

PLEASE NOTE: this case study is completely fictional and does not actually represent a real district or real individuals. All data and quotes used throughout the case study are entirely fictitious. There are also deliberate mistakes and areas for improvement throughout the case study as this case study is intended as a teaching tool only. The department does not endorse or recommend any of the educational approaches in this study.

New York Public Schools District (NYPSD)

A Case Study for the New York State Education Department APPR Conference: April 30th – May 1

OVERVIEW

Starting in 1997, New York Public Schools District (NYPSD) began to see a rapid change in the demographics of its community. The district, located in the heart of New York State, once was home to many factory workers; however, as the factories closed and workers moved on to other areas of the state, new industry emerged in the 21st century. The district began to see an influx of new companies in the latter part of the new century, all with a STEM focus. The change in the labor market and the economy made it impossible for many previously blue-collar workers and their families to remain in the community, while the transformation in the workforce also corresponded to a change in the types of families that gravitated toward the district. It also was no longer possible for students to graduate from NYPSD schools and live a middle class lifestyle: expectations for students now required a college focus.

HISTORY OF THE DISTRICT'S LEADERSHIP 1995 – PRESENT

NYPSD has faced a number of leadership challenges within the district. Over the years there was significant turnover in the superintendent position. From 1995 -2000 the superintendent was Dr. Beth Gerty, who was deeply respected and admired within the community; however, Dr. Gerty moved on to become a leader in a large urban center, leaving the district without any clear succession plan. From 2000 until 2004, the district saw change-over every two years in the superintendent position, which led to significant drops in student achievement outcomes and the lack of any strategic plan for the district. From 2004 until 2008, the district was led by an interim superintendent, Mr. Benjamin Leary. Mr. Leary had spent his career as a teacher in the district, then as a principal, and had left the district for a short period of time, during which he worked fundraising for an urban school district.

The history of NYPSD under the leadership of Mr. Leary was one of contrasts. During that time, the district spent more per pupil than all other districts across the state; however, little to no change occurred in student achievement. The schools in NYPSD varied significantly in their achievement levels, with some winning awards and others appearing on state lists for poor academic performance. Mr. Leary established a number of significant private-public partnerships with local businesses in order to secure externship opportunities for students in STEM fields and to raise funds for many district initiatives. Mr. Leary also brought in a number of non-profit partners to help support and build the district's human capital management system. The human capital development work was a strongly

supported joint venture between NYPSD and both collective bargaining units of the district. The goals of the agreement for the new human capital system were simple: develop, support, and reward teachers and principals effectively, and create multiple career pathways to further their skills and leadership capabilities. The partnership was heralded by many outside organizations and agencies as a truly impactful and visionary partnership. Mr. Leary had spent significant time cultivating the strong relationships and building the trust necessary to bring about this work.

In 2008 the district found a permanent superintendent, Dr. Taylor Baery. Dr. Baery came to the district after acquiring three years of experience as a superintendent at a nearby smaller school district. Prior to that, Dr. Baery was a founding principal in a high-achieving school in one of the lowest-performing districts in the state. Her school was located in a diverse section of the city and many of her students had come directly from some of the lowest performing schools; her impact was significant and Dr. Baery was regarded as an exceptional instructional leader. NYPSD was excited to have Dr. Baery accept the leadership role in their district as they saw in her the excellence in leadership and instruction that the district had been lacking for the past few years.

CURRENT SITUATION

The total district population of NYPSD is approximately 9,100 students. There are six elementary schools, which serve approximately 4,000 students in grades K-5, three middle schools that serve 2,300 students in grades 6-8, and two high schools, which serve nearly 2,800 students in grades 9-12. School attendance rates range from 85.7% to 91.8%. The district-wide suspension rate is approximately 4%.

NYPSD serves a diverse population of families. The parents in the school district are predominantly working class; 43% of the families are eligible for free or reduced lunch. The district's student population is 45% white, 27% African American, 23% Latino and 5% other. Approximately 7% of the students are English Language Learners (ELLs). Approximately 13% of students in the district have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). Most of the school principals were promoted from within the district after serving as teachers in their respective schools. The elementary schools are all in good standing. One middle school and one high school are designated as Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI). The teaching population has been steady for the past 10 years, with minimal turnover. The teaching staff is 85% white, 6% African American, 7% Asian American and 2% Latino.

