



COLORADO
Department of Education

Evaluation Report to the Colorado Legislature

School Turnaround Leaders Development Program

Submitted to:

Colorado State Board of Education
Colorado House Education Committee
Colorado Senate Education Committee
Governor, Jared Polis

By:

Lindsey Jaeckel
School Quality and Support

June 2019

School and District Performance Unit
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203
720 357 4831
Jaeckel_l@cde.state.co.us



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background: Turning Around Under-Performing Schools	7
The STLD Program 2014-2018: Providers	8
The STLD Program 2014-2018: Participants	10
The STLD Program 2014-2018: Successes, Challenges, and Next Steps	13
Appendix A: Timeline of Grant	15
Appendix B: Awards by Year	16
Appendix C: 2018-2019 School Year Provider Snapshot	19
Appendix D: Summary of Participants	22
Appendix E: STLD Provider Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric	23
Appendix F: STLD Participant Grant Evaluation Rubric	28
Appendix G: SBE Rules for the Administration of the STLD Program	31



Executive Summary

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) supports districts and schools in creating innovative and effective ways to ensure student success. This work has been especially critical for districts and schools with a record of low performance. CDE has tracked national research on school turnaround and has designed supports grounded in this research. Much of this research is synthesized in the “Four Domains for Rapid Improvement” framework from the Center on School Turnaround at WestEd¹. As a result, CDE has begun to align support services to the Four Domains: (1) culture shift; (2) instructional transformation; (3) turnaround leadership; and (4) talent development. Leadership is a critical factor in these domains and in most of the national research. Colorado is fortunate to have the School Turnaround Leaders Development (STLD) grant program to support this domain and critical component of school improvement.

The STLD grant program was enacted by the Colorado General Assembly in 2014 to train 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 schools². The authorizing legislation (sections 22-13-101 through 106, C.R.S.) requires annual reporting on the status of the grant to the State Board of Education, the governor, and the education committees of the senate and the house of representatives.

H.B. 18-1355 modified the state’s accountability law and renamed and expanded the School Turnaround Leaders Development Grant as the School Transformation Grant. This shift expanded the type of supports districts and schools can access. In addition to leadership development grant activities, schools and districts on performance watch also can apply for grant funds to support educator professional development, to implement activities geared towards instructional transformation, or to plan or implement one of the restructuring options that state law requires for schools and district with persistent low performance. This shift in funding began in fall 2018 and, as such, next year’s evaluation report will include information about the expanded grant.

This report covers the life of the STLD Program from 2014 to 2018, broken up into the following fiscal years (July 1 to June 30):

- Year One (2014-2015)
- Year Two (2015-2016)
- Year Three (2016-2017)
- Year Four (2017-2018)
- Year Five (2018-2019)

Note that awards to participants in a given fiscal year are not used until the following school year. For example, awards in Year Three (2016-2017) were used by participants during the 2017-2018 school year and awards in Year Four (2017-2018) were used by participants in the 2018-2019 school year. Awards in Year Five (2018-2019) will be used in the 2019-2020 school year.

¹ The Center on School Turnaround (2017), Four domains for rapid school improvement: A systems framework, The Center for School Turnaround at WestEd San Francisco, CA: WestEd, http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CST_Four-Domains-Framework-Final.pdf (accessed October 31, 2017)

² The School Performance Framework has four performance ratings. Priority Improvement is the second lowest rating and Turnaround is the lowest rating.



The executive summary provides a quick overview of the number of approved providers, participants, and grant awards for the life of the grant program. Other details and information about the impact of the program can be found within the report.

Summary of Providers

The following table summarizes the approved provider programs and the number of district and school participants each provider served over the life of the grant program (2014-2018).

Approved Providers	Total Number of Individual Participants (2014-2018 School Years)
Catapult School Leadership (CSL Colorado)*	14
Generation Schools Network	21
Relay Graduate School of Education	121
University of Denver	142
University of Virginia	53
TOTAL	351

*In fall 2018, Catapult School Leadership notified CDE that they will no longer seek to provide leadership training through the STLD program.

**In fall 2017, Promethean / University of Florida notified CDE that they will no longer seek to provide leadership training through the STLD program. After two years of approval, no district applications were recommended for funding to attend the Promethean / University of Florida program.

Summary of Participants

The following table summarizes the districts that participated in the grant program, and which providers served each participating district over the life of the grant (2014-2018).

District/Charter School	Total Number of Individual Participants	Provider(s)
	2014-2018 School Years	
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	14	Relay Graduate School
Adams County School District 14	8	Relay Graduate School
Aurora Public Schools	6	Catapult Leadership
	19	Relay Graduate School
	6	University of Denver
	17	University of Virginia
Aguilar School District	3	Generation Schools Network
Bennett School District	3	Generation Schools Network
Boulder Valley School District	1	University of Denver
Colorado Charter School Institute	2	Catapult Leadership
Colorado High School Charter (Denver Public Schools)	1	University of Denver
Colorado Springs School District 11	9	Relay Graduate School
Denver Public Schools	2	Catapult Leadership
	14	Relay Graduate School



	63	University of Denver
	15	University of Virginia
East Otero School District	3	Generation Schools Network
Englewood Schools	15	University of Virginia
Falcon 49	3	Generation Schools Network
	1	University of Denver
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6	3	Catapult Leadership
	5	Relay Graduate School
HOPE Online Learning Academy (Douglas County School District)	44	University of Denver
Huerfano School District RE-1	3	Generation Schools Network
Ignacio School District	3	Generation Schools Network
Jeffco Public Schools	8	University of Denver
	10	Relay Graduate School
Kiowa C-2 (Elbert County SD C-2)	2	University of Denver
Lake County School District	5	Relay Graduate School
	1	University of Denver
Monte Vista School District	3	Generation Schools Network
Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1	6	University of Virginia
Pueblo City Schools	35	Relay Graduate School
West End Public Schools RE-2	3	University of Denver
Westminster Public Schools	12	University of Denver
Widefield School District 3	1	Catapult Leadership
	2	Relay Graduate School
TOTAL	351	

Summary of Financial Awards

Over the life of the grant program (2014-2018), a total of \$7,376,806 has been awarded through competitive processes to participants and providers.

