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, John Hickenlooper

This report was prepared in accordance with sections 22-13-101 through 106, C.R.S. by:
Peter Sherman, Executive Director, School and District Performance
Sherman_P@cde.state.co.us

March 2017

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The School Turnaround Leaders 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 each year.

Over the life of the grant program, the following funds have been awarded through competitive processes. In June 2015, $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 April 2016, $1,899,999 was awarded – $191,429 to approved Provider organizations as one-time design grants and $1,708,570 to approved school and district Participants. Per the statute, $100,000 was used each year to support CDE staff to manage the grant program. Awards distributed to grantees resulted in the following:

- Six identified provider organizations that offer eight turnaround leadership development programs.
- 121 participant grantees (individuals) from 16 school districts or charter schools were provided funding (an average of $27,684/individual) to attend identified leadership programs.

Timeline of Awards for Years 1 and 2

Date	Award	Awarded to	Total Amount Awarded
March 2015	Design awards to Providers – round 1	Catapult Leadership	$83,000
		Relay Graduate School	$0
		University of Denver	$110,108
		University of Virginia	$0
May 2015	Design award to Providers – round 2	Generation Schools Network	$65,000
May 2015	Awards to Participants	Adams 12	$110,150
		Adams Arapahoe	$512,307
		Denver Public Schools (CO High Charter)	$44,330
		Denver Public Schools	$615,150
		Lake County	$82,772
		Montezuma-Cortez	$39,540
		Pueblo City Schools 60	$163,750
		West End School District	$73,300
November 2015	Design awards to Provider – round 3	Promethean/University of Florida	$59,362
		Relay Graduate School (principal manager program)	$132,067
March 2016	Awards to Participants	Adams 12	$162,600
		Adams-Arapahoe	$297,001

		Aguilar School District	$142,127
		Boulder Valley	$32,000
		Colorado Springs District 11	$65,400
		Denver Public Schools	$360,000
		Greeley-Evans Weld 6	$126,588
		Huerfano School District	$142,127
		Ignacio School District	$142,127
		Jefferson County	$42,000
		Lake County	$65,400
		Pueblo City Schools 60	$131,200
	Total Awarded to date		**$3,799,406**

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 student performance measures are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a school's and a district's performance. This leads to the type of plan a school and district will implement. Schools and districts that 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.

---

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

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 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.

> "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."

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 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 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 Year 1: Providers

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 fall 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,
   c)   The provider's capacity to implement program components, and
   d)   Availability of programs to leaders across the state.

---

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

In September 2015, CDE distributed its second 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. Seven provider applicants responded to CDE's RFP in September 2015; two providers were approved and received one-time design grants. These include: 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).

2015-2016 Provider Programming

The above providers offered the following turnaround leadership programs during the 2015-16 school year. The table below represents the current list of identified providers.

Identified Provider	Program
Catapult School Leadership	Catapult School Leadership
Generation Schools Network Battelle for Kids University of Northern Colorado	Turnaround Leadership
Promethean and University of Florida	School Turnaround Leaders Development
Relay Graduate School of Education	National Principals Academy Fellowship, and National Principals Academy Fellowship for Principal Managers
University of Denver	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, and Turnaround Success Program
University of Virginia	Partners for Leaders in Education

For a more complete description of these providers, please see Appendix C: 2015-2016 Provider Summaries.

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 fall 2015 RFPs. Each approved provider is required to report on a set of required metrics, as well as an annual self-assessment, to the Department on or before July 1, of the following year.

The metrics submitted by providers are shown in Appendix E: 2015-2016 Year 2 Provider Metrics.

The following is a summary of the participants:
- Number of applicants: 72
- Number accepted: 68
- Acceptance rate: 94% average
- Participant demographics of both groups: see Appendix E
- Number of participants in

- o Principal role: 41
- o Assistant Principal role: 10
- o Other role: 17

Providers reported improvements for participants in regard to turnaround leadership competencies, which are connected to the Colorado Principal Quality Standards. The benefit of turnaround leadership development was unique to each of the programs. The degree of improvement and the framework varied by provider, and was based on the specific program offering or the district's tool. A few examples submitted by Providers include:

- Catapult: "1. High satisfaction rates from Fellows on curriculum, faculty and coaching. 2. Observed improvements in student and teacher engagement directly related to leader efforts. 3. Documented growth on all measures of turnaround leadership competencies. 4. Documented growth on key performance areas on principal evaluation tool…"
- University of Denver: "All of our Turnaround Fellows had strong support from their mentor principals/superintendents, and they all demonstrated growth in leadership competencies" as identified on the program rubric.
- Relay: "In our coursework that most closely ties to Quality Standard II, Principals demonstrate [an increase in] instructional leadership."

