



New York State Education Department

Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (STLE)

Summary Report

Watervliet 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 8

Section IV – Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Profile..... 9

Section V – Monitoring History 9

Section VI - STLE Grant Profile 10

Section VII – STLE Grant Analysis 15

 Preparation 15

 Recruitment and Placement 16

 Induction and Mentoring..... 17

 Evaluation 18

 Ongoing Professional Development/Professional Growth 19

 Performance Management 21

 Career Ladder for Teachers and Principals..... 22

 Other 23

 Issues of Equity..... 24

 Sustainability..... 24

Section VIII – Methodology 25

District Contact Information

	Superintendent	STLE Grant Manager
Name	Dr. Lori Caplan	Kirsten DeMento
Phone	(518) 629-3201	(518) 629-3231
Email	lcaplan@vliet.neric.org	kdemento@vliet.neric.org

Section I – District Description

Source: All district description data comes from the Watervliet 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
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
1,344	695	195	31	192	939

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	18	12	4	62	4

Attendance/Suspension Rates	
Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
95%	6%

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
115	0	1	13	9

Need Status
High Need/Resource Urban-Suburban District

Section II – Academic Performance

Source: All academic performance data comes from the Watervliet 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)	47	9	n<5	43
3(2012-13)	29	12	n<5	21
4(2011-12)	48	15	n<5	40
4(2012-13)	20	0	0	14
5(2011-12)	44	8	n<5	31
5(2012-13)	9	0	n<5	5
6(2011-12)	49	0	n<5	37
6(2012-13)	23	0	None tested	17
7(2011-12)	35	0	None tested	31
7(2012-13)	18	0	n<5	16
8(2011-12)	40	5	None tested	35
8(2012-13)	17	0	None tested	11
District Wide (2011-12)	43	5	0	36
District Wide (2012-13)	19	2	Cannot be calculated*	14

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 New York State Mathematics Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
3(2011-12)	59	27	17	56
3(2012-13)	30	6	n<5	24
4(2011-12)	56	23	n<5	49
4(2012-13)	21	0	14	12
5(2011-12)	61	23	n<5	61
5(2012-13)	15	0	n<5	9
6(2011-12)	46	26	n<5	40
6(2012-13)	35	0	None tested	34
7(2011-12)	41	5	None tested	32
7(2012-13)	14	0	n<5	10
8(2011-12)	41	14	None tested	33
8(2012-13)	12	0	None tested	4
District Wide (2011-12)	50	18	17	44
District Wide (2012-13)	21	1	Cannot be calculated*	15

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

Student Performance: 2011-12 & 2012-13 Science Examination				
Grade	% Proficient All	% Proficient SWD	% Proficient ELL	% Proficient ED
4(2011-12)	94	85	n<5	92
4(2012-13)	95	85	100	95
8(2011-12)	68	40	None tested	59
8(2012-13)	50	5	None tested	44
District Wide (2011-12)	79	58	0	74
District Wide (2012-13)	73	36	100	71

Student Performance: 2012-13 New York State Regents Exams				
Exam	All Students		Students With Disabilities	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
Comprehensive English	84	21	20	0
Integrated Algebra	54	3	5	0
Geometry	34	2	20	7
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	32	1	None tested	None tested
Global History and Geography	69	13	29	0
U.S. History and Government	88	35	50	0
Living Environment	73	14	43	3
Physical Setting/ Earth Science	59	12	31	0
Physical Setting/ Chemistry	52	7	n<5	n<5
Physical Setting/ Physics	44	6	None tested	None tested

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level ELA After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	77	40	72	24
SWD	45	7	29	0
ELL	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
ED	69	23	76	29

Cohort Results In Secondary-Level Math After Four Years of Instruction				
	2008 Cohort		2009 Cohort	
	% Proficient	% Mastery	% Proficient	% Mastery
All	79	7	73	3
SWD	45	0	24	0
ELL	n<5	n<5	n<5	n<5
ED	77	2	76	5

Watervliet 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	2	-	-	-	-
	5	3	-	-	-	-
	6	1	-	-	-	-
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	0	0	0	0	0
Mathematics	3	2	-	-	-	-
	5	3	-	-	-	-
	6	1	-	-	-	-
	7	2	-	-	-	-
	8	0	0	0	0	0
Science	8	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	-	-	-	-
Mathematics	1	-	-	-	-

