Evaluation Report to the Colorado Legislature

School Turnaround Leaders Development Program

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The School Turnaround Leadership Development grant program (STLD) was enacted by the Colorado State Legislature in 2014 to nurture and support leaders in turning around academic performance in the state's low-performing schools. The purpose of the STLD program is to serve school leaders who will demonstrate dramatic and lasting improvements of student achievement and growth in Priority Improvement or Turnaround schools. Funds are annually appropriated to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) for the purpose of making grants available to (a) providers in designing these programs and (b) school districts or charter schools that participate in turnaround leadership development programs offered by identified/approved providers. The authorizing legislation (sections 22-13-101 through 106, C.R.S.) requires annual reporting on the status of the grant to the House and the Senate Education Committees by July 1 of each year.

In 2014-2015, **$2,000,000** was appropriated to the grant program, of which **$1,899,407** was distributed to grantees. Per the statute, $100,000 was used to support CDE staff to manage the grant program. Awards distributed to grantees resulted in the following:

- Three leadership provider grantees were provided with one-time design grants to serve four districts.
- 87 participant grantees from seven school districts were provided funding to attend four approved provider leadership programs.

Provider Grantees

In January 2015, CDE disseminated its first Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund the design/development costs of creating/expanding high-quality turnaround leadership development programs and solicit qualified providers of said programs. Thirteen provider applicants responded to CDE's first RFP in January 2015; five providers were approved and three organizations received one-time design grants. In March 2015, an additional RFP was issued in order to release remaining funds and another organization was funded for design costs and approved as a qualified provider.

Participant/District and Charter School Grantees

In March 2015, eleven school districts and charter schools responded to CDE's participant RFP. Nine school districts and charter schools were approved to receive state funds for participating in identified providers' turnaround leadership development programs throughout the 2015-2016 school year. 87 eligible teachers, principals and district staff from districts and schools that have priority improvement or turnaround plans are attending said programs.

Background: Turning Around Low-Performing Schools

The Education and Accountability Act of 2009 (S.B. 09-163) holds the state, districts, and individual public schools accountable for performance to better support evaluation, planning, decision-making and implementation in improving schools. State-identified measures and metrics are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a school's or a district's performance. This leads to the type of plan a school or district will implement. Schools and districts who receive ratings in the lowest categories of performance - Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround status - are required to adopt and implement plans that reflect an appropriate magnitude of change. Effective leadership is critical for school improvement planning and implementation in these more challenging schools.

In the 2013 report, *Turnarounds in Colorado: Partnering for Innovative Reform in a Local Control State[1],* several characteristics are named to create a viable school turnaround system, many of which are directly linked to effective school leadership:

- Effective school turnarounds require fundamental change in the school.
- Effective school turnaround leadership is essential to realizing fundamental change.
- Effective school turnaround leaders take actions that result in dramatic improvement.
- Turnaround leaders cannot implement fundamental change unless they are operating in an environment that supports autonomy and flexibility.
- Turnarounds are hard, and a degree of failure is expected.
- Turnarounds require strategic and determined political leadership from the top.

This same report has recommended next steps for the state including, "developing a supply of high-quality third-party lead partners…for school and district turnaround efforts." The new state legislation is intended to create a steady supply of turnaround leadership development programs for Colorado's rural, urban and suburban schools. Another next step calls for "establishing talent development pipelines to identify, train, and recruit principals and teacher leaders." The STLD grant program is intended to accomplish this goal. By providing routes that train teachers and principals who demonstrate talents and interests that align with known turnaround leader competencies, teachers and principals will be better prepared to lead in turnaround schools.

Turnaround Statistics

- In Colorado, over 82,000 students – about 10% of all students in the state – attend schools that are persistently low-performing.[1](where is this footnote and have we validated the data?)
- Even leaders who have excelled in other situations will often fail in a turnaround setting; according to one study, only 30 percent of turnaround efforts in any sector are successful. [2](where is this footnote?)

---

[1] Robin Baker, Kelly Hupfeld, Paul Teske, Paul Hill - http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/turnaround/download/schoolturnaroundreport.pdf

The Challenge of School Turnaround

In 2007, Mass Insight Education and Research Institute published its groundbreaking report, *The Turnaround Challenge*[2] to make a compelling case for dramatically improving learning for all students by focusing on our lowest-performing schools. Their research suggests that failing schools serve mostly poor students. Since there is a strong correlation between a school's family income characteristics and the learning community's achievement outcomes, it is

"These schools fail because the challenges they face are substantial; because they themselves are dysfunctional; and because the system of which they are a part is not responsive to the needs of the high-poverty student populations they tend to serve."

understandable that these challenges are significant. There are other risk factors that go beyond economic disadvantage – higher absenteeism, behavioral challenges, lower parent involvement, higher student migration and teacher turnover rates, and a prevailing culture of low expectations. These obstacles are far-reaching and render typical, "current" interventions as ineffective.