The goals and priorities of NYPSD changed significantly when Dr. Baery came into her position. While Dr. Baery had always prioritized student achievement, she had largely done so in the context of NCLB requirements with a focus on student test results. In 2010 when the State recalibrated its cut scores for performance levels on the annual state assessments, NYPSD faced the shocking reality that the district's students were not meeting the high standards now required to ensure students exited the district college and career ready. The bar for what NYPSD students now needed to graduate high school knowing and being able to do had been raised considerably.

When Dr. Baery first began her work, she spent significant time meeting with the district's leadership team, school board members, and principals and teachers. She was surprised to learn that despite the

many strong partnerships Mr. Leary had established, and the long-heralded human capital management system plans, there was a lack of real understanding on all sides as to how to raise student achievement outcomes in meaningful ways. Teachers and principals alike seemed uncertain as to how their instruction had changed as they were unable to explain what effective instruction actually looks like. Dr. Baery also noticed little evidence of rigor as she visited school buildings and classrooms. Additionally, nobody in the district office could articulate how the human capital system actually served any performance management functionality, and principals spoke of disjointed and adhoc professional development with a lack of benchmarks or discussion. Teachers spoke of having job security and a lack of turnover in the district, but there was a notable absence of discussion around performance.

CHANGING COURSE

Over the past two years, Dr. Baery changed the course of direction for the district in order to address the lack of coherence and alignment in initiatives, as well as to clarify the academic goals and priorities for schools and educators, to shift the conversations from being about adults into ones about raising student achievement.

Dr. Baery decided to focus on the specific school-based interventions that she believed would have the strongest impact on student achievement:

1. Excellence in leadership and instruction
2. Increased instructional time
3. Use of frequent Data Driven Instruction cycles and constant feedback to improve instruction
4. Daily tutoring
5. Culture of high expectations and defined college and career readiness goals

The district then implemented Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and a PLC culture where the principals meet monthly, and then, separately, teachers meet fortnightly: once in grade teams and the second time in department teams. Each meeting focuses on one of the key aspects that Dr. Baery has prioritized for school-based interventions. Some meetings involve “critical friend” sessions where, for example, an exemplary teacher will model a lesson that the other teachers in the grade/department in the district will focus on later in the month in order to demonstrate best practices, as well as to receive informal peer feedback. The teachers all also use video recording devices in their classrooms for weekly mentoring sessions and informal peer feedback purposes. Teachers and principals alike have found these sessions to be helpful, and see the difference in the types of interactions and conversations they are having in their schools. However, the results from the State tests continue to show average results and Dr. Baery is concerned the work the district is doing is not translating into higher student achievement outcomes.

Developing a Strategic Plan

Dr. Baery spent 2010-11 developing the district’s long-term strategic plan based on the academic priorities and need of NYPSD. Dr. Baery believes that the lack of a strategic plan is one of the things that

has kept NYPSD from achieving its student achievement goals. After reviewing and analyzing data from multiple sources, including district human resource files, NYS School and District Report Cards, item analyses of State and local assessments, surveys of students, families, and community members, and other national research, Dr. Baery developed NYPSD's district priorities.

Results from the extensive data review analysis revealed the following general trends from recent years:

- Results on ELA indicate a lack of improvement overall since the change in cut scores.
- Math 3-8 achievement decreased for the second year in a row.
- The graduation rate has remained relatively consistent over the past three years, dipping slightly from 80% in 2008 to 75% in 2010.
- Formative assessment results show higher results than state test outcomes.
- Performance of SWD at all grade/subject levels is slightly lower and requires attention.
- Performance of ELLs in ELA at the middle school level requires attention.
- SWD and ESL classification rates continue to be low, which holds to the district philosophy of not classifying students unnecessarily.
- Evaluations are inconsistently done, as only 75% of teachers receive annual observations.
- 97% of teachers received satisfactory ratings in 2009 and 2010; 98% of teachers received satisfactory ratings in 2011.
- All principals received satisfactory ratings in 2009, 2010 and 2011.
- No tenured teachers or principals have been dismissed from their positions since 2008 and 97% of probationary teachers who remained in the school until they were eligible for tenure earned tenure.
- In the past 3 years, 5 teachers received TIPs and all of these teachers were judged to have made sufficient progress to remain in their roles.

