-5. TOSAs, Science Administrator, Science Lab Teacher Assistant create curriculum map for science and science lab w/units. Implement Team Teaching Model in Science lab w/classroom teachers teaching in collaboration w/science lab Teacher Assistant (TA) (TOSAs model lessons) using new curriculum map and units	Curriculum maps/Units completed. All students scheduled in lab. 20 teachers co-teaching in lab with one teacher assistant and 3 teachers on special assignment.

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
$374,000	$147,990	$226,010

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives *(This information is available from STLE interim and final reports)*	# In Position/ # Served	Year 1 Interim Report – Actual Exp. *(10/31/12 – 3/1/13)*	Year 1 Final – Actual Exp. *(10/31/12 – 6/30/13)*	Year 2 Interim Report – Actual Exp. (7/1/13 – 12/31/13)	Year 2 Final – Actual Exp. (7/1/13 – 6/30/14)
	recruiting teachers/leaders to take coursework related to STEM	75	-	$2,300	-	$62,339
15	Long-term		-		-	
46	conference out of district/travel	4		$2,614		$2,405

45	supplies and materials		-	$6,008	-	$17,491
40	hired special education consultant	1	-	$10,000	-	$26,976
15	hired/appointed 1 teacher on special assignment - this was only for a portion of the school year the other two positions for teachers were stipend for the remainder of year 1 and will actually be a portion of their actual salary for year 2	1	-	$23,267	-	$182,832
15	appointed 2 teachers to work on grant with a stipend through the end of June/summer in preparation for full implementation of teacher on special assignment positions in year 2	2	-	$10,000	-	-
15	appointed 1 leader to work on grant with a stipend through the end of June/summer in preparation for full implementation of leader on special assignment position in year 2	1	-	$2,500	-	$7,800
40	hired various consultants	19	-	$19,300	$1,000	$26,976
49	BOCES training resources	3	-	-	-	-
15	3 teachers on special assignment: 2.35 FTE and portion of 3 administrator salaries to support the grant: assistant principal to coach math, science/technology administrator and ELA administrator; establish stipends for participants in methods survey class; leaders with stipend for special assignment; teachers participating in college coursework and curriculum development	3	-	-	$92,794	See above
	Total Actual Expenditures		-	**$75,989**	**$93,794**	**$299,843**

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis

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

Guiding questions to direct the review:

> *I. Does the school district have a comprehensive systems approach to the recruitment, development, support, retention and equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders?*
>
> *II. Is the grant impacting high need students and shortage subject areas?*

Preparation

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

	enhancing pathways for educators to achieve various professional certifications.
Summary: This component was not addressed by the STLE grant funded activities.	

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

Recruitment and Placement

Recruitment and Placement	
Standard	The district engages in activities to attract educators to the district. The district engages in targeted placement and recruitment to ensure high needs students and schools 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: Three Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) worked with teacher's grades 3-8 to model lessons, facilitate curriculum work, units and coach in classrooms. The activities that the TOSAs undertook greatly influenced the attainment of the Rotterdam-Mohonasen Goal I- to introduce, deconstruct and implement new learning standards for grades K-12. Consultants were hired to work with teachers to connect strategies into classroom curriculum and instruction. A special education review for the district was implemented and findings from the review were acted upon through co-teaching.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Teacher coaches mentor 15 new/early career teachers (2 years or less) by pushing into classrooms and through regular meetings.	T Mentor	Formal	Coach	District	15	15	

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:

- Consultants (college professors) hired to work with those teachers/administrators connected to the grant and teachers in general to model strategies for integrating STEM concepts into classroom curriculum and instruction. In addition, worked with common

core curriculum, literacy, interdisciplinary teaching, mathematics and instructional strategies for those students with challenging behaviors.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teachers on special assignment (TOSA) and administrator with funding used to support the goals of this grant worked with teachers grades 3-12 to implement some of the special education recommendations in the program review.
- TOSAs worked with teachers 3-8 on science curriculum and coached in classrooms on instructional strategies.
- TOSAs mentored new teachers and/or teachers having difficulty in the classroom.
- Based upon the special education program review, the district implemented a new co-taught mathematics class at the middle school. In addition, they implemented interdisciplinary global studies/English classes at the high school with a special education teacher as a part of the class in order to support programmatic needs. Finally, the district made a concerted effort to have special education teachers' work side by side with regular education teachers for all of the professional development activities that are being provided through the STLE grant by consultants and by the teachers/administrators on special assignment.

