



What is LEAP? LEAP is great teachers and educators!

Educators from across DPS, including teachers, school and district leaders, DCTA, and other stakeholders collaborated on LEAP’s design to establish a clear set of expectations to assess teacher performance, ensuring an excellent teacher in every classroom and ensuring teacher support from highly effective school leaders.

Measures of Effective Teaching (MET)

DPS and the Denver Classroom Teachers Association (DCTA) recognized that the components of a successful growth and performance system must be informed by the ideas and experiences of experienced educators. It also needs to be comprised of multiple measures to provide a comprehensive, fair and reliable picture of a teacher’s performance. Consequently, LEAP was designed with teachers and school leaders and guided by national research. The measures that contribute to LEAP were heavily informed by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study, which was conducted in multiple districts across the United States (including Denver) from 2009–2011 (www.metproject.org). The MET study identified the importance of using multiple measures when evaluating a teacher’s performance.

SB191 Colorado State Requirements

50% teacher performance data related to Professional Practice

- Using observations and at least one of the following measures: (a) student perception measures (e.g. surveys), where appropriate and feasible, (b) peer feedback, (c) feedback from parents or guardians; or (d) review of teacher lesson plans or student work samples.

50% measures of student academic growth

- Using both a collective and individual measure

History of LEAP

DESIGN PROCESS: Spring 2010

- Over 250 school leaders, teachers, parents and students engaged
- 23 Focus Groups launched design phase including focus groups with spring 2011 LEAP pilot participants
- 42 school leaders and teachers
- Competitive application process and collaborative design team process.

UNION COLLABORATION (throughout)

- 2 DCTA liaisons part of the DPS LEAP project team
- Steering Committee representation and leadership
- Through 2016, DCTA Teacher Outreach Manager visited schools to collect feedback and share information throughout the district

INITIAL PILOT: Spring 2011

- 16 schools
- >600 teachers
- Feedback structures through focus groups, online surveys, site visits

2011-12 PILOT

- 126 schools opted-in to the pilot (through teacher vote)
- Over 1000 teachers responded to each of four surveys
- Over 600 pieces of individual feedback via LEAP website

2012-13 PILOT

- 148 schools opted-in to the pilot
- Over 4000 teachers
- Revised Student Perception Surveys
- Small pilot of Professionalism indicators
- Pilot various aspects of Student Outcomes

2013-14 - FIRST FULL YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION - PRESENT (ongoing)

- Continuous feedback cycles put in place: 1) Focus groups/ Feedback Sessions- Student Outcomes working Group, SLO team, and SSP evaluation pilot representation; 2) Faculty Meetings- LEAP team members attend faculty meetings at schools across the district with Supt. Tom Boasberg and Deputy Supt. Susana Cordova; 3) LEAP Mid-Year and End of Year Surveys 4) AP Hotline, Website and Newsletter

Perceptions of LEAP Over Time

While we are committed to continuously improving LEAP, teachers' perceptions of LEAP continue to improve year over year.

Select survey items related to growth & performance	2013-14 EOY	2014-15 EOY	2015-16 EOY	2016-17 MDY**	1314 total # respondents (excludes N/A responses)	1415 # respondents	1516 # respondents	1617 # respondents
Principal feedback from observations is useful and actionable*	72%	75%	75%	85%	1117	1971	1352	1372
Assistant Principal feedback from observations is useful and actionable.	-	-	76%	84%			423	1264
Senior/Team Lead feedback from observations is useful and actionable	72%	84%	85%	88%	388	304	354	940
The LEAP system does a good job of distinguishing effective from ineffective teachers.	45%	52%	57%	64%	970	1976	1623	1903
I believe that teaching practice at my school will improve as a result of the LEAP system.	-	65%	61%	Only asked on EOY survey	-	1997	1748	-
Overall, my experience with LEAP this year has been positive.	62%	69%	69%	80%	973	1994	1747	1889

*Note: in 1516, we began to split out Principal and AP in survey questions. In 1314 and 1415, the question just asked 'school leader feedback'

How do I know observers are really calibrated?

New leaders/ observers are required to attend district training to learn about norming on observation. Additionally, they are required to watch and score a classroom instruction video. This online assessment (scoring the video) requires the participant to have scores that are 83% adjacent to the norm scores. Observers are not granted access to enter observations until successfully passing the online assessment.

Existing leaders/observers: The district provides re-certification training at network meetings at the start of the school year and opportunities to norm as a school leadership team at least one time during the year through Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) calibration sessions.

The required ILT Calibration sessions are facilitated by Peer Observers. School based observers and the Peer Observer co-observe the same teacher, teaching the same lesson and independently align scores and evidence to the Framework for Effective Teaching.

During these sessions, school based observers e.g. principal, AP, senior team lead, etc. Scores matched or were adjacent to the Peer Observers' scores for an average of 96% in Learning Environment and 89% in Instruction.

What do we know about LEAP ratings?

In school year 2015-16, a higher percent of non-probationary teachers received Effective/Distinguished ratings compared to probationary and innovation teachers.

- **Non-probationary:** 94% of non-probationary teachers received Effective/Distinguished ratings
- **Innovation:** 86% of at-will/annual contract teachers received Effective/Distinguished ratings
- **Probationary:** 82% of probationary teachers received Effective/Distinguished ratings
- **Novice (first year teaching):** 61% of teachers with zero year's prior experience were Effective/Distinguished compared to 69% of teachers with 1-3 years' experience and 79% of teachers with 4+ years of experience.

What is the likelihood of a high performing teacher to continue to be high performing in the next year?

- Of those teachers receiving E/D ratings in 2013-14 & 2014-15, **97% received** an E/D rating in 2015-16
- **94% of teachers** receiving E/D ratings in 2014-15 received an E/D rating in 2015-16

Note: Data based on 2013-14 teachers as population (the percent's were calculated by restricting to only include teachers with ratings in subsequent years) for the last bullet, data based on 2014-15 teacher population

Is it possible to be effective/ distinguished in a lower performing school?

- **85% of teachers** at schools Accredited on Probation/Accredited on Priority Watch/Accredited on Watch schools in 2015-16 received an Effective/Distinguished rating
- **92% of teachers** at Meets Expectations/Distinguished schools in 2015-16 received an Effective/Distinguished rating
- Proportion of Novice teachers is greater in our lower performing schools. In 2016-17, **8.8% of the teachers** at our Distinguished/Meets Expectations (Blue/Green) schools were novice teachers, with no prior teaching experience, compared to **15.3%** in our Accredited on Probation (Red) schools
- Since LEAP ratings have been assigned (13-14, 14-15, 15-16) **less than 1% of all teachers** in DPS received a Not Meeting rating