- In Year One, \$1,899,407 was awarded: \$258,108 to approved provider organizations as one-time design grants and \$1,641,299 to approved school and district participants.
- In Year Two, \$1,845,399 was awarded – \$191,429 to approved provider organizations as one-time design grants and \$1,653,970 to approved school and district participants.
- In Year Three, \$1,900,000 was awarded--all of it to approved school and district participants.
- In Year Four, \$1,732,000 was awarded-- all of it to approved school and district participants.
- Per the statute, \$100,000 was used each year to support CDE staff to manage the grant program.



Summary of Awards for Years 1, 2, 3 and 4 (2014-2017)			
	Amount Awarded to Providers	Amount Awarded to Participants	Total
Year 1 (2014-2015)	\$258,108	\$1,641,299	\$1,899,407
Year 2 (2015-2016)	\$191,429	\$1,653,970	\$1,845,399
Year 3 (2016-2017)	\$0	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000
Year 4 (2017-2018)	\$0	\$1,732,000	\$1,732,000
Total	\$449,537	\$6,927,269	\$7,376,806

For a breakdown of per year, per provider, and per participant costs, see [Appendix B: Awards by Year](#).



Background: Turning Around Under-Performing Schools

Colorado's Education Accountability Act of 2009 (S.B. 09-163) requires CDE to evaluate the performance of the state, districts, and individual public schools. State-identified student performance measures are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a school's and a district's performance. Schools and districts that receive ratings in the lowest categories of performance – Priority Improvement or Turnaround status – are required to adopt and implement plans that reflect an appropriate magnitude of change. The ratings help the state know where to direct support and learn from those schools and districts that have had success in meeting students' academic needs.

"Leadership for under-performing schools is fundamentally different than leadership for higher-performing schools."

For those schools and districts that need more support to meet students' needs, CDE organizes turnaround resources through the Four Domains: 1) culture shift; (2) instructional transformation; (3) turnaround leadership; and (4) talent development. The STLD program provides a key support in developing turnaround leadership for our state.

In 2013, a report was produced to study specifically the Colorado education accountability system and the approach CDE might take to address the improvement needs of districts and schools in Colorado. The report, *Turnarounds in Colorado: Partnering for Innovative Reform in a Local Control State*³, names several characteristics 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 require strategic and determined political leadership from the top.

This same report recommended next steps for the state including, "developing a supply of high-quality third-party lead partners ... for school and district turnaround efforts." 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 both of these goals for Colorado's rural, urban and suburban schools. By providing professional learning 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 under-performing schools.

³ 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, <http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/turnaround/download/schoolturnaroundreport.pdf> (accessed October 31, 2017).



Leadership for under-performing schools is fundamentally different than leadership for higher-performing schools. Extensive research shows that to achieve real turnaround and academic improvement, under-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 STLD Program 2014-2018: Providers

C.R.S. 22-13-102(5) defines a "Provider" as a "public or private entity that offers a high-quality turnaround leadership development program for Colorado educators." During the first three years of the grant, the statute allowed for providers to request one-time design grants to further develop their programming. CDE recommended providers to the State Board of Education and the board approved grants for providers during the first two years. The State Board of Education's rules for administering the STLD program name criteria for identifying providers and granting funds for design work ([Appendix G](#), 1 CCR 301-95, section 2.01(1)). These rules provided guidance for the Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for Years One, Two, and Three, in which provider applicants 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;
- c) The provider's capacity to implement program components; and
- d) Availability of programs to leaders across the state.

See [Appendix E: STLD Provider Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric](#) to view the 2016 rubric in its entirety.

In January and March 2015 for Year One (2014-2015), 12 providers applied to CDE's RFP. Five providers were approved and three providers received one-time design grants. Approved providers included: Catapult School Leadership (\$83,000); University of Denver (\$110,108); Generation Schools Network (\$65,000); the Relay Graduate School National Principal Academy Fellowship (no funding requested); and the University of Virginia, Partnering for Leaders in Education program (no funding requested).

In September 2015 for Year Two (2015-2016), seven providers applied to CDE's RFP. Two providers were approved and received one-time design grants. Approved providers included: the Relay Graduate School of Education Principal Manager program (\$132,067) and Promethean with the University of Florida's School Turnaround Leaders Development Program (\$59,362).

In October 2016 for Year Three (2016-2017), six providers applied to CDE's RFP. CDE recommended to the state board that it approve one of those providers – Teach Plus' Turnaround Teacher Teams (T3) Program (\$50,000). The State Board of Education considered CDE's recommendation on Dec. 14 and 15, 2016, but did not approve any of the applicant providers.

CDE did not issue an RFP for additional STLD provider grants in 2017. Per statute, design grants will no longer be available for leadership development providers. CDE issued a call for additional providers in winter 2018 through a Request for Information process. The same evaluation rubric was used in this Request for Information. Through this process, four new providers were added to the provider list. These providers include:

- NYC Leadership Academy;



- Public Consulting Group (PCG);
- TNTP; and
- WestEd.

These providers were added to the program for Year 5; the first opportunity for districts and schools to participate in these new provider programs will be during the 2019-2020 school year.

For a more complete description of the identified providers for Year Four (2017-2018), please see [Appendix C: 2018-2019 School Year Provider Snapshot](#).

Impact of Provider Programming

The State Board of Education's rules provide guidance on identified providers' reporting requirements. ([Appendix G, 1 CCR 301-95, section 2.01\(4\)](#)). These requirements were shared in the program RFPs. Each approved provider is required to report on a set of required metrics to the department on or before July 1 of the year following approval. Data has been collected and summarized through various formats during this grant program including provider submissions and surveys. The following is a summary of impacts for participants from STLD provider programming.