Evidence from Site Visit Notes:

- A Superintendent stated that, teacher leaders provide STEM assistance to teachers district wide; provide mentoring to not only new, but to all teachers in districts. Co-teaching has allowed for greater opportunities to provide one to one student support and differentiated instruction. This has helped maintain and increase student engagement.
- The STEM Coach remarked that, teacher leaders can push in to classrooms to ensure goals are on track and initiatives are occurring, this makes curriculum stronger.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- 3 Teachers on Special Assignment worked with teacher's grades 3-8 to model lessons, facilitate curriculum work units and coach in classrooms.
- Total of 37 teachers coached.
- Embedded coaching and modeling by professors from St. Rose and Union College in grade 3-11 classrooms facilitated best instructional practices in literacy and interdisciplinary work.

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: Although not a primary purpose of the district's STLE grant funded activities, STLE funded TOSAs have included inter-rater reliability in the topics that they have conducted through professional development during monthly staff training.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
3 TOSAs provided professional development on inter-rater reliability	T-Eval	PD	APPR-Obs	District	15	221	N/A	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 2 Interim Report and Call Notes:

- The Rotterdam-Mohonasen SD indicated that 3 STLE funded TOSAs have included inter-rater reliability in the training that they provide to all district staff (221 teachers).

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: There is evidence that the district made progress in the accomplishment of Goal III: to offer professional development opportunities as well as the opportunity to take college level courses in areas of mathematics, special education, science, technology, literacy, and instructional strategies and Goal V: to pilot a science lab model at grades 3-5.

The district used STLE grant funds to provide professional development and training, by consultants, in the areas of science, mathematics, interdisciplinary curriculum, special education and literacy. Teachers shared best practices, modeled successful lessons and there was greater collaboration among staff. Teachers designed more inquiry based lessons and activities that were more hands on for students. There were more consistent conversations taking place about data and curriculum, which allowed for more in depth data analysis.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
75 Stipends for teachers to participate in methods survey course level 1 and level 2 (2 semesters of level 1 and 1 semester of level 2)-	Teacher	Group	Grant	TC, FP	15 40	73	3 semester long courses total of 73 teachers participated – 56 methods 1 and 19 in methods 2	$51,100 $12,390
3 TOSA conducted workshops on data analysis and inter-rater-reliability	Teacher	Group	APPR-Obs, DDI	District		221	School Year PD	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:

- All teachers' grades 4-8 were asked to participate in a survey through survey monkey to assess comfort with STEM and STEM instruction. Surveys were analyzed that were completed and it was encouraged for others to complete the survey since the percentage of participation was relatively low (approx. 23%). Rotterdam-Mohonasen began planning for professional development, curriculum work and mentoring/modeling by TOSA's based upon surveys for implementation with teachers grades 4-8.
- Rotterdam-Mohonasen designed both college courses and professional development opportunities that would occur on site in the school district for year 2. The district planned for professors on site to teach a college level methods course and then also offer other types of professional development in the areas of STEM, interdisciplinary coursework and instruction, effective teaching strategies and working with special education populations effectively.

Evidence from site visit:

- The superintendent/project coordinator indicated that teachers were taking what they learned and brought it back to the classroom for implementation. It was also noticed that student engagement increased and students were more willing to take challenging science classes. It was also stated that teachers were sharing best practices, modeling successful lessons and there was greater collaboration among staff and that teacher leaders helped teachers become more comfortable teaching science.
- The superintendent indicated that the partnerships with Union College and St. Rose helped to adjust to the new Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) modules and teachers were taking the lead with trying new initiatives, non-traditional learning, and sharing info with colleagues.
- The Methods Theory Survey course taught by area professors allowed for teachers to gain greater understanding of analyzing data/assessments to improve and inform instruction as well as gain greater understanding of CCLS; and a principal continued with stating that there were more consistent conversations about data and curriculum, which allowed for more in depth data analysis. The PD provided to teachers and ongoing support allowed for a much smoother implementation of modules.
- A principal continued on with remarking that a science committee worked with grade levels to assess if PD was carried on in the classroom and that teachers shared what is working/what is not.
- Faculty is very willing to learn best practices and take what was learned back to the classroom in order to enhance and improve student learning.
- STEM coaches indicated that the district communicated early on the role of the STEM coach, and more and more teachers began to ask for help. Furthermore teachers designed more inquiry based lessons and activities that were more hands on for students.
- STEM coaches indicated that they complete non-evaluative observations to determine PD need.