Leadership for low-performing schools is fundamentally different than leadership for higher-performing schools. Extensive research shows that, to achieve real turnaround and academic improvement, low-performing schools need to experience significant and fundamental change in instructional practices as well as in the school's climate and culture. Turnaround leadership requires dramatic and transformative intervention in a culture of underperformance within a short amount of time. The research further articulates the skills and competencies that school leaders must have to produce this type of change in a school and that these skills and competencies are dramatically different from those practiced by most school leaders.

The STLD Program: Providers

Criteria for Identifying Approved Providers for Participation and Design Grant

The State Board of Education's rules for administering the STLD program name criteria for identifying providers and granting funds for design work (Appendix A, section 2.01(1)). These rules provided guidance for the January and March 2015 RFPs, in which potential providers were asked to describe the following:

a) Their experience in developing successful leadership in low-performing schools,
b) The leadership qualities that the program intends to develop (listed below),
c) The provider's capacity to implement program components, and
d) Availability of programs to leaders across the state.

The RFP Evaluation Rubric named these criteria in several sections, as follows:

- *Section A – Organizational Qualifications*: Adequate responses describe the organization's credibility and capacity to provide described services; information about the training staff, faculty, mentors and how they are qualified; and lastly, thorough data and criteria for measuring program success.
- *Section B – STLD Program Description*: Adequate responses describe the overall ability to execute a high-quality leadership training for leaders in order to see dramatic and lasting student achievement and growth; thorough descriptions of how the program meets rigorous components including:

---

[2] http://www.massinsight.org/publications/turnaround/51/file/1/pubs/2010/04/15/TheTurnaroundChallenge_MainReport.pdf

- o program purpose
- o leadership competencies
- o recruitment and selection criteria
- o course work and curriculum
- o residency and clinical experience
- o partnership with districts
- o team emphasis
- o program evaluation
- o retention of school leaders
- o turnaround policy-making
- o organizational capacity; and
- o a detailed justification of how the program prepares leaders to be successful in a turnaround school.
- *Section C – Budget Narrative and Electronic Budget (optional for those seeking funding)* – Adequate responses describe the financial cost structures of operating and executing the described services, and a strong rationale for why additional design grant funds are needed.

Please see Appendix B: STLD Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric to see this tool in its entirety.

Identified Providers - 2015-2016

Five providers have been identified and three providers have been funded for one-time design grants. They are as follows:

Identified Provider	Amount Funded, if Applicable
Catapult School Leadership, CO	$83,000
Colorado Seminary – University of Denver, CO	$110,108
Generation School Network, Inc., NY	$65,000
Relay Graduate School, NY	did not apply for funding
University of Virginia, Darden School Foundation, VA	did not apply for funding

For more information on these providers please see Appendix C: 2014-2015 Provider Summaries.

Reporting Requirements for Identified Providers

The State Board of Education's rules in section 2.01(4) provide guidance on identified providers' reporting requirements. These requirements were shared in the January and March 2015 RFPs.

Each approved provider is required to report, at a minimum, the following information to the Department on or before July 15, of the following year:

Metrics after Year 1:

- Number of applicants and acceptance rate
- Number of participants that started in the program, and the number that graduated, and demographics of both groups
- Number of schools/districts/CMOs served
- Number of participants hired in (1) principal role, (2) assistant principal role, (3) other school-based role, and (4) other demographics of placement schools
- Pre/post assessment information based on providers' specific competencies and their reference to the Colorado Principal Quality Standards
- Satisfaction results from placement district, CMO, and/or school staff
- Allocation of funds (for grantees only)

Metrics provided annually thereafter to maintain provider status:
- Same data as Year 1
- Retention rate of leaders
- Success rate of leaders based on school performance

In addition, providers will be required to complete an annual self-assessment that includes:
- Successes
- Challenges
- Key lessons learned and improvements planned for subsequent year
- How you know participants in your program are prepared for success in turnaround leadership

The STLD Program: Participants

Application Procedures for STLD Grants

In section 2.02(2) of the State Board of Education's rules, guidance was provided to inform the Participant RFP (Appendix A, section 2.02(2))District and charter school applications were due to CDE by March 19, 2015. In addition to adhering to a standard grant application process, the rules articulated the following criteria for identifying district and charter school recipients:

- Goals that the applying districts and schools expect to achieve through the grant;
- The number of individuals to participate in leadership programs including existing leaders, aspiring leaders, district managers or support staff;
- A clear plan for leadership development, implementation, and application of skills in the schools and district; and
- A plan to evaluate the program.