Dr. Baery set the following long-term goal for the district:

- To increase the percentage of students who meet the Aspirational Performance Measures from 35% to 50% by the end of 2014-15 school year,.
 - Schools are expected to annually increase the percentage of students scoring proficient on end of course State assessments by at least 7%, and those scoring advanced by at least 4%.
- Priority focus: all schools will prioritize expository writing and STEM subject areas. Academic interventions will be specifically focused in these areas.

To support the schools in NYPSD in their efforts to achieve the ambitious goals outlined in the district's strategic plan, Dr. Baery formed three new committees in 2011-12: a Data Committee, a Common Core Committee, and a Performance Management Committee. The Data and Common Core committees are charged with developing and implementing professional development that is focused on establishing a data driven culture in the schools and developing a deep understanding of the Common Core and its implications for the schools. The Data Committee is focused on identifying the changes in school practice and leadership that must occur in order to develop a true data driven culture in each school. Similarly, the Common Core Committee is focused on identifying the shifts and necessary changes in

practice required to successfully adapt teaching to reflect the Common Core state standards in schools. The Performance Management Committee is focused on co-developing, with the teachers' and principals' unions, an evaluation system that meets the new APPR requirements while also raising the expectations of rigor for teacher and leader excellence.

The Performance Management Committee is attempting to change the district's system into one that will continuously attract and retain talent, while ensuring teachers and leaders at every stage of their career have the help they need to grow professionally. To do so, the committee has to address the issue of having a better teacher and principal evaluation system not only in order to identify those highly effective teachers, but also to ensure that all teachers receive the feedback, mentoring and professional development they need to ensure students learn.

Dr. Baery asserts she has been clear with the committee that observations must be integral to the new evaluation system, for both teachers and principals, and that there must be a real focus on ensuring that student achievement is improving each year. Dr. Baery also provided the committee members with the decisions for SLOs for Comparable Measures and requested that the committee members suggest generic HEDI (Highly, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) criteria for use with SLOs across grades/subjects for her consideration.

The recommendations of the committee will be reviewed by Dr. Baery, the school board, and the teacher's and principal's unions. The recommendations will help inform the final decisions that are locally negotiated in April 2012.

**Dr. Baery's Decisions for Growth on State
Assessments and Comparable Measures**

Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures

Dr. Baery informed the committee that under the new evaluation system, all teachers in grades 4-8 (common branch, ELA, Math) and their building principals, as well as all of the high school principals, will have State-provided growth measures for the first 20% of their evaluation (rising to 25% when there is an approved value-added measure). Dr. Baery also provided the committee with her decisions for SLOs for Comparable Measures for teachers and explained to the members that there were no decisions necessary for principals as all principals within the district will receive State-provided growth measures. All 4-8 teachers will also receive State-provided growth measures.

ASSESSMENT DECISIONS FOR SLOs:

Teachers:

1. K-3: SLOs with a NYPSD-developed ELA assessment and a NYPSD-developed Math assessment
2. 6-7 Science: SLOs with school-wide results on 6-8 ELA and Math State assessments
3. 8 Science: SLOs with State Science assessment
4. 6-8 Social Studies: SLOs with school-wide results on 6-8 ELA and Math State assessments
5. 9-12: SLOs with Regents, where applicable; all other teachers will have SLOs based on a NYPSD-developed Liberal Arts Assessment that includes a blend of social studies, science, math, and ELA
6. School librarians: SLO set collaboratively with classroom teacher(s) (decision as to which grade(s) to focus on is a school level decision)
7. Physical Education: SLOs with a NYPSD-developed assessment
8. Art: SLOs with a NYPSD-developed assessment
9. Special Education: all special education teachers are in co-teaching settings so they will have the same Growth measures as their co-teacher
10. ESL (K-3; high school): SLO with State assessment (ELA and Math), where applicable; otherwise, SLO with a NYPSD-developed ELA assessment and a NYPSD-developed Math assessment