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	4	-	-	-	-	
General Education	3	-	-	-	-	
SWD	1	-	-	-	-	
First Grade						
All Students	5	20	20	0	60	
General Education	5	20	20	0	60	
SWD	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Grade						
All Students	5	0	20	60	20	
General Education	4	-	-	-	-	
SWD	1	-	-	-	-	

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

Third Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	3	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth Grade					
All Students	7	0	43	43	14
General Education	4	-	-	-	-
SWD	3	-	-	-	-
Fifth Grade					
All Students	3	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	1	-	-	-	-
Seventh Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Ninth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Tenth Grade					
All Students	2	-	-	-	-
General Education	2	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Eleventh Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-
Twelfth Grade					
All Students	1	-	-	-	-
General Education	1	-	-	-	-
SWD	-	-	-	-	-

Group	2008 Cohort 4 Year		2007 Cohort 5 Year	
	n	Graduation Rate (%)	n	Graduation Rate (%)
All	127	78	126	81
Students With Disabilities	29	n<30	27	n<30
Limited English Proficient	3	n<30	4	n<30

Economically Disadvantaged	63	73	72	86
----------------------------	----	----	----	----

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

- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level ELA – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Black or African American
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Students With Disabilities
- Elementary/Middle-Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Secondary-Level Math- All Students
- Secondary-Level Math- White
- Secondary-Level Math- Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort- All Students
- 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 – White
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – All Students
- Elementary/Middle-Level Science – White
- Secondary- Level ELA – All Students
- Secondary- Level ELA – White
- Secondary- Level Math – All Students
- Secondary- Level Math – White
- Secondary- Level Math – Economically Disadvantaged
- Graduation Rate: 4-Year Graduation-Rate Total Cohort – White
- Graduation Rate: 4-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

School Name	School Principal	Time of Service	Status	Grades Served	# of Students (12-13)	# of Students (13-14)	# of Admin (12-13)	# of Admin (13-14)	# of Teachers (12-13)	# of Teachers (13-14)
Watervliet Elementary School	Terri O'Brien	2012-14	Original	PreK-6	747	765	1P, 1AP	1P, 1AP	56	53
Watervliet Jr./Sr. High School	Ryan Groat	2012-14	Original	7-12	650	610	1p, 1AP	1P, 1AP	67	63

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/watervliet-appr-plan.pdf Most current version as of: May 7, 2014

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	6	12	0	70
Effective	83	77	53	31
Developing	12	5	48	0
Ineffective	0	7	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

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

2012-13	Year 1 Interim Report Status Update Call	Aviva Baff, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant	April 29, 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	April Marsh, Project Assistant; Megan Lee Collins, Project Assistant	September 16, 2014
2013-14	Site Visit	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator; April Marsh, Project Assistant; Sean Fitzsimons, Project Assistant	January 15, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by February 7, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Interim Report Status Update Call	Carrie Smith, Project Coordinator	April 8, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Submitted by District	N/A	Submitted by June 30, 2014
2013-14	Year 2 Final Report Status Update Call	April Marsh, Project Assistant	July 23, 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
5545-13-0044	\$170,000	10/31/2012 – 6/30/2014	Individual

Key Program Design Elements
<p>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 provided financial incentive, through tuition reimbursement, for teachers willing to obtain additional certification in high needs areas.</i></p>
<p>2. Recruitment and Placement – Activities to attract educators to the district and the schools that need them: <i>A financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education was funded by STLE grant funds.</i></p>

- 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: *All teachers new to teaching and new to the district were assigned a mentor until they received tenure.*
- 4. Evaluation** – The new APPR system based on Education Law §3012-c.: *Teachers were trained in use of the rubric and additional professional development occurred throughout the year so that teachers had an understanding of how they were evaluated.*
- 5. Professional Development/Growth-** Differentiated ongoing support for teacher and/or leader effectiveness, based on evidence of practice and student learning: *Teachers received professional development from ELA, Math and Technology Coaches on increasing the rigor and relevance of common core aligned lessons in grades K-12.*
- 6. Performance Management** – Use of evaluation data in development and employment decisions: *Teachers who were rated as highly effective were selected as mentor-coaches.*
- 7. Career Ladder** – Opportunities for advancement for educators identified as highly effective or effective: *Teachers who were effective/highly effective were selected to mentor-coach teachers who were developing and/or ineffective.*