The Participant RFP Evaluation rubric named these same criteria across different sections of the application.

- *Section A - Needs Assessment –* Adequate responses include the names of Priority Improvement/Turnaround Plan schools that will be served by participating leaders; the number and names of people participating in the program (aspiring, existing and district leaders); and the skills/expertise of participants and gaps that exist and need to be met to be successful in a turnaround environment.

- ***Section B – Turnaround Leadership Provider –*** Adequate responses include identification of provider and rationale for decision; a description of how the chosen program addresses the needs identified in Section A; and a description of how the district will flexibly ensure that selected candidates are able to implement strategies from chosen program.
- ***Section C – Proposed Project Description –*** Adequate responses include clear and measurable goals for participation that are consistent with providers' desired outcomes, and a clearly detailed timeline for implementation of the grant program (activities, interim benchmarks, date of accomplishment, people responsible).

Please see Appendix D: STLD Participant Grant Evaluation Rubric to view this tool in its entirety.

Identified Participants - 2015-2016

To be eligible for funding, applicants needed to score 61 out of a possible 101 points. With the goal of providing training opportunities for as many leaders as possible, some applications that scored below 61 points were asked to submit revisions that would bring the application up to a fundable level. Eleven school districts and charter schools applied, nine of which were funded for participating in identified providers' programs. The district and school grantees are participating in STLD programs, as follows:

District/School	Number/Type of Participants	Provider(s)	Amount Funded
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	5 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School	$110,150
Aurora Public Schools	6 school leaders, 2 district leaders 3 school leaders, 1 district leader 7 school leaders, 3 district leaders 3 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School University of Virginia Catapult University of Denver	$512,307
Colorado High School Charter in Denver Public Schools	1 aspiring leader, 1 school leader	University of Denver	$44,330
Denver Public Schools	10 school leaders, 4 district leaders 8 aspiring leaders, 8 district leaders	Relay Graduate School University of Denver	$615,150
Lake County School District	1 aspiring leader, 1 district leader 1 school leader, 1 district leader	University of Denver Relay Graduate School	$82,772
Montezuma-Cortez District	3 school leaders, 3 district leaders	University of Virginia	$39,540
Pueblo City School District	6 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School	$163,750

West End Public Schools RE2	2 aspiring leaders, 1 district leader	University of Denver	$73,300

Reporting Requirements for STLD Participants

The State Board of Education's rules, in section 2.02(5), provide guidance on participants' reporting requirements. These requirements were shared in the January and March 2015 RFPs.

Each approved provider is required to report, at a minimum, the following information to the Department on or before July 1 of the following year:

- Number of people who participated and in which programs;
- Schools served;
- Impact on student achievement;
- Change in principal or aspiring leader's actions/behavior; and
- Other required data points provided by CDE upon notification of award.

  Providers will be required to submit a report to CDE by July 1, 2016. They were not required to do so in July 2015 as they were just beginning to serve participants and would not have sufficient information to meet the reporting requirements.

Conclusion

Since the inception of the STLD program in 2014, the State Board of Education's rules have made clear the parameters for this program, RFPs for providers and participants have been written and shared, local and national providers have been identified and funded, and 87 participants from seven school districts are engaging in providers' leadership development programs that launch beginning in June 2015. In addition, leaders from these provider organizations came together in June 2015 to discuss their programs' specific audiences, outcomes and foci and collaboratively build a shared understanding of how providers can continue to contribute to the STLD program by creating talent development pipelines for Priority Improvement/Turnaround schools in the state of Colorado.

Timeline

Timeline for Providers and Participants

June 5, 2014 – Governor John Hickenlooper signed the STLD measure.

January 13, 2015 – First round of provider RFP applications due.

February 18, 2015 – State Board of Education approved four providers recommended through the RFP process.

March 13, 2015 – Second round of provider RFP applications due.

March 19, 2015 – Participant RFP applications due.

April 8, 2015 – State Board of Education approved funding for another provider and for leaders from 7 districts and 1 charter school.

May 13, 2015 – State Board of Education approved participant grantees and award letters were mailed.

May 20, 2015 – Financial agreements mailed to participant grantees.

June 22, 2015 – STLD providers convened to create program matrix of support and receive reporting requirements.

September 30, 2015 – STLD provider applications due for 2015-2016 school year.

February1, 2016 – STLD participant applications due for 2016-2017 school year.

July 1, 2016 – STLD reports from both providers and participants due to CDE for evaluation of STLD program.