HEDI Criteria within State-Provided Growth Measures

1. The generic HEDI criteria and scoring framework the committee recommended for locally-selected measures will be used for Comparable Growth SLOs (see recommendations for locally-selected measures). This will provide guidance to principals and teachers as to NYPSD's expectations for growth.
2. Principals will set and approve all SLO targets for the courses and teachers in their schools using the NYPSD-determined expectations.
3. Principals should use the generic HEDI criteria as a guide for the expectations of NYPSD; however, principals will set HEDI criteria.
4. NYPSD will audit a random sampling of SLOs developed by teachers and principals in November to ensure rigor and comparability. All SLOs will be entered into the NYPSD computer system to ensure data integrity and for monitoring purposes.
5. Principals will be expected to only approve SLO targets that ensure all students gain at least one year of academic growth and that students below grade level gain at least two year's grade level growth.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PERFORMANCE
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: 60% OTHER
TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS**

60% Other Teachers and Principals

The Performance Management Committee met over a six-month period with members of the respective teacher and principal unions from NYPSD. The Committee reviewed the current tools used in the district for the purposes of teacher and principal performance management, and provided their findings along with the following recommendations:

Practice Rubrics:

FINDINGS:

The district currently uses NYPSD-developed observation rubrics (for both teachers and principals). One member remarked that "the rubric for the observation of principals is more of a compliance exercise with a number of survey-like checkboxes. Principals are not assessed on the quality or frequency of feedback they give to teachers about their practice." Meanwhile, another stated: "the rubric for the observation of teachers has instructional strategies referenced that do not communicate what effective instruction looks like. The expectations for teachers regarding planning, instruction, and professional responsibilities are undefined." Numerous committee members noted that teachers and principals receive no training on the NYS Teaching Standards or ISLLC Standards, which seems to be the reason there is a noticeable lack of understanding of the Standards.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **TEACHERS:** Adopt the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric for classroom observations of teachers.
2. **PRINCIPALS:** Adopt the Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric for assessment of principal leadership and management actions.

Points within Other Measures:

FINDINGS:

NYPSD requires annual observations of all teachers and principals. However, numerous committee members note that these observations do not happen consistently across or even within schools. Surveys of parents, students, and staff are used annually within the district and have been used for over a decade; however, the committee members felt the surveys should not be used for evaluative purposes as that would require changing and deleting a number of the items on the survey. One member explained that these types of changes were "not something the members felt comfortable doing." Professional growth goals with self-reflection are used annually in NYPSD, along with SMART goals. There was confusion amongst the members of the committee as to whether self-reflection on professional growth plans was an allowable option under APPR; the committee received confirmation from the State Education Department that this was not in fact an allowable option. The committee members were in agreement that goals should be used for principals, and they also agreed that the goals should focus on

the retention of the highest performing teachers; however, the members were conflicted as to whether or not data on its own would provide the most accurate information.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Teachers:

- Probationary Teachers: All of the points assigned to observations using the practice rubric:
 - Two formal classroom observations by principals, at least one of these unannounced, with pre and post conferences (40 points, equal weighting)
 - One formal classroom observation by trained in-school peer teachers and one informal classroom observation by trained in-school peer teachers (20 points, equal weighting for formal and informal)
 - All observations conducted in-person
- Tenured Teachers: All of the points assigned to observations using the practice rubric:
 - Four informal observations by trained in-school peer teachers (60 points, weighted equally)
 - All observations conducted in-person

2. Principals:

- Probationary Principals: 50 points based on the broad assessment of leadership and management actions and 10 points based on goals:
 - Two school visits by principal's supervisor (Dr. Baery), one of which is unannounced, with pre and post visit discussions (40 points, equal weighting)
 - One school visit by trained independent evaluator, announced (20 points)
- Tenured Principals: 50 points based on the broad assessment of leadership and management actions and 10 points based on goals:
 - Two school visits by principal's supervisor (Dr. Baery) with pre and post visit discussions (40 points, equal weighting)
 - One school visit by trained independent evaluator, announced (20 points)

HEDI Criteria within Other Measures

FINDINGS:

The Committee wants to ensure that the HEDI criteria (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, Ineffective) are as fair and understandable to teachers within the district as possible. The Committee has therefore decided to weight all of the standards and the elements within those standards equally. NYPSD already was using a NYPSD-developed principal rubric that had some of the same standards as the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix. Therefore, the Committee found that there are some standards they believe should have a stronger focus than others for principals.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Teachers:

The Committee recommends that the standards – and the elements within those standards – of the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric be weighted equally on the teacher score for both tenured and non-tenured teachers for a total score of up to 60 points. This committee further recommends that in order to be rated as "effective" overall, teachers must rate "effective" on most individual elements and standards.

