**Restart Resources for Denver Public Schools**

As part of the Restart Authorization project, sponsored by the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, we have prepared the following documentation to facilitate the completion of our “Resource Database”. The Resource Database is a collection of tools, artifacts, process descriptions and other original source materials from authorizers, state education agencies, third party support organizations and funders that relate to authorizing charters (or contracted schools) as restart operators. The Resource Database complements the Process Guide, which provides the written narrative of guiding principles and process steps to authorizers and restart operators.

**Part 1: Permission to Use Resources**

In the course of the last several months, organizations have submitted a number of documents to the project for review; in addition, we have collected a few publicly available materials from websites. The documents listed below are the resources from your organization that we would like to include in our Resource Database. The Resource Database will be:

* Published via the internet (linked from multiple sites) and made publicly available at no cost
* Cross-referenced throughout the Process Guide both by general reference and by links to specific documents in the Resource Database
* Searchable by keyword, region, type of document, process step and other common tags to help users find applicable resources
* Reviewed 2-3 times in 2016 and possibly again in 2017 for updates/additions/subtractions
* Jointly managed by EdPlex and Public Impact
* Structured to allow for user feedback and commentary, if possible

At this time, we are not sure whether the Resource Database will continue to be available beyond 2017 as we recognize that the field evolves quickly and there are not financial resources set aside for ongoing maintenance.

By adding your name by each resource listed below, you are:

* Granting permission for each document to be published in the Resource Database
* Acknowledging that you understand the purpose and intent of the Resource Database as a free and publicly available tool
* Acknowledging that if you change your mind and would like your resource removed from the database, you will need to reach out to a designated contact at EdPlex or Public Impact to request this change as part of the review cycles scheduled for 2016 and possibly 2017

In addition to adding your name to grant permission for use, please:

* List any desired modifications or redactions that you would like the project team to complete (you may also edit directly and e-mail revised version)
* Note whether you are willing to provide the resource in an editable format; editable formats are much more useful for our users as they enable people to more quickly adapt tools for their own use without recreating them (and avoid future direct requests to you for an editable version)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resource File Name (s)** | **Name of Individual Granting Permission for Use** | **Any requested modifications or redactions within the resource prior to publishing**If yes, please specify information to redact or modify (e.g. page numbers, names, etc.) | **If the file is not yet in an editable format, are you willing to provide it in one?****(**e.g. Word, Powerpoint, Excel) |
| Denver-Plan-2020\_Strategic Plan | Jennifer Holladay |  | [no](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BxkoX9T4joa8b21jYnp4bThmTVk/view?usp=sharing) |
| Denver School Performance Compact | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg1Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg2Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg3Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg4Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg5Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg6Community Engagement Process\_Denver Final Recs | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable for the most part |
| Call for New Quality Schools 2016 | Jennifer Holladay  |  | no |
| Call for New Quality Schools Board Recommendations 2015 | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |
| Call for New Quality Schools Supplement 2015 | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| Call for New Quality Schools Supplement Overview Handout 2015 | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| Multi-School Rubric | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |
| Multi-School Evaluation Approach | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |
| Training for Application Review Team Members | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |
| School Closure Process and Checklist | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |
| SPF School Performance Stoplight | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| SPF Performance Indicators | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| SPF Performance Rubric | Jennifer Holladay |  | No |
| Training and Support to Schools Pre-Opening | Jennifer Holladay |  | Already editable |

21 total files from DPS

**Part 2: Resource Descriptions and Lessons Learned**

Each document in the Resource Database will be published with text to describe how the document was used, where it came from and high-level outcomes or lessons learned from using the document. The working group to this project has emphasized the importance of providing this type of context with each published resource.

In the tables provided for each resource:

1. Suggest any revisions to file name title.
2. Review and edit the draft “Description” (if included) of the resource to articulate the intended audience, purpose and high-level content within the resource.
* Minimize or eliminate the use of abbreviations.
* 3-5 sentences is sufficient.
* If a draft description is not included, please create one.
1. Add text to describe the outcomes and lessons learned from the use of the resource.
* Consider what would be most important for an external reviewer to understand in order to learn from and adapt the tool/resource.
* 3-5 sentences is sufficient (can be less if there is not much to say).
* The text can be specifically about the resource (e.g. “The presentation probably includes too much detail for a large public meeting, but it helped to ensure accurate reporting about the process in local media outlets”), or about the process step that the resource represents (e.g. “The handbook for School Councils is a good example of Community Engagement but it provided too much detail and was too prescriptive about their responsibilities and activities. It exposed the District to criticism because the Councils were not conducting many of these activities and we did not have capacity to monitor and support their work.”).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Denver Plan 2020\_Strategic Plan** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Envision, Engage, Accountability |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Strategic Plan |
| **Vignette** | Denver Strategy |
| **Linked Files** | (none) |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | The Denver Plan 2020 is a five year strategic plan that was formulated with extensive community input and engagement. The primary audience for this work is the broader community in Denver and the elected Board of Education uses the plan to guide oversight activities for all schools, both district and charter. It identifies a primary goal of having great schools in every neighborhood, which in turn serves as the foundation for the school turnaround and restart work in Denver. All schools in Denver are measured using the School Performance Framework, which is grounded primarily in academic growth and achievement.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | In the process to create the plan, community input was collected through a variety of mechanisms. This process took over six months, but generated more broad-based support for the goals identified in the plan. The plan was a total overhaul of the prior strategic plan and thus intentionally narrowed the focus to only five key goals with one of the goals serving as an over-arching goal. The plan is now easier to understand and utilize because it is simpler and more focused.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Denver School Performance Compact** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Match, Accountability |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Performance Management, Policy |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Linked Files** | (none) |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This is a Denver Board of Education adopted policy that came out of the Denver Plan 2020 work. It establishes principles to guide the identification of schools for school replacement, restart and/or closure. The policy applies across district-run and charter schools. The policy establishes the importance of community engagement throughout a process to intervene with a low performing school. It works in tandem with the Call for New Quality Schools process in Denver and related policies like Denver’ Facility Allocation Policy.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | The initial policy was adopted in December 2015. The first official year of implementation will be the 2016-17 school year. To date, the policy helps the district narrow intensive supports to a subset of schools that are candidates for closure and/or restart. One of the lessons learned thus far is that the policy itself is a starting point and the implementation guidelines for the policy are more challenging to tease out. The adopted version of the policy does not articulate the screening criteria to designate a school as persistently low-performing, but the policy does create a requirement that such designation be made by November in the year preceding any potential intervention.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Call for New Quality Schools Supplement 2015** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Engage, Recruit, Approve, Match |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver |
| **Vignette** | Intro\_Denver Identify |
| **Linked Files** | Entire series of Community Engagement Process files from DenverCall for New Quality Schools Supplement Overview Handout 2015 |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This document from Denver Public Schools is a combined invitation for new operators to apply and for pre-approved operators to seek a match placement at specific sites in the city that are in need of restart. This supplement was issued in May of 2015, after the standard Call for New Quality Schools process in Denver because the district did not receive sufficient applications from qualified schools to restart or replace designated low-performing schools. In matching a potential operator to school building that previously (or currently) housed a low-performing school, Denver utilizes a policy called the “Facility Allocation Policy”. This Facility Allocation Policy guides the matching decision.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) |  One of the lessons learned in this process was the importance of starting a community dialogue as soon as possible; in this case, starting community engagement over the summer was not soon enough for a potential placement that takes effect twelve months later. Denver now attempts to provide 18 months between the initial invitation to operators and the opening day of the new school. Another lesson learned was specific to the nature of this invitation and the fact that it advertised excess space in a building that currently housed a school program. Specifically, opposition from the existing school community during the process reinforced the importance of starting the conversation early.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Call for New Quality Schools Supplement Overview Handout 2015** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Engage, Approve, Match |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver |
| **Vignette** | Intro\_Denver Identify |