July 1, 2016 – STLD evaluation report submitted to the State Board, the Governor, and the Education Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Budget

2015 School Turnaround Leaders Development Program Grant Providers and Participants	
Grantee	**Amount Funded**
District Participants	
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	$110,150
Aurora Public Schools	$512,307
Colorado High School Charter in Denver Public Schools	$44,330
Denver Public Schools	$615,150
Lake County School District	$82,772
Montezuma - Cortez District	$39,540
Pueblo City School District	$163,750
West End Public Schools RE2	$73,300
Total awarded to Participants	**$1,641,299**
Provider	
Catapult School Leadership	$83,000
Colorado Seminary – University of Denver	$110,108
Generation Schools, Batelle for Kids, University of Northern CO	$65,000
TOTAL AWARDED PARTICIPANTS AND PROVIDERS	**$1,899,407**

Appendix A: SBE Rules for Administering C.R.S. 22-13-101

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Colorado State Board of Education

RULES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL TURNAROUND LEADERS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1 CCR 301-95

[Editor's Notes follow the text of the rules at the end of this CCR Document.]

Authority: Article IX, Section 1, Colorado Constitution. 22-2-106(1)(a) and (c); 22-2-107(1)(c); 22-7-409(1.5); 22-13-103 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.).

1.00   Statement of Basis and Purpose.

The statutory basis for these emergency rules adopted on September 11, 2014 is found in 22-2-106(1)(a) and (c), State Board Duties; 22-2-107(1)(c), State Board Powers; and 22-13-103, C.R.S., School Turnaround Leaders Development Program – Rules.

The School Turnaround Leaders Development Program, 22-13-103, C.R.S., requires the State Board of Education to promulgate rules to implement and administer the program. At a minimum, the rules must include: Criteria for identifying approved providers from among those that respond to the request for proposals pursuant to section 22-13-104, C.R.S.; Timelines for the design grant application and approval process; Criteria for awarding design grants to identified providers to partially offset the design and development costs of creating or expanding high-quality turnaround leadership development programs; Timelines for the school turnaround leader grant application and approval process; The requirements for a school turnaround leader grant application, including but not limited to the goals that the applicant expects to achieve through the grant; and Criteria for selecting school turnaround leader grant recipients.

2.00   Definitions.

2.00(1)   Charter School: A charter school authorized by a school district pursuant to part 1 of article 30.5 of title 22 or an institute charter school authorized by the state charter school institute pursuant to part 5 of article 30.5 of title 22 of the Colorado Revised Statutes.

2.00(2)   Department: The Department of Education created and existing pursuant to section 24-1-115, C.R.S.

2.00(3)   Institute: The State Charter School Institute established in section 22-30.5-503, C.R.S.

2.00(4)   Program: The School Turnaround Leaders Development program created in section 22-13-103.

2.00(5)   Provider: A public or private entity that offers a high-quality turnaround leadership development program for Colorado educators.

2.00(6)   School District: A school district organized pursuant to article 30 of title 22, C.R.S.

2.00(7)   School Turnaround Leader: A principal or teacher leader in a school that is required to adopt a priority improvement plan or turnaround plan pursuant to section 22-11-210, C.R.S. or a district-level administrator or employee of the State Charter School Institute that coordinates and supports turnaround efforts in schools of the School District or Institute Charter schools that implement priority improvement plans or turnaround plans.

2.00(8)   Turnaround plan: The lowest plan type assigned to a school in Colorado based on the percentage of points earned on the School Performance Framework. A Turnaround plan puts a school on the "five-year accountability clock" per the Education Accountability Act of 2009.

2.00(9)   Priority Improvement plan: The second-lowest plan type assigned to a school in Colorado based on the percentage of points earned on the School Performance Framework. A Priority Improvement plan puts a school on the "five-year accountability clock" per the Education Accountability Act of 2009.

2.00(10)   State Board: The State Board of Education created pursuant to Section 1 of Article IX of the Colorado Constitution.

2.01   Turnaround Leadership Development Programs Request for Proposals

The Department will issue a request for proposals (RFP) from providers who seek to participate in the program. Based on the criteria outlined below, the Department will identify one or more providers to provide turnaround leadership development programs for school districts, the Institute, and charter schools that receive School Turnaround Leader Grants. Providers that respond to the RFP may request a one-time design grant to offset the costs incurred in creating or expanding the provider's Turnaround Leadership Development Programs.