- Teacher leaders indicated that PD allowed for teacher leaders to work together ahead of time; and the work that was completed helped teachers when writing curriculum maps, and helped to shape common assessments in all science classrooms to ensure common teaching was occurring.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- Teachers participated in a survey methods course conducted by professionals from around the area (i.e. Teacher Center and a college professor).
- TOSAs worked with teachers and administrators supported by the grant to develop science lab curriculum and units; re-organized physical space in science lab; worked with/supported teachers grades 3-5 in science lab; created assessments; assisted teachers in planning and implementing science lessons.
- The district reported that various consultants provided ongoing professional development as coaches in interdisciplinary classrooms at the high school; and ELA and other content classes grades 3-8.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- In July 2013 the district brainstormed how to reconfigure professional development/college level courses for teachers; based upon feedback from discussions and survey, the district knew that they needed to offer something on site. A methods survey course was created and teachers were able to receive a stipend of $700. Consultants were secured to provide this coursework.
- Professional development with TOSA's and a consultant on "what it means to be a teacher leader and how to work with people when willing or even when resistant to assistance".
- Summer enrichment camp in area of STEM coordinated and run by the TOSA's.
- The TOSAs deconstructed common core learning standards and modules in order to present to faculty throughout the school year; they deconstructed CCLS in math, science, tech, English and created units integrating standards and modules. The TOSAs worked with 89 teachers.
- The district remarked, the resources that we were able to secure (including but not limited to: access to consultants, professional development), as well as the stipends to provide to teachers and administrators training through the grant have been invaluable. We would not have had the tools or support to do all of the training on DDI, APPR, CCLS and best instructional practice through the methods survey course had we not been a grant recipient.

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 funded activities.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Served	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: The district supported its Goal IV: to provide career ladder opportunities for teachers and administrators, has been accomplished and Goal V: to pilot a science lab model at grades 3-5, is also supported by the career ladder positions that have been established.

Grant funds were used to pay stipends for three teacher leaders and an assistant principal whose focus is on math 6-12 curriculum and instruction. Teacher leaders provided STEM assistance to teachers district wide, and provided mentoring to not only new, but to all teachers in district.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
3 teachers on special assignment: 2.35 FTE	T-TOSA	STLE 1	CC- ELA, CC-Math, STEM, Coach	15	Stipend	2.35	$125, 415
1 new Science and Technology Administrator hired Stipend for Admin for Math with focus on STEM activities grade 6-8 related to STLE grant Stipend for Admin for ELA with focus on literacy activities grade 3-8 related to STLE grant - also this administrator, in conjunction with the science administrator coordinated the methods survey courses	T-FT	STLE 1	CC-ELA, CC-Math, STEM, Coach	15	Stipend	3	$22, 620
Teacher Assistant Science Lab	T-RTR	STLE 1	STEM	15	Salary	1	$14,820
Leaders with stipend for special assignment	T-FT	STLE 1	CC-ELA, CC-Math, CC-other, STEM	15	Stipend	2	$5,000
Grant Coordinator/leader with stipend for special assignment	T-FT	STLE 1	Grant	15	Stipend	1	$2,800

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 Interim and Final reports Year 1:

- Stipends were paid with grant funds for an assistant high school principal, whose focus was on math 6-12 and 3 teachers on special assignment.
- A coordinator of STLE grant tasks was paid a salary as if teaching in a classroom.

Evidence from site visit:

- The superintendent/project coordinator indicated that teacher leaders provided STEM assistance to teachers, district wide, provided mentoring to not only new, but to all teachers in district and those teacher leaders be able to work with teachers district wide to improve instruction, and provided PD in interdisciplinary studies and CCLS. STLE activities helped to get students involved in STEM and to carry on to HS and beyond. Also reported that there has been a positive response from parents.
- A principal indicated that the teacher on special assignment (TOSA) positions afforded the three teachers the opportunity to take on a leadership role in a very different and unique way than what would have been possible without the grant and that developing the teacher leader positions allowed for great teachers with leadership potential to take on greater leadership responsibilities while still having the opportunity to stay in the classroom.
- A principal continued with remarking that the teacher leader role in developing the science academy greatly impacted the science program. Students were more engaged and it has allowed for female students to take a more active role in STEM classes.
- The teachers on special assignment (TOSA) positions have afforded teachers an opportunity to take on leadership roles in a very unique way. According to school administrators, TOSAs have been instrumental in the development of the Science Academy. It was reported that the Science Academy has led to a stronger science program, as well as increased student engagement in the classroom.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Bi-weekly meetings between superintendent/assistant superintendent and science administrator to facilitate transition and familiarize with STLE grant and goals.
- Met with TOSA's in July and August to discuss roles and responsibilities.

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: The district does not have any STLE funded activities /positions that would qualify as "Other".	

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.
Summary: Based upon the special education program review, the district implemented a new co-taught mathematics class at the middle school. In addition, they implemented interdisciplinary global studies/English classes at the high school with a special education teacher as a part of the class in order to support programmatic needs. The district assigned a middle school special education teacher with the task of researching best reading practices for students with disabilities in order to determine whether the reading strategies being used currently were the most effective. Finally, the district made a concerted effort to have special education teachers work side by side with regular education teachers for all of the professional development activities that were provided through the STLE grant by consultants and by the teachers/administrators on special assignment. The district provided training, mentoring, and coaching to teachers in areas of mathematics, science, ELA, technology, special education, and instructional strategies. The district also supported a focus on STEM activities with a Science Lab.	