Program Goals (Taken from Year 1 Final Report)	Targets (Taken from Year 2 Interim Report)	Outcomes (Taken from Year 2 Final Report)
Goal I: Recruit and retain properly trained and certified teachers (at least 1) in high needs/shortage areas including K-12 special education teachers.	<p>Establish a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education and internships. At least one teacher has already agreed. (By January 2013, develop criteria and contract for teachers to sign up for financial incentive program for obtaining additional teaching certifications. Now moved to end of July as new teachers are being recruited.)</p> <p>All participating teachers accepted and enrolled in college classes/programs.</p> <p>All participating teachers will show new certification credentials.</p>	<p>One teacher received additional training and obtained B-2 Special Education certification.</p> <p>A teacher was recruited to get additional certification in Special Education and is now teaching as a special education B-2 S/C teacher. The teacher was reimbursed \$1,914 for the cost of college courses.</p>
Goal II: Teachers and principals will deepen their	All teachers in the district will participate in orientation to	14 teachers on Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPS)

<p>understanding of the district's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) process as well as their understanding of the Charlotte Danielson 2011 Framework; principals will also have a deeper understanding about the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) for their evaluation.</p>	<p>new plan/forms. The Charlotte Danielson 2011 Framework began with a 1/2 day conference day on 9/27/2012.</p> <p>The principals will attend training on the MPPR. (March 27, 2013 with Giselle Martin-Kneip)</p> <p>Establish a teacher/coach/mentor program for those teachers with a Teacher Improvement Plan (or anticipation of plan in year 2012-13) in an effort to support the teacher and move the teacher to the effective/highly effective level, while providing a career ladder position for effective and highly effective teachers. (100% of the teachers will receive a coach/mentor)</p>	<p>were matched with a mentor teacher (someone effective or highly effective) for the year.</p> <p>Each mentor met for at least 1 hour a week with their two assigned teachers.</p> <p>Mentors (8) were paired with 16 teachers on TIPS plans in grades 7-12</p>
<p>Goal III: Establish professional development opportunities whereby teachers and school leaders are able to increase effectiveness and improve student learning.</p>	<p>Instructional Coaches in the areas of Mathematics, English Language Arts (ELA), and Technology will be hired to assist with integration of common core, lesson planning, and student learning objectives. This will help ensure classrooms are engaging and that students are college and career ready when they graduate. Coaches will assist with the development of a minimum of 30 new common core aligned lesson plans (10 each) geared toward high needs students, including students with disabilities (SWD) within the first year.</p> <p>Establish a Professional Learning Community, a social</p>	<p>116 teachers in both the elementary and the high school met weekly with an ELA or Math coach for professional development (PD). Each teacher handed in a lesson plan each month.</p> <p>21 Teacher/administrators took part in a book club Professional Learning Community (PLC) this year (21).</p> <p>At the end of June, teachers were able to bring their end of year (EOY) data and Student Learning objectives (SLO's) to the coaches to discuss the year and finalize their SLO's.</p>

	<p>group of new and experienced educators for the purpose of reviewing professional literature and enhancing student learning by reading and discussing important topics that influence education. Engage a minimum of 10 teachers and school leaders at both the elementary school and the middle/senior high schools to participate.</p> <p>Use of BOCES Data coach as turnkey trainer on data analysis and SLO review at grade levels/departments.</p>	
<p>Goal IV: Use evaluation data in development and employment decisions</p>	<p>Purchase and modify the Teachscape program for APPR use by the Watervliet City School District by end of year 1.</p> <p>Ensure 100% observer participation in the Teachscape rater-training program during the summer/fall of 2013.</p> <p>Purchase equipment for administrator use with Teachscape system. (i-pads)</p> <p>Use the end of year Teachscape data to inform decisions on hiring, TIPS plans and needed professional development.</p>	<p>All (5) administrators met last July/August to review the Teachscape training videos and discuss observation characteristics for each scoring band.</p> <p>Various Teachscape Reports were reviewed for trends so administrators can plan PD for 2014-15.</p> <p>The grant coordinator and principals indicated that Teachscape training was provided with modules that match the domains.</p> <p>The district purchased and modified the Teachscape program for APPR use by the Watervliet City School District by end of year 1.</p> <p>The administrators used the Teachscape system to calibrate observation expectations. 16 teachers were</p>

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

		<p>placed on a TIPS plan and received mentoring from 7 effective/highly effective teachers.</p> <p>The grant coordinator and principals indicated that Teachscape results (Component Score Distribution) were used to address professional development needs of teachers.</p>
--	--	---