2.01(1) **Criteria for Identifying Approved Providers for Design Grant.**

The Department will develop an RFP, according to the Department's competitive grants and awards RFP process, which consists of: use of a standard grant application and scoring rubric template; and a fair and equitable application review. The following criteria will be considered for identifying providers from among those that respond to the RFP:

2.01(1)(a)   Each Provider's experience in developing successful, effective leadership in low-performing schools and School Districts;

2.01(1)(b)   The leadership qualities that each Provider's turnaround leadership development program is expected to develop;

2.01(1)(c)   A Provider's capacity to implement identified program components that make up a comprehensive leadership development experience; and

2.01(1)(d)   The availability of turnaround leadership development programs for School Turnaround Leaders in public schools throughout the state. The grant program shall seek to ensure approved providers are available for leaders in all regions of the state.

2.01(2) **Timeline for RFP.** During the 2014-15 school year, the Department will provide funding to identified providers to offset the costs incurred in creating or expanding the provider's

Turnaround Leadership Development Programs. Applications will be due to the Department on or before January 1, 2015. Application decision notification will occur on or before February 1, 2015. For the 2015-16 school year and each year thereafter, subject to available appropriations, Turnaround Leadership Development Program Design Grant applications will be due by September 1.

2.01(3) **Duration of Design Grant Awards.** During the first three years that the program receives appropriations, an identified provider may apply as provided by rule for a one- time design grant to offset the costs incurred in creating or expanding the Provider's turnaround leadership development programs.

2.01(4) **Reporting Requirements for All Identified Providers.** Each identified provider shall track the effectiveness of persons who complete a turnaround leadership development program and report the effectiveness to the department on or before July 1 of the year following the training. The report must use department rubrics to measure the effectiveness of persons who complete the turnaround leadership development program. Each grant recipient must report on the following:

2.01(4)(a)   Number of participants in program;

2.01(4)(b)   Schools served; and

2.01(4)(c)   Change in principal or aspiring leaders actions/behavior (as data is available).

2.02   **School Turnaround Leader Grants.** Subject to available appropriations, the State Board shall award School Turnaround Leader Grants to one or more School Districts or Charter Schools or the Institute to use in: identifying and recruiting practicing and aspiring School Turnaround Leaders; subsidizing the costs incurred for School Turnaround Leaders and their staff, if appropriate, to participate in turnaround leadership development programs offered by identified providers (both funded and non-funded); and reimbursing the School Turnaround Leaders for costs they incur in completing turnaround leadership development programs offered by identified providers (both funded and non-funded).

2.02(1) **Timeline for School Turnaround Leader Grants.** During the 2014-2015 school year, the Department will conduct an initial School Turnaround Leader Grant competition. Applications will be due to the Department on or before February 1, 2015. Application decision notification will occur on or before, April 1, 2015. For the 2015-16 school year and each year thereafter, subject to available appropriations, School Turnaround Leader Grant applications will be due by September 1.

2.02(2) **Application Procedures for School Turnaround Leader Grants.** The Department will develop an RFP, according to the Department's competitive grants and awards RFP process, which consists of: use of a standard grant application and scoring rubric template; and a fair and equitable application review. The following criteria will be considered for identifying School Turnaround Leader grants:

2.02(2)(a)   The goals that the applicant expects to achieve through the grant;

2.02(2)(b)   The number of individuals to participate in leadership programs, including: existing leaders, aspiring leaders, district managers or support staff;

2.02(2)(c)   A clear plan for leadership development, implementation, and application of skills in the schools and district; and

2.02(2)(d)   A plan to evaluate impact of program.

2.02(3)   **Criteria for Selecting Recipients of School Turnaround Leader Grants.** The following criteria will be considered in selecting School Turnaround Leader Grant recipients:

2.02(3)(a)   For applying school districts, the concentration of schools of the school district or, for the Institute, the concentration of Institute Charter Schools, that must implement priority improvement or turnaround plans. For applying Charter Schools that are implementing priority improvement or turnaround plans will be prioritized.

2.02(4)   **Duration of School Turnaround Leader Grant Awards.** Each school turnaround leader grant may continue for up to three budget years. The Department shall annually review each grant recipient's use of the grant moneys and may rescind the grant if the Department finds that the grant recipient is not making adequate progress toward achieving the goals identified in the grant application.

2.02(5)   **Reporting Requirements for School Turnaround Leader Grant.** Each grant recipient will annually track the effectiveness of persons who complete a turnaround leadership development program and report the effectiveness to the department on or before July 1 of the year following the training. The report must use department rubrics to measure the effectiveness of persons who complete the turnaround leadership development program. Each grant recipient must report on the following:

2.02(5)(a)   Number of people who participated and in which programs;

2.02(5)(b)   Schools served;

2.02(5)(c)   Impact on student achievement; and

2.02(5)(d)   Change in principal or aspiring leaders actions/behavior.