- Providers reported that approximately 37 percent of participants attended over 20 in-person sessions as part of the leadership programs; about 16 percent of participants attended 14-20 in-person sessions, and about 41 percent of participants attended less than 10 in-person sessions in 2017-2018.
- 100% of providers reported an increase in instructional practices and use of data in participating schools. Over 60 percent of providers reported an increase in reported practices in the participating schools in the following areas: school culture and climate; systems of progress monitoring; aligning curricula; observation and coaching; and quality professional development.
- Providers reported new systems or structures being implemented in participating schools that had not existed before the leadership training, including: use of data in schools; distribution of leadership; use of formative instructional practices; common lesson plan templates and review; common data protocols; observation and coaching of teachers; consistent expectations for instruction; use of progress monitoring tools and routines; and professional development menus.
- Providers reported high satisfaction rates from participants on leadership development curriculum, faculty, and coaching.
- Providers reported increases in demonstrations of turnaround leadership competencies as measured by self-reported provider pre/post assessments.
- Most providers use cohort models in program structures which allows for participants to learn from one another.
- Providers reported an observed increased focus on leaders holding others accountable for student performance.
- Providers reported increased awareness and focus, as demonstrated by participants, on culture and climate expectations in schools and districts.
- Providers reported enhanced efforts on teacher and leader recruitment and hiring practices, as demonstrated by participants.

Approved providers are expected to connect and align leadership training to the Colorado Principal Quality Standards. Providers reported improvements for participants in regard to turnaround leadership competencies, which are connected to the Colorado Principal Quality Standards. The specific benefits of the turnaround



leadership development was unique to each of the programs. The degree of improvement on the Quality Standards varied by provider, and was based on the specific program offering or the district's tool.

The STLD Program 2014-2018: Participants

C.R.S. 22-13-102(7) defines a “school turnaround leader” as a “principal or teacher leader in a school that is required to adopt a priority improvement plan or administrator or employee of the state Charter School Institute that coordinates and supports turnaround efforts...” The grant program gives the State Board of Education the authority to award funding to participants to participate in turnaround leaders training with one of the approved providers. The State Board of Education's rules outline minimum requirements for participant applications ([Appendix G](#), 1 CCR 301-95, section 2.02(4)). All applications were required to include:

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

See [Appendix F: STLD Participant Grant Evaluation Rubric](#) to view the 2016 rubric in its entirety.

For Year One (2014-2015), no school districts or charter schools participated in the program as the providers and participants were being identified during this time.

In March 2015, for Year Two (2015-2016), 11 school districts and charter schools applied to participate. Eight of these were funded for participation in identified providers' programs. Approved applicants included: Adams 12 Five Star Schools, Aurora Public Schools, Colorado High School Charter School in Denver Public Schools, Denver Public Schools, Lake County School District, Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1, Pueblo City Schools, and West End Public Schools RE-2.

In February 2016, for Year Three (2016-2017), 21 school districts and charter schools applied for the grant program and 12 applicants were funded for participation in identified providers' programs. Approved applicants included: Adams 12 Five Star Schools, Aguilar School District RE-6, Aurora Public Schools, Boulder Valley School District, Colorado Springs School District 11, Denver Public Schools, Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6, Huerfano School District RE-1, Ignacio School District, Jeffco Public Schools, Lake County School District, and Pueblo City Schools.

In March 2017, for Year Four (2017-2018), 20 school districts and charter schools applied for the grant. Thirteen applicants were funded for participation in identified providers' programs. Approved applicants included: Adams 12 Five Star Schools, Adams County School District 14, Aurora Public Schools, Bennett School District, Colorado Charter School Institute, Colorado Springs School District 11, Denver Public Schools, Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6, HOPE Online Learning Academy in Douglas County School District, Monte Vista School District, Pueblo City Schools, West End Public Schools RE-2, and Widefield School District 3.



For Year Five (2018-2019), the STLD Participant application was incorporated into the Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) grant process. The EASI is a new single application from CDE that matches needs of under-performing schools and districts with supports and resources (both state and federal). The EASI opened in late October 2017, with applications due on December 6, 2017. Twelve districts and charter schools applied for the STLD component of the grant. Fourteen applications were funded for participation in identified providers' programs. Approved applicants include: Adams County School District 14, Colorado Springs District 11, Denver Public Schools, East Otero School District R1, Englewood Schools, Falcon 49, Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6, Harrison School District 2⁴, Jefferson County Public Schools, Kiowa C-2 (Elbert County SD C-2), Pueblo City Schools, and Westminster Public Schools.

Impact of the STLD program for participants

The State Board of Education's rules outline minimum reporting requirements for participants. These requirements were shared in the program RFPs. ([Appendix G](#), 1 CCR 301-95, section 2.02(8)). Each participant is required to report on a set of required metrics to the department on or before July 1 of the following year. Data has been collected and summarized through various formats during this grant program including participant submissions and surveys. The following is a summary of impacts collected.

It is inherently challenging to draw causal relationships between leadership training and student learning outcomes, especially when participants may not currently be leading a school. In spring and summer 2017, CDE shifted the evaluation portion of this program to a survey format for both participants and providers. Ninety-one participants out of 98 (92 percent) responded to the survey in summer 2018 with the following data and trends:

Observation & Instructional Feedback

- 77.8 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "Teachers regularly reflect on their instructional practice."
- 82.2 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "school leaders regularly observe classroom instruction."
- 8.8 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "school leaders regularly meet one-on-one with teachers to provide feedback on their instruction."
- 74.5 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "school leadership helps teachers to use data to improve student learning."
- 75.6 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "teachers adapt their instruction based on an analysis of student assessment results."

School Culture

- 81.1 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "leaders consistently support teachers for improved performance."
- 70.1 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "leaders ensure students understand expectations for their conduct."
- 72.2 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that "leaders motivate students by successfully challenging them."

⁴ Harrison School District 2 was awarded funding but did not complete the full program as of June 2019. Subsequently, their award dollars are reflected in this report, but their participation will not be reflected until in later reports.



Leadership

- 77.5 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that “the school leadership team institutes an inclusive process to develop a shared mission and vision that promotes high expectations for student achievement.”
- 74.2 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that “the school leadership team specifies research-based strategies for meeting goals.”
- 76.4 percent of participants identified an increase in their perception that “the school leadership team engages all staff in continuous improvement processes by monitoring progress.”

Overall Experience with Provider Program

- 91 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that “the provider program will result in sustained change in the schools.”
- 91 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that “the quality of the experience is worth the time invested.”
- 94 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that “this provider program will enhance the competencies and skills of school leaders.”
- 92 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that “I was able to apply what I learned in a short period of time.”