Total Grant Award	Year 1 Allocation	Year 2 Allocation
\$170,000	\$64,135	\$107,805

Budget Code	Description of Funded Activities/Strategies/Initiatives (<i>This information is available from STLE interim and final reports</i>)	# 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	Teacher Coaches	50 yr 1/ 26 yr 2	-	\$36,989	-	\$11,850
40	Margaret Deguilo	1	-	\$500	-	-
40	Pauline Lestrangle	1	-	\$1,500	-	-
40	CASDA	1	-	\$811	-	-
40	JARA Consulting	1	-	-	-	\$1,450
40	DATAG	1	-	\$295	-	-
40	Allison Reynolds	1	-	-	-	\$1,913
40	MOEMS	1	-	\$99	-	-
45	CDW Government	-	-	\$642	-	-
45	Barnes and Nobles	-	-	\$319	-	\$390
45	Apple Store	-	-	\$2,681	-	-
45	Stenhouse Publishing	-	-	\$290	-	-
45	Heinman	-	-	\$372	-	\$219
45	Staples Credit Plan	-	-	\$1,337	-	\$220
45	Superior Office Supplies	-	-	-	-	\$30
45	Cambium Learning	-	-	-	-	\$82
45	Scantron	-	-	-	-	\$447
45	NPR	-	-	-	-	\$295
80	Employee Benefits	-	-	\$884	-	\$1,940
90	Indirect Costs	-	-	\$148	-	-
49	Questar	-	-	\$45	-	-
49	Capital Region BOCES	-	-	\$16,928	-	\$88,969
15	The science teachers (2) are recruited and are in the middle of taking classes.	-	-	-	-	-
40	Purchase and implement the TeachScape APPR program. Purchase (2) I pads for use with the system (3-15-2013).	-	\$13,973	-	-	-
15	Career Ladder- for new teacher certifications	1	-	-	\$1,940	-

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

15	Career ladder- Mentors for teachers on TIPS	5 year 1 7 year 2	-	-	\$0	-
15	Professional Learning Communities	-	-	-	\$0	-
40	In service Training	-	-	-	\$1,500	-
40	Conferences for teachers and admin	-	-	-	\$219	-
49	Principal Mentoring Service	-	-	-	\$5,900	-
49	ELA and Math Coaches for PD	-	-	-	\$29,340	-
49	TeachScape Software Implementation	-	-	-	\$9,969	-
49	Data Coach	-	-	-	\$0	-
	Total Actual Expenditures		\$13,973	\$64,135	\$48,868	\$107,805

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 district met this standard by providing financial incentives, through tuition reimbursement, for teachers willing to obtain additional certification in high needs areas. This supported the district’s Goal I: recruit and retain properly trained and certified teachers (at least 1) in high needs/shortage areas including K-12 special education teachers. One teacher acquired Special Education (SpEd) certification through this career ladder initiative of the district.	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Total Amount
Teacher to complete certification in Spec. Ed.	New Role	T - CL	SWD	IHE-DS	40	1	\$1,914

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district established a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education. At least one teacher has already agreed.

Evidence from Year 2 Interim Report:

- All participating teachers accepted and enrolled in college classes/programs.

Evidence from Year 2 Final Report:

- The district recruited a speech teacher to become certified as a special education teacher. She completed special education certification requirements in September 2013 and started teaching the K-2 self-contained class at the start of the school year.

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 worked to meet this standard through grant funded activities that attracted educators to the district who were deemed highly qualified. These activities supported the district in accomplishing Goal I: recruit and retain properly trained and certified teachers (at least 1) in high needs/shortage areas including K-12 special education.</p> <p>When recruiting new teachers and administrators, the district sought to employ highly qualified teachers. Special attention was paid if they also held additional certification in shortage areas such as special education and secondary Science, Technology, Engineering Mathematics (STEM). When recruiting new administrators the district sought to employ highly qualified administrators.</p> <p>In year 1 of the STLE grant program the district established a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education.</p>	

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

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- When recruiting new teachers and administrators, the district sought to employ highly qualified teachers. Special attention was paid if they also held additional certification in shortage areas such as special education and secondary STEM.