2.02(6)   **Evaluation of School Turnaround Leader Grant Program.** The Department will analyze and summarize the reports received from grant recipients and annually submit to the State Board, the Governor, and the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, or any successor committees, a report of the effectiveness of the School Turnaround Leader Grants awarded pursuant to this section. The Department will also post the annual report on its web site.

Appendix B: STLD Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Section A: Organizational Qualifications	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
An adequate response for this section will describe: • Thorough information about your organization's credibility and capacity to provide the described services. • Thorough information about your training staff, faculty, mentors and how they are qualified and prepared to deliver the described services. • Thorough, detailed, and compelling data and criteria for measuring program success.				
1) Provide a thorough yet concise summary of your organization's experience in developing successful, effective leadership in low-performing schools and school districts.	0	1	3	5
2) Describe the overall qualifications of your organization to develop high quality leaders for low performing schools.	0	1	3	5
3) Describe the number, roles, and qualifications of Instructors/Staff that Provide Turnaround Leadership Services. Have any of your staff led or been part of a leadership team of a high-performing or successful turnaround school serving low-income and at-risk students? How do you recruit your staff and ensure that they are effective?	0	1	3	5
4) Provide a detailed table describing the services your organization provides.	0	1	3	5
5) Provide data and evidence describing the results of your program. What impact has your training had on student achievement? How do you measure the growth and success of your graduates? How many graduates have you produced, what are they doing now, and how many of them meet your success criteria?	0	4	7	10
Reviewer Comments:				
			TOTAL POINTS	**/30**

Section B: Turnaround Leadership Development Program Description	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
An adequate response for this section will describe: • Overall ability to execute a high-quality turnaround leadership training for teacher leaders, school leaders, and district leaders in order to see outcomes of dramatic and lasting student achievement and growth. • Thorough, detailed, and compelling descriptions and justifications of how your program meets the rigorous components described below. • A detailed justification of how your program prepares leaders to be successful in the unique challenges of a turnaround school.				
1) **Program purpose/overview:** Explain how your program is uniquely designed to prepare leaders to meet the demanding work of dramatically improving student achievement in persistently low performing schools in Colorado. Describe how your program prepares leaders to work in diverse and challenged communities including meeting the student and family needs of: special education, low-income, English-language learners, exceptional students, and others.	0	4	7	10
2) **Leadership competency framework:** Describe your Competency Framework, specifying which competencies are considered as part of the selection and which are new or learned as part of the program? Cite research and ensure alignment with the Colorado State Principal Quality Standards. Ensure competencies encompass instructional and operational domains, as well as qualities of visionary and engaging leadership.	0	4	7	10
3) **Recruitment and selection:** Describe your process for recruiting and selecting top talent to participate in your program. Describe the eligibility criteria and selection practices you use, showing how these are directly linked to the Competency Framework described above. Explain how you identify a candidate pool and whether you have different practices for attracting/selecting aspiring versus existing leaders.	0	4	7	10

4) Coursework/curriculum: Describe your curriculum content and delivery methods. What is the pedagogical approach? How does the delivery method support an experience which is: engaging, interactive, intellectually rigorous, applicable and relevant, project-based, and hands-on? Explain how your curriculum is differentiated to meet the unique needs of different communities (rural, mountain, metro, small, and large…). Explain how learning is individualized and organized for participants to make progress toward clear goals and outcomes based on identified competencies and skills. Explain how feedback cycles, peer accountability, and other methods support self-reflection and create a culture of continuous improvement. Describe the length of the program and different phases of training.	0	8	12	15
5) Residency/clinical experience: Describe the residency or practical experience of your program, including how participants are matched with a proven, effective principal mentor in a high needs school and the type of coaching participants receive during the experience. How do you measure if a residency experience is successful? Where do you place participants? How do you ensure these experiences are successful?	0	8	12	15
6) Partnering with districts to facilitate placements and provide ongoing support: Describe how your program supports finding the right match for your participants at the conclusion of the program, and what your relationship is with districts/Charter Management Organizations to support this. Describe ongoing support you provide for graduates of your program, including coaching and mentoring, cohort networking, and access to tools and resources, and how you intend to work with the district to support these leaders.	0	4	7	10
7) Team emphasis: How does your program emphasize distributed leadership within a school and between a school and the district/CMO? For example, do you have administrative teams (principal, AP, dean) attending all or a portion of the program together? Of teacher teams? Or a combination of school-based and district support? What skills and competencies does your program develop in district/CMO staff to support appropriate autonomies for school leaders?	0	4	7	10