| **Related Files** | Entire series of Community Engagement Process files from DenverCall for New Quality Schools Supplement 2015 |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This simple two-page handout explains the new school approval process in Denver and highlights the various ways that community members can get involved with the process. The graphic presentation makes it a useful tool, particularly with community members with limited English proficiency (though the document would also be translated and distributed). The second page of the handout is customized to the specific region where a community meeting is being held and provides an overview of the operators who are presenting to the community and seeking consideration for placement within that regions.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | This handout was developed in response to feedback received from the community that the much longer Call for New Quality Schools document was difficult to understand. In an effort to make sure that community members are informed about the process to open new schools, the handout walks through the application and approval process. Given the challenge of conversations around potential restart operators, this handout can be useful in establishing a baseline understanding about the process before community members are asked to consider specific operators that may match as the restart provider for their existing school.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Names**  | **Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg1****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg2****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg3****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg4****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg5****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Mtg6****Community Engagement Process\_Denver Final Recs** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Envision, Identify, Engage, Recruit, Match,  |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Tool |
| **Vignette** | Intro\_Denver Identify |
| **Related Files** | Call for New Quality Schools Supplement 2015Call for New Quality Schools Supplement Overview Handout 2015 |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This series of seven presentations was used to facilitate a community thought partner group in Denver. A community thought partner group is a collection of key stakeholders such as parents, guardians and broader community stakeholders who convene in order to learn about school intervention strategies and in turn provide input to district level decisions about school turnaround, closure and/or restart. In Denver, thought partner groups tend to have 10 to 15 people. These presentations walk a community group through the entire process of envisioning, identification, reviewing quality applicants and then creating matching recommendations. It is intended for the community audience and designed to support easy translation (Spanish versions available). This particular series of meetings worked in coordination with the release of Denver’s Call for New Quality Schools Supplement 2015.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | This particular series of meeting started in May 2015 and resulted in a report out in September from the thought partner group. The group outlined perceived strengths and weaknesses of school operators that proposed to restart or supplement the existing low-performing program. The attendance in the series of meetings was low, suggesting that parents are not as engaged over the summer. In addition, attendees who started the process did not necessarily participate throughout, suggesting that it is difficult to sustain interest over an extended period of time. In future decisions, Denver Public Schools plans to convene focus groups that meet only once to provide input into school “match” decisions. Another lesson learned is that there should be clear criteria upfront as to who should be eligible to participate in the thought partner group (or focus group).  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Call for New Quality Schools 2016** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Engage, Recruit, Approve, Match |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Policy |
| **Vignette** | Denver Call |
| **Related Files** | Call for New Quality Schools Board Recommendations 2015 |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This document from Denver Public Schools is an example of their annual invitation to interested parties to apply to open a new school in Denver. One unique feature of the Denver process is that both charter schools and district-run schools go through the same review and approval process prior to opening. This ensures that a standard set of quality criteria is applied prior to opening for any new public school. This document opens by reminding the audience of the broader strategic plan and goal for having a high percentage of performing schools in Denver (see Denver Strategic Plan). The primary function of the document is to explain where DPS sees needs for new schools; these needs may arise out of existing over-crowding or out of persistently low-performing schools that need to be replaced. This document works through the regions of the city that need new schools and explains the student demographics in these neighborhoods so that school developers can tailor their applications to meet the needs of the specific students. This document also explains the Denver “placement process” (i.e. match process). The outcome to this process is a series of recommendations to the Denver Board of Education, a sample for which is provided in the Call for New Quality Schools Board Recommendations 2015.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | The Call for New Quality Schools process originally debuted in Denver in approximately 2009. Since that time, a number of related policies have been put in place to clarify performance expectations for all schools and to establish shared goals around the agreed percentage of schools that should be high performing in each region of the city. The Call is separate from the actual school application guides that walk potential applicants through the detailed questions that they need to address when applying to open a new district-run or charter school. DPS has tried various strategies to engage community members in the conversation about new schools and both requires applicants to demonstrate some degree of community support and also facilitates community forums where applicants present their ideas and vision. Colorado state law forbids a district authorizer from denying a charter applicant simply because there is not a documented need for new schools in the region or neighborhood where the charter intends to locate. However, the law does let an authorizer consider whether a school is likely to be financially viable and obtaining adequate enrollment is a large piece of financial viability. To that end, the Call document has evolved to share detailed information about where there is over- and under-supply of school seats in neighborhoods throughout the city.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Call for New Quality Schools Board Recommendations 2015** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Approve, Match |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver |
| **Vignette** | Denver Call |