- The district established a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education. At least one teacher has already agreed.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district established a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education. At least one teacher has already agreed.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district recruited a speech teacher to become certified as a special education teacher. She completed special education certification requirements in September 2013 and started teaching the k-2 self-contained class at the start of the school year.
- A teacher was recruited to get additional certification in Special Education and is now teaching as a special education B-2 S/C teacher.

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: The district used grant funds to ensure that new and early career educators were provided a mentor to support them in advancing their professional practice and to help them improve their ability to produce positive student outcomes. This supported the district in achieving Goal III: establish professional development opportunities whereby teachers and school leaders are able to increase effectiveness and improve student learning.</p> <p>All teachers new to teaching and new to the district were assigned a mentor until they receive tenure. All mentors met at least monthly with their assigned teachers to support them as they began their careers in the district. In Year 2 of the STLE grant program, the two district principals were assigned a mentor to assist with increasing their productivity, supervision and evaluation skills, and to enhance their leadership capacities.</p>	

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

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- All mentors met at least monthly with their assigned teachers to support them as they began their careers in the district.
- All teachers new to teaching and new to the district were assigned a mentor until they received tenure.

- Beginning in Year 2 of the grant, it was planned for both principals to be assigned a mentor to assist with increasing their productivity, supervision and evaluation skills as well as enhance their leadership capacities.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The building principals in both buildings were enrolled in a Principal Mentor Program through the Educational Learning Corporation. The principals were in contact regularly with their mentors.
- 16 teachers were placed on a Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPS) and received mentoring from 7 effective/highly effective teachers.

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
<p>Summary: The district has an approved APPR plan for teachers that include the Danielson 2011 Rubric. These activities supported the district Goal II: teachers and principals will deepen their understanding of the district's Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPR) process as well as their understanding of the Danielson 2011 <i>Framework</i>; principals will also have a deeper understanding about the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) rubric for their evaluation.</p> <p>The teachers were trained in use of the rubric and additional professional development occurred throughout the year so that teachers had an understanding of how they were evaluated. The district has approved APPR plan for administrators that utilizes the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. The principals along with the superintendent attended training to review good practice.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	# Added	Total Amount
Orientation on APPR plan, forms, framework and rubrics for teachers and principals	T-Eval; P-Eval	PD	APPR - Other	District	15 40	All		\$4,200
Professional development on APPR and Best Practices for administrators	P - Eval	PD	APPR - Obs	BOCES – DS; Other organizations	49	7		\$5,900

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The grant coordinator and principals indicated that Teachscape training was provided with modules that match the domains and those coaches observed teachers to assess implementation of knowledge.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- All teachers in the district participated in orientation to new plan/forms. The Charlotte Danielson 2011 Framework began with a 1/2 day conference day.
- The principals attended training on the APPR with Giselle Martin-Kneip.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district held refresher training for all teachers on Teachscape. Additional training about the Danielson rubric and district expectations occurred during faculty and other school wide meetings.
- All administrators used Teachscape and the Danielson model to observe teachers. District principals were trained last year in the APPR rubric.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The district provided professional development opportunities through BOCES and other capital district organizations on APPR and best practices for administrators.
- The administrators used the Teachscape system to calibrate observation expectations.

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.
<p>Summary: The district used grant funds to successfully implement differentiated and ongoing support for teacher and leader effectiveness. These initiatives were consistent with Goal III: establish professional development opportunities whereby teachers and school leaders are able to increase effectiveness and improve student learning.</p> <p>The district provided professional development for teachers that included in-service training provided by ELA, Math, and Technology Coaches on increasing the rigor and relevance of common core aligned lessons in grades K-12. Additionally, teachers who were not seen as having sufficient "growth" based on the 2011 NYS 3-8 exams were provided a Mentor-Coach to assist them with their classroom instructional practices. Professional development was also offered to teachers on close reads, reviewing and revising pre- and post- assessments for grades K-6 ELA and Math and reviewing K-6 writing standards. The district also provided professional development opportunities through BOCES and other capital district organizations on APPR and best practices for administrators.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Provider	Budget Code	# Served	Frequency	Total Amount
Training for, and use of Teachscape	T-PD External	Group	Grant	BOCES-DS	45 and 49	6 admin., 95% of	1 day admin.,	\$20,402