8) **Program evaluation:** How and what data will you use to evaluate your services and support to Colorado school and district leaders, and program effectiveness on turning around Colorado's low-performing schools? Specify methods to collect information, frequency of collection and who will be designated to coordinate data tracking and analysis. See evaluation and reporting requirements on pages 4-5.	0	4	7	10
9) **Sustainability/retention of turnaround leaders:** Is there a minimum requirement to serve in a high needs school after participating in your program? What kinds of supports or policies will you have in place to maximize success and retention, and prevent burnout? How will you support teaming (see above) to help plan for leadership succession?	0	4	7	10
10) **Partner in turnaround policymaking:** How will you work with districts and/or the state to improve conditions for turnaround leaders to thrive and succeed? How will you support districts and states in creating the appropriate policy environment in which turnaround leaders can have the autonomy and decision-making authority needed to drive student achievement?	0	3	5	7
11) **Organizational Capacity:** Describe the capacity your organization currently has to meet the requirements identified in items 1-10. If needing to develop in some areas, what will be required in order to build the appropriate capacity (staff, funding, etc…) to meet the needs of this proposal? What infrastructure will be needed to serve the identified and targeted regions and districts?	0	4	7	10
Reviewer Comments:				
			TOTAL POINTS	**/117**

Section C: Budget Narrative & Electronic Budget	Incomplete	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
All applicants are required to complete Section C. If applicants are not requesting funds or are requesting minimal funds, answers may be more concise. **An adequate response for this section will describe:** • The financial cost structures of operating and executing the described services. • A strong rationale for why additional design grant funds are needed to provide the described services. Priority will be given to applications demonstrating strong needs for funding based on current capacity and organizational structures. Such applications will demonstrate not only clear budget and cost analysis, narrative, but also clear rationale for additional needs above and beyond operating revenues generated by participant tuition.				
1) Describe the cost structure for your program. What is the cost per participant? How much of your costs are covered by tuition versus other funding sources?	0	4	7	10
2) Provide a detailed budget and budget narrative that is tied to your program description (Section B). In your electronic budget and budget narrative be sure to include line items and accompanying justification for costs per participant, additional travel costs (differentiated by geographical areas of service deliver, if appropriate), staff costs, materials costs, and other line item costs.	0	4	7	10
3) Describe specific costs that will be required to build your program's infrastructure in order to deliver the intended services. What will you need to build, grow, and develop in order to provide the services described in this proposal?	0	4	7	10
4) Demonstrate how the funds awarded under the program will be able to supplement the level of funds available for authorized programs and activities, and **will not supplant** any funding currently being used on providing leadership development services or support.	0	1	3	5
Reviewer Comments:				
			TOTAL POINTS	**/35**

Appendix C: 2014-2015 Provider Summaries

Identified Providers	Program Summaries
Catapult School Leadership, CO	Catapult School Leadership has over five years of experience in developing successful, effective leaders that have closed achievement gaps, transformed failing schools, and created new schools in neighborhoods where there were not enough quality schools to meet the needs of the community. Catapult's Fellowship trains experienced educators to serve in low-income communities by providing fellows with an innovative approach to school leadership which combines the best practices of education with business training, team development, and critical communication skills from the arts. They have developed 40 school leaders and have 16 individuals in the current fellowship. 98% of Catapult's graduates serve in a leadership role in CO. 29 are serving in school leadership positions and 11 are leading in district or state organizations. Catapult has supported the creation of 10 new school models, assisted in 5 schools gaining innovation status, and supported 4 replications of successful charter schools.
Colorado Seminary – University of Denver, CO	The Morgridge College of Education's Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Program is uniquely designed to prepare turnaround leaders who are capable of dramatically improving student achievement in persistently low performing schools in CO. This program is an 8 quarter, 2 year program that begins with the foundation of either the Ritchie Program for School Leaders or the Executive Leadership for Successful School certificate program and culminates with an additional year of coursework, clinical experiences, and a capstone project to refine knowledge, skills and competencies for the specific context of low performing schools in diverse communities. The program will partner with the Daniels College of Business to deepen the entrepreneurial, results-oriented, re-culturing, business and innovation components of these courses.
Generation School Network, Inc., NY	Generation Schools Network, in partnership with Battelle for Kids and the University of Northern Colorado Center for Urban Education will serve as a provider for turnaround work in CO. Turnaround leaders and teams will receive support through workshops, short-cycle design series, an in-depth design process, professional development, ongoing coaching for school leadership and teams and access to training modules and materials. Using a cohesive approach, leaders and teachers will use tools, strategies, and resources to identify gaps in understanding, modify instruction and engage students in learning. The program will provide support and training around innovation planning, data cycles, blended learning, teacher collaborative practice and health and wellness.
Relay Graduate School, NY	The Relay Graduate School of Education National Principals Academy Fellowship (NPAF) is a selective national instructional school leadership program designed for passionate and reflective sitting principals and principal managers. The program offers a strong, practice-based curriculum in which principals study