| **Related Files** | Call for New Quality Schools 2016 |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This presentation is an example of the way that Denver Public Schools presents its new school approval and denial recommendations to the elected Board of Education. It includes recommendations for all new schools (whether district-run or charter). This particular presentation includes one approval for a restart operator, University Prep II, which sought to replicate an existing high performing charter to take over a closing charter school. The recommendations ground the conversation in the existing local and state policies that apply to new school approval processes as well as the over-arching school quality goals articulated in Denver’s strategic plan. |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | Denver’s new school approval recommendations have evolved over time since they were first introduced in approximately 2009. In 2011, Denver introduced the School Quality Framework to guide the evaluation of both school applications and implementations in terms of the quality of the various program components. This modification created a unified approach to quality assessments on the front, middle and back end of a school’s life cycle. In 2012, Denver started using a mix of standard and school-specific conditions in its approval recommendations to address the fact that sometimes new school applicants came very close to meeting the quality bar, but needed to adjust one or two items to fully be in compliance. In 2013, Denver started calling out the details of the proposed school’s facility placement in a separate callout. This callout is the place where staff recommends the operator to serve as the restart provider (or not) of an existing low-performing school.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Multi-School Evaluation Approach** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Approve, Accountability, Post-Opening |
| **Keywords/Location** | Charter Management Organization, Tool |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Linked Files** | Multi-School Rubric |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This presentation explains how Denver Public Schools approaches oversight differently for entities that operate multiple school sites (e.g., charter management organizations). It articulates guiding principles for how a given multiple-school site organization should demonstrate capacity and efficacy in running more than one school, as distinct from those things a single-site operator would articulate for just one school site. The presentation is intended for an audience of existing school leaders as part of the charter renewal process. It includes a list of the specific document requests that DPS will make to evaluate the strength and capacity of a multi-site organization.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | Denver developed this supplement to its existing school quality framework in recognition of the importance of considering specific central office strengths and capacity as part of their school quality reviews. These principles apply both in the new school application review and the ongoing oversight and/or charter renewal review. The MSO rubric has evolved based on feedback from existing charter management organizations as well as the need to consider district-run schools that are also effectively “operating” multiple sites that are replications of one another.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Multi-School Rubric** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Approve, Accountability, Post-Opening |
| **Keywords** | Charter Management Organization, Tool, Restart Operator Application |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Linked Files** | Multi-School Evaluation Approach |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | Denver Public Schools uses this rubric to guide new school applications and existing operations of school organizations that oversee more than one school site. This tool is particularly useful when schools are applying to replicate their program, whether or not the replication site is a restart or fresh start. The indicators on the rubric are designed to address those specific aspects of governance, oversight and organizational capacity that should be in place for a school operator to oversee multiple sites. One unique feature of the school landscape in Denver is that there are both charter and district-run operators who oversee multiple sites of their established school model. The rubric supplements a larger comprehensive School Quality Framework that evaluates a quality school design and implementation in Denver. |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | Denver has implemented this approach in recognition of the fact that the health of the multi-site operator is a foundation to the sustainability of each individual school site. Denver uses this rubric because it has learned that the potential quality of a new school site depends in part on the capacity of the operator to support coordination and consistent quality across multiple sites, where applicable. Over time, the multi-school rubric has been adapted to work across both charter and district-run schools. Because of the Colorado innovation laws, district-run schools can operate with many of the same freedoms as charter schools while still functioning as part of the school district. Therefore, Denver has had to create authorizing practices that span both charter and district-run schools.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **School Closure Process and Checklist** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Accountability, Transition |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, tool |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Linked Files** | (none) |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This Denver document articulates all the legal and procedural requirements for a school that is closing. The tool is a working document that is shared between the closing school and the authorizer. It establishes clear expectations about who is responsible for what, when the various steps need to be completed and how best to complete the steps. It addresses a mix of items from what to do with furniture, fixtures and equipment that was purchased with public funds to what to do with student and HR records. It could be updated with the applicable state and local requirements for a different city or region of the country to be used as a tool. This type of tool would be helpful in a restart situation to ensure that the closing school prepares orderly records and satisfies all its financial obligations prior to closure.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | Denver has supported 1-2 charter schools in closing each year since 2011. Over time, this checklist has improved to clarify important items like how to handle student files and what to do with financial records. The checklist is usually accompanied by regular check-in meetings between the school and authorizer to verify progress against the checklist.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **SPF Performance Indicators** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Accountability |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Performance Management |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Related Files** | SPF Performance RubricSPF School Performance Stoplight |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | The one-pager summarizes all the possible performance indicators and potential point values in the Denver School Performance Framework (SPF). The relative possible point values translate to the degree of weighting of different measures. Certain measures are only applicable at the elementary or high school levels. The relative weighting of growth is high on the Denver SPF; for example, 51 points relate to growth and only 16 relate to proficiency at the elementary level. The student growth measures largely employ the Colorado Growth Model that creates percentile ranks for each student in the state based on comparing their performance to their cohort of matched peers across the state.