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 district had professors on site to teach a college level methods course and then also offer other types of professional development in the areas of STEM, interdisciplinary coursework and instruction, effective teaching strategies and working with special education populations effectively.
- Consultants (college professors) were hired to work both with those teachers/administrators connected to the grant and teachers in general to model strategies for integrating STEM concepts into classroom curriculum and instruction. In addition they worked with instructional strategies for those students with challenging behaviors.
- A teacher participated in a conference related to STEM.
- Consultant surveyed special education teachers, and some of the regular education teachers that work with those teachers and administrators. She conducted follow-up interviews and focus groups with targeted teachers/administrators from the information collected in the survey. In addition, she compiled results and met with central office staff to discuss results and next steps for implementing recommendations in year 2 of the grant (primarily PD).

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- A new science lab model was piloted with grades 3-5. A teaching assistant was hired through grant funding to coordinate this lab and also used the expertise of the

teachers/administrators on special assignment to create the curriculum maps and lessons for this lab.

- Training over the summer occurred for the teacher assistant and the three teachers on special assignment in how to train other teachers in the use of the lab. Development of the lab curriculum occurred. Schedule for lab and expectations for teachers bringing their classes to the lab was re-vamped. Teachers on special assignment were scheduled to model lessons in the lab. Physical space and equipment in the lab was re-organized. The revised curriculum was implemented during fall and spring semesters, and revisions as necessary continued.

Evidence from Site Visit:

- The Superintendent remarked that, 3rd- 5th grade students had not been previously going to sciences lab. Teacher leaders were now taking these students to the lab to ensure extra science support. Teacher leaders were helping teachers become more comfortable teaching science instruction. Teacher leaders are working to pre survey students in order to provide differentiated instruction as well as to see where improvements are needed and were providing materials for pre instruction prep.
- STEM Coach reported that, students are reporting that they are trying science lessons at home. A connection across grade levels and engaging students in science has increased along with female participation increasing in science, emerging technologies, and looking to the future to where science can take them with college/career. Incorporating parents/community to talk about science careers and connecting to real life. Sixty K-2 students enrolled in science enrichment program. Hands on learning connecting all subjects.
- A Principal reported that, more teachers are confident with science and math instruction. Turnkey trainers have been able to effectively model unit components. We were very pleased to be able to incorporate 5th grade into the science lab schedule. The teacher leaders were instrumental in helping the lab teacher prepare lessons. Teacher leader's role in developing the science academy has greatly impacted the science program. Students are more engaged and has allowed for the female student to take a more active role in STEM classes.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- Professional development with TOSA's and a consultant, on what it means to be a teacher leader and how to work with people when willing or even when resistant to assistance.
- Summer enrichment camp in area of STEM coordinated and run by the TOSA's.
- Re-vamped science lab and developed curricula at the 3-5 grade level.

Sustainability

Sustainability	
Standard	The district has a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan to sustain grant activities beyond the life of the grant.
Summary: Through STLE and STLE3 the district has expanded the initiative to train their own cadre of teacher leaders who will be able to do professional development and mentoring because they have developed expertise in a variety of areas	

Short Description	Code	Type
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 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that they plan on using the knowledge of teachers who have participated in the survey course to share knowledge beyond the life of the grant. Beyond that, there is no indication that the district intends to sustain STLE funded activities/positions.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district remarks, "We continue to write and apply for grants. In fact, we were fortunate to apply for and receive STLE3 grant funding".
- The district stated, "Through STLE and STLE3 we have expanded the initiative to train our own cadre of teacher leaders who will be able to do professional development and mentoring because they have developed expertise in a variety of areas. It will also become more institutionalized as we record all PD with the flipped classroom concept creating our own professional learning community".

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

- Superintendent
- Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum
- Grant Manager/Science and Technology Administrator K-12
- Pinewood School (3^{rd} – 5^{th} grades)
- Science Teacher
- Science Teacher
- Science Lab Teacher
- Math Teacher
- Math Teacher

Description of classroom observations (including amount of time, student population and rubrics used to conduct observations)

- N/A

Documents and materials reviewed to complete this report

- Rotterdam-Mohonasen Year 1 Interim Report
- Rotterdam-Mohonasen Year 1 Final Report
- Rotterdam-Mohonasen Year 2 Interim Report
- Rotterdam- Mohonasen Year 2 Final Report
- Rotterdam-Mohonasen Site Visit Notes
- Rotterdam-Mohonasen Site Visit Debrief Letter