In addition, providers are required to complete an annual self-assessment that includes successes, challenges, key lessons learned and anticipated improvements. This information provides a feedback loop to both the Colorado Department of Education, as well as the providers who use this information to plan for improvements for the following year.

The self-assessment feedback from the providers is being used to assess next steps with the overall grant program. The following are examples that help at an aggregate level with grant programming, as well as offer transparency into the self-assessment and continuous improvement efforts of individual providers.

Self-assessment feedback from summer/fall 2016

Catapult	The focus provided by CDE on priorities and key competencies was a strong foundation to work from. Tools from Public Impact are highly complementary to Catapult curriculum and assessments. Participants were especially grateful for the cohort model and specifically referenced the value of working with other leaders from outside their district. Improvements we have made based on what we've learned this year: • Additional practice and application for design and structural thinking has been built into the June institute. • Catapult coaches have engaged in additional training and collaboration on specific turnaround challenges. • New workshops on group dynamics and organizational transformation theory have been developed. • Coaches have been trained on assessment tools for structural tension charts. • Catapult performance assessment has been refined to reflect our learning from this year.
DU Turnaround Success	We are not sure if it currently makes sense for us to continue to offer this type of customized approach as part of the Turnaround leadership resources available to the school districts in Colorado. One way we may adjust that might lead to more success is if we are customizing a series of workshops, leadership retreats, and skill building seminars and take less of a consulting approach.
Relay Graduate	This year, with the generous support of the Colorado Department of Education, Relay has been building upon our foundational program to expand our services to directly impact supporting staff and principal supervisors.

School of Education	1. Ancillary Trainings and Visits for School Staff: This year, we began to conduct National Principals Academy Fellowship (NPAF)-related trainings for leadership team members who work with an NPAF participant, but are not enrolled themselves, to engage school staff at all levels around the core tenets of effective leadership and deepen the reach of the program. We have done so through school visits providing on-the-ground support and real-time feedback on implementing NPAF readiness tools and best practices. 2. Principal Managers Training: After completing the program design, Relay is now offering more differentiated training specifically for principal supervisors who participate in NPAF (in the 2016-17 school year). The new principal manager components include breakout sessions, dedicated coursework and targeted practice opportunities. Anecdotally, we have heard that the increased involvement of principal supervisors is creating greater cohesion and alignment for leadership teams. We find that participants with managers trained by NPAF are more likely to consistently implement observation/feedback tactics.
University of Virginia	We are reporting a change in principals' behavior and look forward to comparing our observations around these schools' progress with CDE. Observations include: • Increased focus on holding others accountable for performance • Enhanced conceptual thinking, applied towards revamping systems for climate and culture • Increased culture of expectations • Talent management focus: enhanced recruitment and vision • Willingness to take risks and redesign approaches not working • Increased focus on instructional leadership • Enhanced focus on high-leverage levers versus multitude of initiatives • Increased results-orientation around creating collaborative ownership of problems

The STLD Program Year 1: Participants

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)). In addition to adhering to a standard grant application process, the rules articulated the following criteria for identifying district and charter school recipients:

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 program.

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

In the winter of 2015, 11 school districts and charter schools applied; eight of these were funded for participating in identified providers' programs. The district and school grantees are participating in STLD programs, as follows: 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 District, Pueblo City School District, and West End Public Schools RE2.

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

- Number of participants
- Schools served
- Impact on student achievement
- Change in participants' actions and behavior

District/School	Participants	Provider(s)
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	6 school leaders	Relay Graduate School
Aurora Public Schools	6 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School
	23 school leaders, district leaders	University of Virginia
	6 school leaders	Catapult
Colorado High School Charter in Denver Public Schools	1 aspiring leader, 1 school leader	University of Denver
Denver Public Schools	17 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School
	6 aspiring leaders	University of Denver
Lake County School District	1 school leader	University of Denver
	1 school leader	Relay Graduate School
Montezuma-Cortez District	3 school leaders, 3 district leaders	University of Virginia
Pueblo City School District	6 school leaders, 2 district leaders	Relay Graduate School
West End Public Schools RE2	7 school leaders/aspiring leaders	University of Denver

Participants were also required to report on impact to student achievement and the change in principal or aspiring leader's actions/behavior.

Improvements in student achievement: Districts approached submitting student achievement data differently, including providing average GPA, CMAS Science and Social Studies, CMAS PARCC ELA and Math scores, teacher attendance data, formative assessment data such as ANet and DRA, truancy and suspension rates, etc. Thus, it was difficult to draw comparisons between districts or even within districts or schools in some cases. Additionally, it is difficult to draw a causal relationship between student achievement and grant programs alone. However, some of the gains reported are highlighted below:

- Significant reading deficiencies in K-3 decreased at end of year.
- Increase in student completion rates.
- Increase in student attendance rates.
- Decrease in drop-out and truancy rates.

Improvement strategies and implementation benchmarks: Reported as a result of the leadership development programs are highlighted below:

- 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.
- Teacher retention improved in numerous schools.

Improvements in leadership competence: All districts reported improvements in demonstrated behavior of school leaders based on the framework used either by the district or provider. Again, similar challenges with developing trends and patterns across districts and schools persisted due to variability and differences in approach or language of the framework. However, some of the improvements reported from participating districts are highlighted below:

- 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.
- Surveys were used in some districts to measure: leaders' self-confidence; teacher perceptions about leaders' behaviors; teacher and leader climate perceptions; and other subjective data.
- Aspiring leaders participating in programs were promoted to assistant principals or principals.

The STLD Program Year 1 Results: Summary and Next Steps

Our assessment of this program in Year 1 identified the following successes, challenges, and next steps.

Successes:

- *Development of provider content that focused specifically on school turnaround.* In-course improvements were made throughout the year. 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.
- *Turnaround school leadership improvement across the state of Colorado*. Students in eight districts, which included over 40 schools, experienced leadership practices that were influenced by the individual leader development opportunities in programs like DU, Catapult, and Relay, as well as the leadership team development opportunities in programs like UVA and Relay. 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.* 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.

Challenges:

- *Data collection and evaluation.* Districts and providers submitted varying metrics and measurements both in the area of student achievement and leadership competence. In the future, CDE will revise the qualitative data collection from districts and will partner with WestEd to develop this evaluative report. The next data collection cycle will focus on the value added by these leadership development programs and the return on investment of the funds.
- *Internal application/identification of participants in school districts.* In Year 1, with short timing, it was a challenge for all districts to strategically identify individuals to participate. Going forward, it will be easier for districts to approach individuals after having some experience in this area, as well as a better understanding of the program offerings and options.
- *Communication between providers and districts.* With providers working within several different district structures, it was at times difficult to ensure an efficient flow of communication between organizations. Again, this will be easier going forward with some experiences to draw from.

Next Steps:

- *Offer a two-hour pre-grant application workshop that includes examples and sharing on how to identify participants and match with providers.* This should include presentations by providers and opportunities to network. Continue to support districts in normalizing internal identification and matching processes for participants/programs.
- *Refine data collection by creating a standard online tool that all providers must use* to:
  o Track participants and leadership competence against a rubric
  o Track progress in real-time
  o Answer direct self-assessment questions
- *Refine data collection by creating a standard online tool that all participating districts/schools must use* to:
  o Track participants, their associated programs and schools
  o Enter a standard set of student achievement and engagement data annually
- *Create an online survey tool for both providers and participants* to ensure a standard set of responses at the end of the grant year.
- *Offer a mid-year half-day check-in for providers and participating districts* to troubleshoot and ensure communication lines are clear.

Create opportunities for identified providers and other principal-preparation programs to network and learn from one another. Such a gathering was held on October 11, 2016.

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. The grant program continues to meet key milestones in the timeline provided, with this grant report signaling the end of the first year of the grant and evidence of success in its wake. As we move into the second year of the grant, we will continue to improve in the gap areas identified above in order to maximize the STLD program's reach and financial support in creating talent development pipelines for lower-performing districts and schools in the state of Colorado.

Timeline

Timeline for Providers and Participants

June 5, 2014 – Governor John Hickenlooper signed the School Turnaround Leaders Development (STLD) bill (SB 14-124).

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 2016-2017 school year.

February 1, 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.

March, 2017– STLD evaluation report submitted to the State Board, the Governor, and the Education Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

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.]

Proposals to amend the Rules for minor clarifications will be initiated with the State Board of Education in October 2016.

Authority: Article IX, Section 1, <u>Colorado Constitution.</u> 22-2-106(1)(a) and (c); 22-2-107(1)(c); 22-7-409(1.5); 22-13-103 of the <u>Colorado Revised Statutes</u> (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)   <u>Charter School:</u> 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)   <u>Department:</u> The Department of Education created and existing pursuant to section 24-1-115, C.R.S.

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

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

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

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

2.00(7)   <u>School Turnaround Leader</u>: 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)   <u>Turnaround plan:</u> 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)   <u>Priority Improvement plan:</u> 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)   <u>State Board</u>: 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 l eadership 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

This rubric located in the RFP has been updated. The revised rubric and RFP can be found at:
http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/turnaroundleadership

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: 2015-2016 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 NPAF 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)
1. 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
2. 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
3. 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)**

	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.