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) |  In the last couple years, Denver has determined that its School Performance Framework is too heavily weighted towards growth, particularly for elementary schools where there should be a prevailing expectation that a significant percentage of students are reaching proficiency by the third grade. Therefore, changes are underway for the SPF to adjust the relative weightings and ensure that academic proficiency is weighted more heavily.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **SPF Performance Rubric** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Accountability |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Performance Management |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Related Files** | SPF School Performance StoplightSPF Performance Indicators |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | The detailed rubric that explains how points are computed and assigned for each indicator on the Denver Public Schools School Performance Framework. The SPF heavily emphasizes student growth within the various indicators on the SPF. This rubric explains how two years’ worth of school performance are factored into the scores for each indicator, using a grid that outlines how many points are awarded for meeting expectations in the prior year vs. the current year. The Denver SPF also heavily weights disaggregated data analysis for at risk groups like FRL, ELL, etc. The similar schools indicator looks out how each school compares to the schools in the district that are most similar to it in terms of the % FRL, % ELL, % SPED and % student mobility.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | Denver uses the similar schools comparison indicators to ensure that schools who serve like students (in terms of demographics) are compared to one another. This type of comparison ensures that restart and turnaround schools are given credit for their relative performance as compared to schools who also serve high numbers of at risk students. The SPF considers two years of data each time a school rating is generated, ensuring that data fluctuations are not overly influential in the overall rating.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **SPF School Performance Stoplight** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Identify, Accountability |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Performance Management |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Linked Files** | SPF Performance RubricSPF Performance Indicators |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This report is a sample stoplight report produced by the Denver School Performance Rating. The report is color-coded similar to a stoplight where red indicates low performance, green indicates adequate performance and blue indicates exceptional performance. This version of the stoplight is intended for an audience of educators. The stoplight is simplified when it is presented to the community. The relative weightings of the various indicators are easy to identify in this report based on comparing the total possible points for each group of indicators. This sample report shows how a school that serves a relatively high percentage of FRL students (77%) and ELL students (49%) can achieve the highest rating of distinguished on the Denver SPF.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) |  Denver is continuing to refine the weightings applied to the various indicators on the School Performance Framework. Over time, new weightings will be introduced to ensure that there is more balance between growth and proficiency, but at present growth is factored much more heavily than proficiency. In addition, Denver is continuing to refine the indicators that measure college readiness.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Training for Application Review Team Members** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Recruit, Approve |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Tool |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Related Files** | (none) |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This presentation serves to train the new school Application Review Team (ART) members in Denver. An ART team includes expertise from curriculum, student services, English language acquisition, finance, community engagement and school oversight. The team also includes a designated parent or community member and a separate external consultant. The training shares the rationale for approving new schools in Denver (including schools to replace failing schools) and then walks through the application structure and rubrics. It pairs with a calibration activity that ensures reviewers use a similar lens. |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) | The training for the application process has improved based on feedback from reviewers and increasing clarity about the policy guidelines for the work. This presentation helps facilitate that training and also introduces the review team members to one another. One of the key improvements to the process was the addition of practice exercises where participants read an excerpt from a prior application and then norm around the scoring. The practice has proven very helpful in making sure that people know how to read and interpret the scoring rubric before they are asked to apply it.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Name**  | **Training and Support to Schools Pre-Opening** |
| **Process Step(s)** | Transition |
| **Keywords/Location** | Denver, Tool |
| **Vignette** | (none) |
| **Related Files** | (none) |
| **Description**(e.g. What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | This document outlines a series of workshops that are designed to support new schools in an effective planning and transition year prior to opening in Denver. Denver calls the 12 months prior to opening “year zero” and proactively works with schools during this year to support them in building relationships within the district, learning about compliance requirements and making necessary decisions that will impact their program in the coming year. Workshops listed in this document are co-facilitated by the authorizing team and other relevant departments to ensure that all departments within the district are invested in the successful opening of the new school.  |
| **Outcomes & Lessons Learned**(e.g., What happened? What did you learn? What would you do different? What worked well?) |  The series of workshops planned and implemented during the twelve months prior to opening for a new school has evolved substantially in Denver. Denver has opened new schools (a mix of fresh starts and restarts/turnarounds) at a rate of 9-12 schools per year for the past several years. This has necessitated a very intentional approach to supporting these schools through this important transition period. These workshops now also include opportunities to hear from other school leaders who have recently opened schools – a favorite component among the incoming principals.  |

**Part 3: Additional Restart Resources**

Please identify any additional resources that you recommend for inclusion in the restart resource database. Please post the document to your DropBox folder and include a description and summary of outcomes and lessons learned.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Resource File Name** *(Please post actual document in DropBox folder)* | **Description** (What is it? What was the audience and purpose? How and why was it used?) | **Outcomes and Lessons Learned****(**e.g. What happened? What did you learn? What would you different? What worked well?) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |