

Considering LEAP Accountability when Approving Student Learning Objectives

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are primarily an instructional framework of best practices – understanding and prioritizing standards, clarity on what students know at the beginning and end of the course, and ongoing responses to fast-formative progress monitoring throughout a course. Since SLOs provide an intimate connection between instruction and student learning, Denver Public Schools also uses SLOs for accountability purposes in LEAP and ProComp.

The School Leader is the instructional leader. As such, it is his/her responsibility to: approve teachers' assignments of students' end of course expectation levels based on appropriate evidence from data sources and the SLO learning progression rubric, and ensure that teachers have made a strong case for their end of course expectation levels and can back up their decisions with evidence.

With respect to LEAP, what do I look for when reviewing an SLO submitted with expectation levels?

Key Idea: All students who are in a given course/section should be included in a teacher's SLO; expectation levels, and the growth they represent, should be an accurate reflection of student learning.

Step 1 Ensure all students who should be in the SLO are included.

All students in the selected class or section are required to be included in an SLO.

Students in the 'Recommended for Inclusion in this SLO' section (screenshot below), are:

- 1) in a section included in the SLO,
- 2) have >80% attribution based on Infinite Campus data¹, and
- 3) are not currently in the objective.

SLO App requires rationale –evaluator should review– if a student from this area is *not* added to the SLO.

If Infinite Campus data is accurate, then students in this section of the application must be included in the SLO. Teachers may elect to add a student from this section at the same time they determine end of course expectation levels. If a teacher has added a student from this section, s/he will appear in the student list with 'late-add' next to their name.

Students Recommended for Inclusion in this SLO ⓘ

Select student(s) (students shown with attribution %) ⓘ

Select Preparedness Level ⓘ

Significantly Underprepared

+ Add

¹ Attribution is discussed in more detail in Step 3.

Considering LEAP Accountability when Approving Student Learning Objectives

Step 2 Review expectation levels and corresponding growth points.

Evaluators can most easily see all preparedness → expectation level combinations, and the growth points associated with each, on the SLO Scoring Matrix (available on the [ARE SLO website](#))². The end of course expectation levels are defined by the learning progression rubric that matches the teacher's SLO. The expectation level choice "N/A due to attendance" is intended for students who were initially in a teacher's SLO but have since left the class/section. Therefore, a teacher does not have a complete body of evidence for that student and is unable to confidently assign the student an end of course expectation level. This option is different than exclusion due to attribution³.

SLO App requires rationale –evaluator should review– if a teacher has to choose the growth point level.

For three combinations, because there can be tremendous variability in actual growth, teachers choose the growth point level. These are highlighted in pink. For example, a student can begin the course Significantly Underprepared, make exceptional growth, and still not reach Partially Met Expectations (i.e., they have not begun mastering grade level standards). Or a student could begin the course Significantly Underprepared and make little to no growth. Additional guidance for making these decisions can be found on the [ARE SLO website](#)⁴. The school leader's role is to approve each decision a teacher has made.

Key Idea: A growth point level of 3 (blue growth), is indicative of tremendous growth. Correspondingly, it would be infrequently used; it would **only** be earned in cases of truly exceptional student growth resulting from particularly exceptional instruction. A growth point level of 2 (green growth) is indicative of effective teaching and expected student growth.

Evaluators should strongly consider, review and discuss with the teacher, students who have growth point levels of 3 (blue growth). Blue growth, at a minimum, means a student has grown '1.5 years' in just one year, and sometimes *two or three years, in just one year*. As examples:

- Significantly Underprepared to Approached Expectations indicates over 2.5 years of growth
- Underprepared to Met Expectations indicates over 2 years of growth
- Somewhat Prepared to Met Expectations indicates 1.5 years of growth

If teachers believe the expectation level is accurate, but recognize the growth indicated is inflated, they may need to adjust the preparedness level to accurately reflect where a student actually started. (The SLO would need to be returned to Long-Term Goal in Progress by the SLO team.) Also, there should be some anticipation that students' expectation levels will be close to in-line with outside assessments, when they become available (CMAS, etc.).

² [ARE SLO website](#) -> SLOs in LEAP and ProComp -> 'SLO Scoring Matrix Handout' for the SLO Scoring Matrix.

³ Additional information about attribution is detailed in Step 3.

⁴ [ARE SLO website](#) -> SLOs in LEAP and ProComp -> 'Overview of SLOs and Student Growth' for guidance on choosing the appropriate growth point level in decision boxes

Considering LEAP Accountability when Approving Student Learning Objectives

Step 3 → Students with greater than 80% attribution must be included in LEAP Student Growth.

Students with >80% attribution are required to be included in LEAP Student Growth. Attribution is similar to attendance but includes student late-start or removal from the course, student absences, and teacher late-start/leave. More information on attribution is provided on the [ARE SLO website](#)⁵.

By default, the SLO Application:

- includes students in LEAP Growth who have higher than 80% attribution,
- includes students if attribution cannot be calculated, and
- excludes students who have less than 80% attribution.

SLO App requires rationale –evaluator should review– if a teacher does not use the recommendation.

School scheduling in Infinite Campus is sometimes inaccurate and does not always reflect the instructional time students are with a specific teacher (this may be especially true in roles such as PE, Visual Arts, intervention, etc.). Thus, student attribution is shown for each student, and teachers have the opportunity to change the inclusion/exclusion the SLO Application recommends. (In the screen shot below, if the recommendation is *not* used, the box is flagged yellow.)

End of Course Command Levels ⓘ					
Students	Baseline Preparedness Level	End of Course Command Level* ⓘ	Growth Points ⓘ	Teacher-Student Attribution (as of 1/26/2016) ⓘ	Include in Student Growth? ⓘ
	Prepared	Strong	2	95%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Somewhat Prepared	Moderate	2	83%	<input type="checkbox"/>

Teachers may override the recommendation and include students with less than 80% attribution, if they believe they have had enough time with the students to have a meaningful impact on their learning, and have a body of evidence for that student to support the assignment of an end of course expectation level. Inclusion of students with low attribution must be applied uniformly (i.e. a teacher should not include one student and exclude another that both have an accurate attribution of 60%).

⁵ [ARE SLO website](#) -> Process Resources: EOC Expectation Levels -> 'Teacher-Student Attribution Guidance'

Considering LEAP Accountability when Approving Student Learning Objectives

Step 4 Request revisions if necessary, or discuss with teacher before/during LEAP EOY conversation.

If, per the steps above, a teacher has:

- not included all students in the SLO and/or the rationale provided is not adequate, or
- included a large percentage of students in blue growth and you have questions or want to discuss a teacher's assessments, rationale, or accuracy of assigned expectation levels, or
- not used the application recommendation for inclusion in LEAP and the rationale included is not adequate,

the evaluator should either request revisions for the SLO, and/or plan to discuss the SLO and corresponding concerns with the teacher before or during their LEAP EOY conversation. An SLO submission must be approved in the SLO Application in order for an SLO score to be sent to the LEAP Application tool. As such, it is important that evaluators plan accordingly in order to ensure they have enough time to complete all entries necessary for SLO and LEAP before the last day of school.

Are there additional resources for teachers or principals around SLO scoring and how SLOs are used in LEAP?

Information is available on the [ARE SLO webpage](#), including:

- Attribution information
- Determining growth levels for decision boxes in SLO Scoring matrix
- Turnkey presentation on EOY information for school leaders to present to staff
- Conversation Protocol for EOY LEAP Conversations

You may also e-mail the SLO team at slohelp@dpsk12.org.