Other improvement strategies that have been implemented over the life of the program (2014-2018) in districts and schools as a result of the leadership training, as reported by participants, include:

- Curricula scope and sequences were developed and implemented;
- Interim assessments were developed and implemented;
- Professional Learning Community data conversations were developed, improved, and implemented;
- An increased level of instructional coaching, observation and actionable feedback was provided for teachers in language arts and mathematics;
- Increased and improved professional development for teachers occurred with unique foci on school needs;
- Increased focus on community engagement resulted in higher community satisfaction as reflected in local survey results; and
- Teacher retention improved in numerous schools.

Other improvements in leadership competence that have been reported over the life of the program (2014-2018) include:

- An increased level of distributed and shared leadership with school staff.
- An increased level of skill and capacity for observation and feedback between principals and teachers and between principal managers and principals, both leading to improved instruction.
- Principals increased capacity to recruit, retain, and support high-quality teachers.
- District and school leaders identified low performing teachers early and provided targeted support. As needed, low performing teachers were replaced.
- In some districts, surveys were used to reflect on practices which included: leaders’ self-confidence; teacher perceptions about leaders’ behaviors; teacher and leader climate perceptions; and other subjective data.
- Some aspiring leaders participating in programs have been promoted to assistant principals or principals.



The STLD Program 2014-2018: Successes, Challenges, and Next Steps

CDE's assessment of this program from 2014-2018 has identified the following successes:

- *Development of provider content that focused specifically on school turnaround.* In-course improvements were made throughout the years. For example, a nationally recognized program, Relay, reported improving on its current programming based on participants' needs in this program by customizing supports and by developing a principal manager training program. Relay has continued to refine their programming to offer additional district learning opportunities in order to better support principals.
- *Turnaround school leadership improvement across the state of Colorado.* Students in 26 districts or charter schools experienced leadership practices that were influenced by the individual leadership development opportunities in identified STLD programs. 352 individual educators have participated in leadership training for this program. In many cases, this grant has led to continued partnerships between districts and partner organizations and/or development of in-house and other leader development opportunities for school and district leaders.
- *Evidence of improvements in leadership competence.* Participants and providers reported demonstrated improvements in leadership competence in participants in a variety of domains on the Colorado Principal Quality Standards, such as: strategic planning and communication; data-driven leadership; observation and feedback of instruction; focus on equity and serving all students; and strategic hiring of teachers and principals.
- *Retention and recruitment for turnaround leaders in our most challenging schools to serve.* District leaders have reported that the grant program serves as a retention and recruitment tool for current and aspiring school turnaround leaders by offering exposure to high-quality training programs.
- *Expansion of practices.* Many principal supervisors report that they are expanding their learned practices beyond their under-performing schools and are broadening practices to all district schools.

CDE's assessment of this program from 2014-2018 has identified the following challenges.

- *Data collection and evaluation.* Districts and providers submitted varying metrics and measurements in the areas of student achievement and leadership competence, which has made it challenging to summarize the impact of the program. CDE has revised the qualitative data collection from districts and will be engaging in a deeper program evaluation starting in the 2019-2020 school year as a result of the additional funding for evaluation provided by the legislature this year.
- *Identification of best match of providers with participants in school districts.* CDE has provided increased support to applicants during the life of this grant to identify individual leaders and best match their needs to available leadership training programs. However, it remains the responsibility of the district to ensure that individuals are selected in the application process for leadership training and CDE must rely on the district's judgement. As more districts engage with various STLD providers, districts gain an increased understanding of which leadership training best fits the needs of each district and individual.
- *Funding amounts.* CDE seeks to differentiate award amounts to districts based on their needs. Based on size of district, local resources, and geography, different districts may require different grant funding amounts to successfully support leadership training. In many cases, awards to smaller/rural districts include travel costs in order to help them afford the training.



CDE has re-designed the way district and school improvement needs are matched with CDE and external support structures and grants. As mentioned above, beginning in October 2017, the STLD participant grant became part of the Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI), CDE's single application for districts for supports and grants for under-performing systems. The goal of this application process is to support districts in thinking strategically about their district and school-level needs and match those with the available supports and funding. As leadership development is a key need for many identified schools and districts, it makes sense to include this grant as part of the set of supports available. By integrating STLD awards into the EASI process, CDE will assist districts in better identifying and aligning their needs with available resources to ensure leadership development is incorporated.



Appendix A: Timeline of Grant

Timeline for Providers and Participants

June 5, 2014	Governor John Hickenlooper signed the School Turnaround Leaders Development (STLD) bill (SB 14-124)
January – May 2015	First rounds of providers recommended by CDE and approved by the State Board of Education First round of participants approved (Year 2)
Fall 2015	Second round of providers approved
Spring 2016	Second round of participants approved (Year 3)
Spring 2017	Third round of participants approved (Year 4)
Spring 2018	Fourth round of participants approved (Year 5)
May 2018	HB18-1355 adjusts the School Turnaround Leaders Development grant to the School Transformation Grant, expanding the allowable uses of the funds.
Spring 2019	Fifth round of participants approved under the School Transformation Grant (Year 6)



Appendix B: Awards by Year

Year 1 (2014-2015) Awards	
Providers	Amount Awarded
Catapult School Leadership	\$83,000
Generations School Network	\$65,000
University of Denver	\$110,108
Total Amount Awarded to Providers	\$258,108
Participants	Amount Awarded
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	\$110,150
Aurora Public Schools	\$512,307
Colorado High School Charter (Denver Public Schools)	\$44,330
Denver Public Schools	\$615,150
Lake County School District	\$82,772
Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1	\$39,540
Pueblo City Schools	\$163,750
West End Public School RE-2	\$73,300
Total Amount Awarded to Participants	\$1,641,299
Total Amount Awarded to Providers and Participants	\$1,899,407

Year 2 (2015-2016) Awards	
Providers	Amount Awarded
Promethean, Inc.	\$59,362
Relay Graduate School of Education	\$132,067
Total Amount Awarded to Providers	\$191,429
Participants	Amount Awarded
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	\$152,600
Aguilar School District RE-6	\$142,127
Aurora Public Schools	\$274,601
Boulder Valley School District	\$32,000
Colorado Springs School District 11	\$65,400
Denver Public Schools	\$360,000
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6	\$126,588
Huerfano School District RE-1	\$142,127
Ignacio School District	\$142,127
Jeffco Public Schools	\$42,000
Lake County School District	\$65,400
Pueblo City Schools	\$109,000
Total Amount Awarded to Participants	\$1,653,970
Total Amount Awarded to Providers and Participants	\$1,845,399



Year 3 (2016-2017) Awards	
Providers	Amount Awarded
None	\$0
Total Amount Awarded to Providers	\$0
Participants	Amount Awarded
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	\$40,000
Adams County School District 14	\$76,252
Aurora Public Schools	\$652,790
Bennett School District	\$140,070
Colorado Charter School Institute	\$83,336
Colorado Springs School District 11	\$60,000
Denver Public Schools	\$163,766
Douglas County School District (HOPE Online Learning Academy)	\$47,250
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6	\$62,100
Monte Vista School District	\$149,370
Pueblo City Schools	\$325,500
West End School District RE-2	\$35,000
Widefield School District 3	\$64,566
Total Amount Awarded to Participants	\$1,900,000
Total Amount Awarded to Providers and Participants	\$1,900,000

Year 4 (2017-2018) Awards	
Providers	Amount Awarded
None	\$0
Total Amount Awarded to Providers	\$0
Participants	Amount Awarded
Adams County School District 14	\$102,000
Colorado Springs District 11	\$48,000
Denver Public Schools	\$366,500
East Otero School District R1	\$158,000
Englewood Schools	\$444,500
Falcon 49	\$187,000
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6	\$48,000
Harrison School District 2	\$102,000
Jefferson County Public Schools	\$62,000
Kiowa C-2 (Elbert County SD C-2)	\$50,000
Pueblo School District 60	\$102,000
Westminster Public Schools	\$62,000
Total Amount Awarded to Participants	\$1,732,000
Total Amount Awarded to Providers and Participants	\$1,732,000



Summary of Awards for Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 (2014-2017)			
	Amount Awarded to Providers	Amount Awarded to Participants	Total
Year 1 (2014-2015)	\$258,108	\$1,641,299	\$1,899,407
Year 2 (2015-2016)	\$191,429	\$1,653,970	\$1,845,399
Year 3 (2016-2017)	\$0	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000
Year 4 (2017-2018)	\$0	\$1,732,000	\$1,732,000
Total	\$449,537	\$6,927,269	\$7,376,806



Appendix C: 2018-2019 School Year Provider Snapshot

Note: This table reflects the providers, programming, and costs for participation in the 2018-2019 school year

PROVIDER & PROGRAM	PARTICIPANTS SERVED	AREAS OF FOCUS	TOUCH POINTS	PROGRAM DURATION	PROGRAM LOCATION	PROGRAM COST
Catapult School Leadership (CSL Colorado): Turnaround Leadership Fellowship	☐ Teachers ☒ Aspiring Leaders ☒ Current Principals ☒ District Staff ☒ Principal Supervisors ☐ Other:	Comprehensive organizational analysis; strategic planning; leadership development institutes; local and national site visits; on-site support, assessment and feedback; executive coaching.	Summer Institutes and quarterly cohort meetings; local meetings for those outside the metro area. Distance learning via Skype; coaching in person and by phone	2 years	Metro Denver	\$38,000 per participant over 2 years; \$21,500 per participant for all services for Year 1 (includes travel costs for out-of-state site visit); \$16,500 per participant for Year 2 (all inclusive).
Generations Schools Network: Turnaround Leadership Program	☒ Teachers ☒ Aspiring Leaders ☐ Current Principals ☒ District Staff ☐ Principal Supervisors ☒ Other: Team approach involves 3 or more participants from each school	Strategy, Instruction, School Culture & Equity, Human Resources, Management, External Development	Summer retreats and ongoing onsite coaching	2.3 years	All Colorado Districts and Schools	\$140,000 over 2.3 years for a team size of 3 persons = \$20,300 per participant per year. \$10,000 per additional participant which will cover the entire period.
Relay Graduate School of Education: National Principals Academy Fellowship (NPAF)	☐ Teachers ☐ Aspiring Leaders ☒ Current Principals ☐ District Staff ☐ Principal Supervisors ☐ Other:	Instructional leadership; strong instruction (content); strong instruction (pedagogy); self and other people; cultural leadership; and strategic leadership	Two-week summer session in June, followed by four intersessions on weekends throughout the school year in Oct, Dec, Feb & May	1 year	Denver	\$20,000 per participant, excluding travel. \$18,000 is covered by tuition; the remaining \$2,000 is covered by Relay GSE's philanthropic partners.



PROVIDER & PROGRAM	PARTICIPANTS SERVED	AREAS OF FOCUS	TOUCH POINTS	PROGRAM DURATION	PROGRAM LOCATION	PROGRAM COST
Relay Graduate School of Education: National Principal Supervisors Academy (NPSA)	☐ Teachers ☐ Aspiring Leaders ☐ Current Principals ☐ District Staff ☒ Principal Supervisors ☐ Other:	Instructional leadership; strong instruction (content); strong instruction (pedagogy; cultural leadership; and strategic leadership	Two-week summer session in June, followed by 4 intersessions on weekends throughout the school year in Oct, Dec, Feb & May	1 year	Denver	\$20,000 per participant, excluding travel. \$18,000 is covered by tuition; the remaining \$2,000 is covered by Relay GSE's philanthropic partners.
Relay Graduate School of Education: Instructional Leadership Professional Development (ILPD) Program	☒ Teachers ☒ Aspiring Leaders ☐ Current Principals ☐ District Staff ☐ Principal Supervisors ☐ Other:	Instructional leadership; data driven instruction; observation and feedback; and improving school culture	One-week summer intensive professional development	1 week	Denver	\$8,500 per participant; excluding travel.
University of Denver: M.A. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (DU ELPS)	☒ Teachers ☒ Aspiring Leaders ☐ Current Principals ☒ District Staff ☐ Principal Supervisors ☐ Other:	Structural leadership, instructional leadership, change leadership, cultural leadership, human resource leadership, business design and innovation, design thinking, improvement science. CO principal licensure.	Cohort-based with a combination of in-person full day workshops, webinars and online asynchronous discussions.	21 months	Denver metro, Front Range CO (I25 corridor – Pueblo to Greeley), Western Slope and central mountain region.	\$32,000-\$35,000 tuition and fees for the 45 credit hour accredited degree program.



PROVIDER & PROGRAM	PARTICIPANTS SERVED	AREAS OF FOCUS	TOUCH POINTS	PROGRAM DURATION	PROGRAM LOCATION	PROGRAM COST
University of Denver: Turnaround Success (DU TS) Program	☐ Teachers ☒ Aspiring Leaders ☒ Current Principals ☒ District Staff ☒ Principal Supervisors ☒ Other: Students, Parents, and Communities	Needs and asset analysis; development and execution of an action/implementation/sustainability plan that may include leader retreat, series of workshops, action learning challenges, sustainability planning; utilizing improvement science and design thinking	Co-designed with school/district	Flexible (6-12 months)	Denver metro, Front Range CO (I25 corridor – Pueblo to Greeley), Western Slope and central mountain region	\$45,000 per school or district (up to 5 districts) for up to a year-long engagement that includes all program elements. Does not include participant travel.
University of Virginia: Partnership for Leadership in Education (PLE)	☐ Teachers ☐ Aspiring Leaders ☒ Current Principals ☒ District Staff ☒ Principal Supervisors ☒ Other: School leadership teams	High impact school and LEA leadership; identifying and overcoming critical challenges; fostering effective interactions between the school and district leaders; co-creating solutions to most pressing problems	Readiness assessment, leadership competency interviews, 5 executive education sessions, annual retreat, site visits, tailored support	3 years	Charlottesville, Virginia, locally in the district, and other locations in the Southwest	\$86,500 per school for all services across 3 years plus the cost of the readiness assessment (\$17,000 - \$25,000)



Appendix D: Summary of Participants

The following table summarizes the number of district and charter school participants each year that attended different provider programs over the life of the grant (2014-2018). Note that awards to participants in a given fiscal year are not used until the following school year. For example, awards in Year Two (2015-2016) were not used by participants until the 2016-2017 school year.

District/Charter School	Number of Participants				Provider(s)
	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	5	7	2		Relay Graduate School
Adams County School District 14			4	4	Relay Graduate School
Aurora Public Schools	6				Catapult Leadership
	8	8	3		Relay Graduate School
	4		2		University of Denver
	4	4	9		University of Virginia
Aguilar School District RE-6		3			Generation Schools Network
Bennett School District			3		Generation Schools Network
Boulder Valley School District		1			University of Denver
Colorado Charter School Institute			2		Catapult Leadership
Colorado High School Charter (Denver Public Schools)	1				University of Denver
Colorado Springs School District 11		3	3	3	Relay Graduate School
Denver Public Schools			2		Catapult Leadership
	14				Relay Graduate School
	8		37	18	University of Denver
		5		10	University of Virginia
Englewood Schools				15	University of Virginia
East Otero School District				3	Generation Schools Network
Falcon 49				3	Generation Schools Network
				1	University of Denver
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6		3			Catapult Leadership
			3	2	Relay Graduate School
HOPE Online Learning Academy (Douglas County School District)			44		University of Denver
Huerfano School District RE-1		3			Generation Schools Network
Ignacio School District		3			Generation Schools Network
Jeffco Public Schools		1		7	University of Denver
				10	Relay Graduate School
Kiowa C-2				2	University of Denver
Lake County School District	2	3			Relay Graduate School
	1				University of Denver
Monte Vista School District			3		Generation Schools Network
Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1	6				University of Virginia
Pueblo City Schools	8	5	17	5	Relay Graduate School
West End Public Schools RE-2	2		1		University of Denver
Westminster Public Schools				12	University of Denver
Widefield School District 3			1		Catapult Leadership
			2		Relay Graduate School
TOTAL	69	49	138	95	



Appendix E: STLD Provider Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Note: From the 2016 RFP.

Section A: Organizational Qualifications	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
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. Describe key structures or systems used to provide feedback and monitor progress.	0	3	5
2) Describe the overall qualifications of your organization to develop high quality leaders for low performing schools.	0	3	5
3) Describe the number, roles, and qualifications of Instructors/Staff that Provide Turnaround Leadership Services. Address: • If 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; and • How you recruit your staff and ensure that they are effective?	0	3	5
4) Provide a detailed description of the services your organization provides. Specifically describe: • The key components of your program that ensures participant growth in the turnaround context. • How feedback is communicated to participants and how often.	0	3	5
5) Provide data and evidence describing the results of your program. Specifically include: • What impact your training has had on student achievement; • What are your criteria for success? How do you measure the growth and success of your participants? Include any rubrics or tools you use to assess leaders' performance and growth. • How many participants have you produced, what are they doing now, and how many of them meet your success criteria?	0	10	15
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/35



Section B: Leadership Development Program Description	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
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) <u>Program purpose/overview</u> 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. Specifically address: • 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	7	10
2) <u>Leadership competency framework:</u> • Describe your program's competency or instructional framework, specifying which competencies are considered as part of the selection and which are new or learned as part of the program. Include any documents or tools you use. • 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	7	10
3) <u>Recruitment and selection:</u> • 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	3	5



4) <u>Coursework/curriculum</u> Describe your curriculum content and delivery methods. Address: • What the pedagogical approach is. • How the delivery method supports an experience which is: engaging, interactive, intellectually rigorous, applicable and relevant, project-based, and hands-on. • How your curriculum is differentiated to meet the unique needs of different communities (i.e., rural, mountain, metro, small, and large). • How learning is individualized and organized for participants to make progress toward clear goals and outcomes based on identified competencies and skills. • How feedback cycles, peer accountability, and other methods support self-reflection and create a culture of continuous improvement. • The length of the program and different phases of training.	0	10	15
5) <u>Residency/clinical experience:</u> Describe the residency or practical experience of your program. Address: • 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. • Where participants are placed. • How you measure if a residency experience is successful (pre and post data) and how you ensure these experiences are successful.	0	7	10
6) <u>Partnering with districts to facilitate placements and provide ongoing support:</u> • 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 participants 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	3	5
7) <u>Team emphasis</u> • Describe how your program emphasizes distributed leadership within a school and between a school and the district/CMO. For example, do administrative teams (principal, AP, dean) attend all or a portion of the program together? Or teacher teams? Or a combination of school-based and district support? • Describe the skills and competencies your program develops in district/CMO staff to support appropriate autonomies for school leaders.	0	7	10