1. In order to calculate each teacher’s score for each standard, each performance indicator must be scored (1-4) and then totaled and divided by the # of indicators.
2. Each teacher’s total score is based on ratings for all seven standards. The total score is divided by the number of standards (7) in order to determine each teacher’s final score.
3. Since the standards and elements within those standards weigh equally, the teacher's 60 point score would be based on the rubric's standards average.
4. The rubric score is then converted into a score on a scale of 0-60 according to the 60 point scoring bands below:

Overall Rubric Score	Rating Category	0-60 point distribution by rating category
1-1.8	Ineffective	0-49
1.9-2.8	Developing	50-56
2.9-3.6	Effective	57-58
3.7-4.0	Highly Effective	59-60

2. Principals:

A. The Committee recommends that the dimensions of the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix have different weights (see table below) with a total weighting of 100% for both tenured and non-tenured principals. This committee further recommends that in order to be rated as "effective" overall, principals must rate "effective" on most individual elements and standards.

1. In order to calculate each principal’s score for each of the 10 dimensions, each performance description must be scored (1-4) and then totaled and divided by the # of performance descriptions within the dimension.

2. The total score for each dimension must then be weighted according to the percent weighting shown below in the table (e.g., a score of 4 on the dimension “Faculty Development” would be weighted as a .48 while a score of 4 on the dimension “Decision Making” would be weighted as a .28).
3. Each principal’s total score is based on the sum of the weighted ratings for all ten dimensions of the Reeves Matrix.
4. The rubric score is then converted into a score on a scale of 0-60 according to the 60 point scoring bands below, which is the same as that used for teachers:

REEVES Category	Percent Weighting
Resilience	8%
Personal Behavior and Professional Ethics	8%
Student Achievement	16%
Decision Making	8%
Communication	8%
Faculty Development	12%
Leadership Development	12%
Time/Task/Project Management	12%
Technology	8%
Personal Professional Learning	8%
TOTAL: 100%	

Overall Rubric Score	Rating Category	0-60 point distribution by rating category
1-1.8	Ineffective	0-49
1.9-2.8	Developing	50-56
2.9-3.6	Effective	57-58
3.7-4.0	Highly Effective	59-60

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PERFORMANCE
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: LOCALLY-SELECTED
MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OR
GROWTH**

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

FINDINGS:

The Committee wants to ensure that the collaborative nature of the school culture within the schools of NYPSSD is preserved. The committee wants to prioritize using district-developed assessments that have been created with assessment experts and rigorously field tested over the past two years. Dr. Baery has prioritized expository writing and STEM and the high school teachers have expressed they want to see better incoming writing skills in order to ensure NYPSSD achieves the 2014-15 goal of raising its APM to 50%.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. TEACHERS:

- K-3 Common Branch: SLOs using a district-developed writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline writing sample.
- 4th ELA and Math (common branch): 75% of students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 4th grade State Science assessment
- 5-8 ELA: a 5% increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the current year Math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the prior year Math State assessment.
- 5-8 Math: a 5% increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the current year Math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the prior year Math State assessment.
- 6-7 Science: SLOs using a district-developed analytical writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline analytical writing sample.
- 8th Science: 75% of students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 8th grade State Science assessment
- 6-8 Social Studies: SLOs using a district-developed analytical writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline analytical writing sample
- 9-12: SLOs using a district-developed analytical writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline analytical writing sample
- School librarians: school-wide growth based on State-provided school-wide scores for all students in the school taking the State ELA assessment in grades 4-8
- Physical Education: school-wide growth based on State-provided school-wide scores for all students in the school taking the State Math assessment in grades 4-8
- Art: school-wide growth based on State-provided school-wide scores for all students in the school taking the State ELA assessment in grades 4-8
- Special Education: all special education teachers are in co-teaching settings and the committee recommends they have the same locally-selected measures as their co-teacher

- ESL (K-3; high school): K-3: SLOs using a district-developed writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline writing sample; high school: SLOs using a district-developed analytical writing performance task and rubric. SLOs are based on the percentage of students who demonstrate growth of at least one level higher on their baseline analytical writing sample

2. PRINCIPALS:

- K-5 Principals:
 - Percentage of students who were a Level 1 or 2 last year on the State assessments who achieve proficiency this year (ELA and Math State assessments)
 - Percentage of 4th grade science students who achieve proficient or higher scores on State science assessments will be 75% or higher
- 6-8 Principals:
 - Growth of ELL students on 6-8 ELA and Math State assessments. No students decrease if 3s or 4s, at least 40% increase one level if 3s or below, at least 75% increase if 1s
 - Percentage of 8th grade science students who achieve proficient or higher on State Science assessments will be 75% or higher
- High School Principals:
 - SLO using the ELA and Math Regents. The percentage of students who score a 75 on their ELA Regents and 80 their Math Regents will increase by at least 7%

HEDI Criteria within Locally-Selected Measures

FINDINGS:

The committee explored many options for how to establish HEDI criteria within locally-selected measures. The Committee all felt the HEDI criteria should be as closely aligned with the State assessments as possible to make it easier for people to understand. The committee suggests that SLOs for locally-selected measures follow similar protocols to those used for Growth in that NYPSD should audit a random sampling of SLOs developed by teachers for their locally-selected measures in November to ensure rigor and comparability. Also, the committee suggests that SLOs used for locally-selected measures should also be entered into the NYPSD computer system to ensure data integrity and for monitoring purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

TEACHERS:

1. *District-Developed Assessments:* use one generic HEDI criteria for use with all district-developed assessments across the applicable grades/subjects within the district (K-3 (common branch); 6-7 Science; 6-8 Social Studies; 9-12):

What Student Progress Meets Expectations				
Performance Level	END: 1	END: 2	END: 3	END: 4
START: 1	NO	YES	YES	YES
START: 2	NO	NO	YES	YES
START: 3	NO	NO	NO	YES
START: 4	NO	NO	NO	YES



Target is what % of students make their specific level of acceptable growth or better.

Rating Points	Ineffective 0-2 points	Developing 3-8 points	Effective 9-17 points	Highly Effective 18-20 points
Percentage of students whose progress meets expectations	0-29%	30-54%	55-79%	80%+

2. *Increase in the Percentage of Students Scoring Proficient or Higher on State Assessments:* the committee recommends that the following ranges be adopted for use with State assessments for all applicable grades/subjects within the district (5-8 ELA/Math):

Level	Results	Points
Ineffective	≤ 3.9	0-2
Developing	4.0% - 4.9%	3-11
Effective	5.0% - 5.9%	12-17
Highly Effective	≥6.0%	18-20

3. *Percentage of Students Earning the Proficient Level (Three) or Higher on State Science Assessments:* the committee recommends that the following ranges be adopted for use with State assessments for 4th and 8th grade Science:

Level	% of Students Earning Proficient Level (Three) or Better	Points
Ineffective	≤ 62%	0-2
Developing	63% - 74%	3-11
Effective	75% - 94%	12-17
Highly Effective	95%	18-20

4. *Generic HEDI Criteria for Consideration:* the committee recommends that the following generic HEDI criteria be considered by Dr. Baery for adoption with the comparable growth measure for all grade and subjects across the district. This generic HEDI criteria could also be considered for locally-selected measures. The following represents the committee’s agreed upon generic HEDI criteria for use with all SLOs across grades/subjects within the district:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
<p>The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year.</p> <p>Greater than 50% of students exceeded the Student Learning Objective, at least 40% met the Student Learning Objective, and no more than 10% did not meet the Student Learning Objective.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic growth.</p> <p>Greater than 80% of students met or exceeded the Student Learning Objective and no more than 20% did not meet the Student Learning Objective.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher.</p> <p>Greater than 50% of students met or exceeded the Student Learning Objective.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student academic growth.</p> <p>Fewer than 50% of students met or exceed the Student Learning Objective.</p>

CASE CONCLUSION

CASE CONCLUSION:

In April 2012, the recommendations of the committee were agreed to by Dr. Baery, the school board, and the district's collective bargaining units. The district is now ready to submit the recommendations to the Commissioner in their APPR form.