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

	P-PD External					teachers	1 day teachers	
Elementary school PLC, Curriculum writing for ELA and Math	T-PD Internal P-PD Internal	Group	D CC-ELA, CC-Math	District	15 40 45	56 2	varies	\$33,861
Professional development on CCLS, close reads, beginning and end of year assessments for ELA, Math and Writing standards	T –PD External	Group and Indiv.	CC-Other, CC-ELA, CC-Math	BOCES- DS	49	Approx. 130	4 days per week	\$71,082
Professional development for administrators on APPR and best practices	P –PD External	Group and Indiv.	APPR	Educ. Learning Corp.	49	7		\$5,900

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- A principal indicated that teachers are shifting the way they view the work and a collegial approach to the work has been fostered. The use of observations and Teachscape encouraged the teachers to reflect more. Teachers on TIPS had a mentor and were supported to address areas of need as identified by observations. Teachers expressed doing new things that they would not have done otherwise.
- BOCES coaches indicated that teachers have a better understanding of Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS).
- Data Driven Instruction (DDI) was helpful to target areas of need for the teachers.
- Teacher mentors indicated that they met with mentees once a week and provided strategies to assist teachers. Efficiency and classroom management were a focus of work with teachers. They observed classrooms for areas of strength and areas of growth.
- The district formed a successful partnership with Capital Region BOCES. BOCES coaches reported that they have helped to support district initiatives by providing both professional development and individualized support to English Language Arts (ELA) and math teachers with regard to CCLS implementation.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- Instructional Coaches in the areas of math and ELA were hired to assist with integration of CCLS, lesson planning, and student learning objectives. This helped ensure classrooms were engaging and that students were college and career ready when they graduated.
- Coaches assisted with the development of a minimum of 20 new common core aligned lessons plans (10 each) geared toward high needs students, including students with disabilities within the first year as well as the second year.
- The district established a Professional Learning Community (PLC), a social group of new and experienced educators for the purpose of reviewing professional literature and enhancing student learning by reading and discussing important topics that influence education.

- The district engaged a minimum of 10 teachers and school leaders at both the elementary school and the middle/senior high schools to participate in the PLC.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district utilized a BOCES Data Coach as a turnkey trainer on data analysis and SLO review for grade levels/departments. The Data Coach was in the district for a day twice a year to assist teachers and principals.
- ELA and math Coaches worked with faculty weekly on provided professional development to help support implementing the CCLS in their lesson plans to reach all the students, especially students with disabilities.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Teachers responded that they needed more professional development to understand what the common core curriculum was and how the skills would be implemented in their classrooms.

Performance Management

Performance Management	
Standard	The district is systemically using evaluation data in development and employment decisions.
<p>Summary: The district used grant funded activities to systemically use evaluation data in development and employment decisions. This is consistent with the district’s Goal IV: use evaluation data in development and employment decisions.</p> <p>The district trained administrators and teachers on the use of Teachscape. In fall of 2013, the district began to use this technology to gather and review the information regarding teacher effectiveness. Teachers who were rated as highly qualified were selected as mentor-coaches. Additionally, teachers who were considered highly qualified were selected to serve on the district level and building level inquiry teams.</p>	

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Compensation	Budget Code	# Hired/ Developed	Total Amount
Training for, and use of Teachscape	T-PM P-PM	Develop	Grant		45 49		\$20,402

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- The grant coordinator and principals indicated that Teachscape results (Component Score Distribution) were used to address professional development needs of teachers.
- The grant coordinator and principals indicated that BOCES provided 2 coaches (math and literacy), and targeted professional development is provided as identified by principals.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- The district purchased and modified the Teachscape program for APPR use by the Watervliet City School District by end of Year 1.
- The district planned the use of the end of year Teachscape data to inform decisions on hiring, Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPS) and needed professional development.
- The district worked with Teachscape and Northeastern Regional Information Center (NERIC) at implementing the on line program to capture data for the APPR.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- Mentors, who were rated effective/highly effective, were assigned to teachers who were rated developing or ineffective.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- Outcomes included 100% observer participation in the Teachscape rater-training program.
- Outcomes included the use of end of year Teachscape data to inform decisions on hiring, TIPs plans and needed professional development.
- Various Teachscape Reports were reviewed for trends so administrators could plan PD for 2014-15.
- Effective Teachers were paired with teachers rated Developing and Ineffective, to mentor them on a weekly basis.

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.
<p>Summary: The district effectively used grant funds to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers had opportunities for advancement. This initiative supported the district’s efforts to accomplish Goal III: establish professional development opportunities whereby teachers and school leaders are able to increase effectiveness and improve student learning, as well as Goal IV: use evaluation data in development and employment decisions.</p> <p>A teacher obtaining Special Education certification is evidence of the district meeting Goal I: recruit and retain properly trained and certified teachers (at least 1) in high needs/shortage areas including K-12 special education teachers.</p> <p>Teachers who were rated effective/highly effective have been selected to mentor-coach those teachers who have not shown sufficient growth. Mentor-Coach Teachers, who were rated Effective/Highly Effective, mentored teachers who were rated developing and/or ineffective. They met on at least a weekly basis to review classroom lesson plans, projects, etc. In Year 1 of the STLE grant period. 3 teachers served as mentor-coaches, in Year 2, 7 teachers were appointed. The stipend for this career ladder position is \$1,800 annually.</p>	

Additionally, a Speech teacher was reimbursed \$1,914 for courses taken to become certified to teach Special Education, so that the teacher could take over a self-contained elementary classroom.

Short Description	Code	Type	Purpose	Budget Code	Compensation	# On Ladder	Total Amount
Stipends for teacher mentors (year 1)	T-FT	STLE 1	Coach	15	\$900	3	\$2,700
Stipends for teacher mentors (year 2)	T-FT	STLE 1	Coach	15	\$1,800	7	\$10,800
Speech Teacher gaining certification in Special Ed.	T-FT	STLE 1	SWD	15	\$1,914	1	\$1,914

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from site visit interviews:

- A teacher (Speech Therapist) indicated that she/he was seeking Special Education certification through STLE.

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- Three coaches were hired in Jan 2013 for ELA, math and technology.
- The district indicated that three Mentor-Coaches received a stipend of \$900 each, as they did serve in the role the entire school year. The annual rate indicated is \$1,800.

Evidence from the Year 2 Interim Report:

- The district indicated that eight teachers were serving as Mentor-Coaches, at the stipend rate of \$1,800.
- Mentors (8) were paired with 16 teachers on TIPS plans in grades 7-12.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- 7 Effective Teachers were paired with a teacher receiving an APPR rating of developing/ineffective to mentor them on a weekly basis.
- A teacher was recruited to get additional certification in Special Education and is now teaching as a special education B-2 S/C teacher. The teacher was reimbursed \$1,914 for the cost of college courses.

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 funded activities.	

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

Issues of Equity

Issues of Equity	
Standard	The district is focused on equitably distributing highly effective and effective teachers and principals working with high need students and in shortage subject areas including STEM, ELL, bilingual and/or special education or in schools identified as at-risk.
Summary: The district used STLE funded activities to support the equitable distribution of high quality educators by recruiting a teacher to obtain certification in Special Education, consistent with Goal I: recruit and retain properly trained and certified teachers (at least 1) in high needs/shortage areas including K-12 special education teachers. The teacher is now teaching a self-contained class.	

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the Year 1 Final Report:

- A desired outcome is to establish a financial incentive program for teachers interested in obtaining additional teaching certification in shortage areas including special education and internships. At least one teacher has already agreed.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- A teacher was recruited to get additional certification in Special Education and is now teaching as a special education B-2 S/C teacher. The teacher was reimbursed \$1,914 for the cost of college courses.

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 used grant funded activities to implement programs and practices that should have a long term impact on the district, by establishing teacher mentor-coach career ladder positions. The district has indicated that the intention is to continue the program by shifting funds. However, there is no evidence of a detailed plan for sustainability.	

Short Description	Code	Type
BOCES Coaches	Personnel	Shift

Supporting Evidence:

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

Evidence from the site visit:

- In an effort to continue the successful ELA and math support BOCES coaches have provided, the district is encouraged to develop a sustainability plan.

Evidence from the Year 2 Final Report:

- The stated plan was to put the BOCES coaches into the school budget for the 2014-15 school year.

Section VIII – Methodology

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

Individuals interviewed

District Level

- Superintendent
- STLE Coordinator
- Director Pupil Personnel Services

Building Level

- High School Principal
- Elementary School Principal
- Career Ladder Teacher
- Mentor
- Mentor
- Mentee (Math)
- Mentee (Special Education)

BOCES Coaches

- Math Coach
- ELA Coach

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

- Year 1 FS 10-F Report
- Watervliet Year 1 Interim STLE Report

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

- Watervliet Year 1 Final STLE Report
- Watervliet Year 2 Interim STLE Report
- Watervliet Year 2 Final STLE Report
- Watervliet Site Visit Notes