8) Program evaluation Describe how and what data will be used 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 page 5.	0	7	10
9) Sustainability/retention of turnaround leaders • Specify if there is a minimum requirement to serve in a high needs school after participating in your program. • Describe the kinds of supports or policies you have or will have in place to maximize success and retention, and prevent burnout. • Describe how you will support teaming (see above) to help plan for leadership succession.	0	7	10
10) Partner in turnaround policymaking • Describe how you will work with districts and/or the state to improve conditions for turnaround leaders to thrive and succeed. • Describe how you will 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	5	7
11) Organizational Capacity: • Describe the capacity your organization currently has to meet the requirements identified in items 1-10. • If development is needed in some areas, describe what will be required in order to build the appropriate capacity (staff, funding, etc.) to meet the needs of this proposal. • Describe the infrastructure that will be needed to serve the identified and targeted regions and districts.	0	7	10
Reviewer Comments:			
			Total /102



Section C: Budget	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
All applicants are required to complete Section C. Please address the appropriate question depending on whether you <u>Are</u> or <u>Are Not</u> applying for a Design Grant. 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. Applicants that <u>ARE NOT</u> applying for a design grant, please address: Describe the cost structure for your program. Specify: • The cost per participant. • How much of your costs are covered by tuition versus other funding sources.			
	0	7	10
Applicants that <u>ARE</u> applying for a design grant, please address: Complete (and attach) the electronic budget form and provide a detailed budget narrative that is aligned to your program description (Section B). 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. • An expenditure timeline. • Specific costs that will be required to build your program's infrastructure in order to deliver the intended services. Describe what you will need to build, grow, and develop in order to provide the services described in this proposal.			
	0	7	10
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/10



Appendix F: STLD Participant Grant Evaluation Rubric

Note: From the 2016 RFP.

Section A: Needs Assessment			
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. <i>Provide a list of PI/T schools to be served.</i>	Did not Include ☐	Included ☐	
7) Use blue columns of STLD Participant Matrix Spreadsheet to identify the number and names of individuals to participate in leadership programs, including: aspiring leaders, existing leaders, teacher leaders, district managers or support staff. <i>CDE recommends that the district, CSI or school identify individuals that are committed to serve the school for a minimum of two years, after completion of the program.</i> <i>In Participant Matrix, list the number and names of individuals to participate in programs.</i>	Did not Include/More Information Needed ☐	Included and Adequate Information Provided ☐	
	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
8) Describe the current skills, expertise and commitment level of proposed participants, and the skills and expertise that are needed to successfully lead 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). <i>Describes participants' current skills, expertise and commitment level (specific to each type) and the skills/expertise needed to lead in a turnaround environment.</i>	0	4	7
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/7

	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
Section B: Turnaround Leadership Provider and District/CSI/School Plan			



Indicate which identified provider(s) are you requesting funding (green column in STLD Participant Matrix Spreadsheet) and address the following: • Why this/each of these Providers was selected. • How the chosen program directly addresses the needs identified in Section A of this application. • Include rationale that discusses how the provider's areas of focus <u>and</u> program components (internships, follow up support, etc.) would be most responsive to the needs of your district and schools. <i>Clearly articulates the districts'/schools' rationale for selecting provider that includes how the providers focus and components will meet the schools' needs.</i>	0	5	10
Describe: • How the district will ensure that selected candidates are able to implement strategies from the chosen program. • What flexibility and support will the district offer school and district leaders in order to help ensure successful turnaround work. <i>Clearly describes how selected candidates will be supported to act flexibly to implement strategies from the program.</i>	0	5	10
• For each provider identified, include a clearly detailed timeline for implementation. Timeline should identify major implementation activities, progress indicators in relation to Providers' contract, the date by which they will be accomplished, and the person(s) responsible. (See program descriptions on website) <i>Provides a detailed timeline for implementation that articulates strategies, progress indicators, and people responsible across timeline.</i>	0	7	15
For example: Provider A			
Strategies /Activities	Progress Indicators of Implementation	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/35

Section C: Program Evaluation	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria <i>(information not provided)</i>	Met One or More Criteria <i>(requires additional clarification)</i>	Met All Criteria <i>(concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)</i>
-------------------------------	---	--	--



1) Describe the formative process to track progress for each individual participant. Specify methods to collect information, frequency of collection and who will be designated to coordinate data tracking and analysis. Address all reporting requirements found in Attachment D.	0	7	15
<i>Clearly describes the process for monitoring participants' progress by identifying methods of collecting data, people responsible and analysis protocols that connect to Attachment D.</i>			
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/15

Section D: Budget Narrative and STLD Matrix	Not Addressed or Met No Criteria (information not provided)	Met One or More Criteria (requires additional clarification)	Met All Criteria (concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)
1) Describe all expenditures contained in the STLD Participant Matrix and connect to strategies and activities from Section B. The costs of the proposed project (as presented in 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. <i>The attached STLD Participant Matrix Spreadsheet (Attachment C) includes pre-populated costs for each provider program by individual and/or school team. Applicants may add additional costs and travel expenses under the "Other Expenses" and "Travel Costs" columns. Granted amounts will be dependent on available funds and demand by other applicants. If greater demand exists than funds allow, CDE may limit awards to some or no costs for Other or Travel expenses.</i> <i>Note: Approved applicants will be asked to complete and submit the Electronic Budget Workbook as soon as final numbers are set.</i> <i>Clearly describes the expenditures named in Participant Matrix that aligns with strategies and activities identified in section B.</i>	0	7	15
Reviewer Comments:			
Total			/15



Appendix G: SBE Rules for the Administration of the STLD Program

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Colorado State Board of Education

RULES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL TRANSFORMATION GRANT 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); 22-7409(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 rules is Sec 22-13-103, C.R.S., which requires the State Board of Education to promulgate rules to implement and administer the School Transformation Grant Program.

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 Transformation Grant 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) State Board: The State Board of Education created pursuant to Section 1 of Article IX of the Colorado Constitution.



2.01 Turnaround Leadership Development Providers Request for Proposals

The Department must 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 grants.

2.01(1) Criteria for identifying approved Turnaround Leadership Development Providers

The Department must develop an RFP, which consists of an application and scoring rubric template. Thereafter, the Department must undertake a fair and equitable application review. In such review, the Department must consider the following 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 approving new Turnaround Leadership Development Providers. Applications for new providers to apply will open at the Department's discretion and a decision notification will occur within 90 days of the closing application date.

2.01(3) Review of approved Turnaround Leadership Development Providers. The department, on a regular basis, shall review each provider's turnaround leadership development programs, including the success achieved by the persons who complete the programs, and revise the list of identified providers as appropriate to ensure that the turnaround leadership development programs that are available through the program are of the highest quality.

2.01(4) Reporting requirements for approved Turnaround Leadership Development Providers. Each approved provider shall track the effectiveness of persons who are engaged in and 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(5)(a) Number of participants in program;
- 2.01(5)(b) Schools served; and
- 2.01(5)(c) Change in principals' or aspiring leaders' actions/behavior (as data is available).



2.02 School Transformation Grants.

2.02(1) Use of funds for School Transformation Grants. Subject to available appropriations, the State Board shall award School Transformation Grants to one or more school districts or charter schools or the Institute to use in one or more of the following areas:

- 2.02(1)(a) Identifying and recruiting practicing and aspiring school turnaround leaders;
- 2.02(1)(b) Subsidizing the costs incurred for school turnaround leaders and their staff, if appropriate, to participate in turnaround leadership development programs offered by identified providers;
- 2.02(1)(c) Reimbursing the school turnaround leaders for costs they incur in completing turnaround leadership development programs offered by identified providers;
- 2.02(1)(d) Providing educator professional development for educators working in public schools that are required to adopt priority improvement or turnaround plans for the immediate or preceding school year;
- 2.02(1)(e) Providing services, support, and materials to transform instruction in public schools that are required to adopt priority improvement or turnaround plans for the immediate or preceding school year; or
- 2.02(1)(f) Planning for and implementing one or more of the following rigorous school redesign strategies:
 - (i) Converting a district public school to a charter school if it is not already authorized as a charter school;
 - (ii) Granting innovation school status to a district public school pursuant to section 22-32.5-104;
 - (iii) With regard to a district or institute charter school, replacing the school's operator or governing board;
 - (iv) Contracting with a public or private entity other than the school district to partially or wholly manage a district public school, which entity is accepted by the department and the local school board as using research-based strategies and having a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances; or
 - (v) Closing a public school or revoking the charter for a district or institute charter school.

2.02(2) Timeline for School Transformation Grants. For the 2018-19 school year and each year thereafter, subject to available appropriations, School Transformation Grant applications will be due each year no later than January 15. Application decision notification will occur directly after State Board approval, no later than by the following April meeting.



- 2.02(3) Application procedures for School Transformation Grants. The Department must develop a grant application and scoring rubric template. Thereafter, the Department must undertake a fair and equitable application review.
- 2.02(4) Application requirements for School Transformation Grants—turnaround leadership development applicants. The following minimum requirements will be included in applications for School Transformation Grants for turnaround leadership development programs:
- 2.02(4)(a) The goals that the applicant expects to achieve through the grant;
 - 2.02(4)(b) The number of individuals to participate in leadership programs, including: existing leaders, aspiring leaders, district managers or support staff;
 - 2.02(4)(c) A clear plan for leadership development, implementation, and application of skills in the schools and district; and
 - 2.02(4)(d) A plan to evaluate impact of program.
- 2.02(5) Application requirements for School Transformation Grants—all other applicants. The following minimum requirements will be included in all other applications for School Transformation Grants:
- 2.02(5)(a) The goals that the applicant expects to achieve through the grant;
 - 2.02(5)(b) A clear action plan and corresponding budget for grant activities comprised of reasonable and necessary requests for funding; and
 - 2.02(5)(c) A plan for monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of grant funds.
- 2.02(6) Criteria for selecting recipients of School Transformation Grants. The following minimum criteria will be considered in selecting School Transformation Grant recipients:
- 2.02(6)(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, those that are implementing priority improvement or turnaround plans will be prioritized.
 - 2.02(6)(b) Quality of grant applications and demonstrated need, based on the applicant's:
 - (i) Goals to be achieved through the grant;
 - (ii) Action plan and corresponding budget for grant activities comprised of reasonable and necessary requests for funding; and
 - (iii) A plan for monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of grant funds.
- 2.02(7) Duration of School Transformation Grant awards. Each grant may continue for up to three budget years. The Department shall annually review each grant recipient's use of the grant money 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(8) Reporting requirements for School Transformation Grant—turnaround leadership development. 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 surveys to measure the effectiveness of persons who complete the turnaround leadership development program and include the following information, at a minimum:

2.02(8)(a) Number of people who participated and in which programs;

2.02(8)(b) Schools served;

2.02(8)(c) Impact of the grant on raising student achievement and establishing a positive school culture; and

2.02(8)(d) Change in principals' or aspiring leaders' actions/behavior.

2.02(9) Reporting requirements for School Transformation Grant— all other grantees. Each grant recipient will annually report the following at a minimum:

2.02(9)(a) Impact of the grant on raising student achievement and establishing a positive school culture.

2.02(10) Evaluation of School Transformation 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 Transformation Grants awarded pursuant to this section. The Department will also post the annual report on its web site.

Editor's Notes

History

Entire rule emer. rule eff. 09/10/2014; expired 01/08/2015.

Entire rule eff. 01/15/2015.

Entire rule eff. 01/30/2016.

Sections 2.01(2)-2.01(5) eff. 01/30/2017.