	strategic, cultural and instructional leadership and learn skills and techniques that are immediately applicable to their everyday work. The NPAP program will develop the next generation of high-performing principals for high-need and turnaround schools; prepare principal managers to better support their principals and implement a common framework for identifying and cultivating excellence in instructional leadership; increase teacher effectiveness as a result of higher-capacity principals that provide meaningful and actionable feedback to teachers on critical components of their practice; and ultimately, increase student achievement as a result of increased teacher effectiveness.
University of Virginia, Darden School Foundation, VA	The University of Virginia School Turnaround Program utilizes a systemic approach to change by working with school, district, and state-level leadership teams to help them build the internal capacity necessary to support and sustain effective school turnarounds. The program works to empower change focusing on two critical components critical to successful and sustainable turnarounds: high-impact school leaders and the district conditions necessary to initiate and support transformational change. Since 2004, the program has reached approximately 380 schools in 85 districts and 17 states. Their goal is to empower system-level and school-level leaders to jointly achieve dramatic improvement in a set of persistently underperforming schools. The lessons learned and successes achieved inform strategies for expanding and sustaining success across the school system.

Appendix D: STLD Participant Grant Evaluation Rubric

Section A: Needs Assessment	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
6) List the Priority Improvement Plans or Turnaround Plan (PI/T) schools in the school district or Charter School Institute that will be served by the school turnaround leaders (principals and teacher leaders) supported through this grant program.	0	2	5	7
7) Identify the number and names of individuals to participate in leadership programs, including: aspiring leaders, existing leaders, teacher leaders, district managers or support staff.	0	1	3	5
8) Describe the skills and expertise of proposed participants and the gap that exists between current skills and expertise necessary to be successful in a turnaround environment. Description here does not have to be specific to each individual but rather specific to each type of participant (i.e.: aspiring leaders, existing leaders, teacher leaders, district managers or support staff).	0	2	5	7
Reviewer Comments:				
			TOTAL POINTS	**/19**

Section B: Turnaround Leadership Provider	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
1) For which identified Provider(s) are you requesting funding? Why did you select this/each of these Providers? Which individuals do you propose will participate in each Provider program?	0	2	5	7
2) Describe how the chosen program directly addresses the needs identified in Part A of this application. Include rationale that discusses areas of focus and models of support (internships, follow up support, etc.) that are responsive to the needs of your schools.	0	3	7	10
3) Describe how the district will ensure that selected candidates are able to implement strategies from the chosen program. What flexibility will the district offer school and district leaders in order to help ensure successful turnaround work?	0	3	7	10

Reviewer Comments:

	TOTAL POINTS	**/27**

Section C: Proposed Project Description	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
1) Provide clear, measurable goals/objectives for your participation in the identified Provider program(s) - consistent with desired outcomes of the School Turnaround Leaders Development Program, including training, recruiting, incentivizing, and sustaining successful, high-quality turnaround leaders.	0	5	10	15
2) Provide a clearly detailed timeline for implementation of this grant program. Timeline should identify major implementation activities, interim benchmarks, the date by which they will be accomplished, and the person(s) responsible. **For example:**	0	5	10	15

Strategies /Activities	Outcomes	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible

Reviewer Comments:

	TOTAL POINTS	**/30**

Section D: Program Evaluation	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
1) Describe the evaluation process to track progress on measurable objectives identified in item C1. Specify methods to collect information, frequency of collection and who will be designated to coordinate data tracking and analysis. Include reporting requirements found in Attachment B.	0	3	7	10

Reviewer Comments:

	TOTAL POINTS		**/10**

Section E: Budget Narrative & Electronic Budget	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
5) Describe all expenditures contained in the electronic budget form and connect to project goals and activities from Section B. The costs of the proposed project (as presented in the electronic budget and budget narrative) must be reasonable and the budget sufficient in relation to the objectives, design, scope and sustainability of the proposed project activities outlined in Section B. This may include costs associated with: identifying participants, salaries, services, tuition costs, travel, supplies, etc.	0	3	7	10
6) Demonstrate how the funds awarded under the program will be used to supplement the level of funds available for authorized programs and activities, and will not supplant federal, state, local, or non-federal funds.	0	1	3	5
Reviewer Comments:				
TOTAL POINTS				/15

Endnotes

1. **Baker, R, Hupfeld, K., Teske, P. & Hill., P. (2013).** *Turnarounds in Colorado: Partnering for Innovative Reform in a Local Control State*, **for Get Smart Schools and the School Turnaround Study Group.**

2. **Beer, M. & Nohira, N. (2000).** *Breaking the code of change.* **Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.**