LUMINARY
LEARNING NETWORK

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
LUMINARY LEARNING NETWORK BOARD
Tuesday September 18, 2018 at 8:30 AM

8:30 - 8:45	Welcome and Review of Agenda, Objectives for the day
8:45 - 9:45	Board Composition ● Objectives: ○ Identify potential candidates to fill slate ○ Decide on timelines and process for changes
9:45 - 10: 45	Zone Collaborative Council ● Objectives: ○ Develop consensus on LLN goals for the council and how to achieve these goals in concert with other new and developing Zones
10:45 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:30	Accountability ● Objectives: ○ Discuss which accountability metrics should be used in this year's renewal process ○ Surface potential tension with current system ○ Define a plan for improving upon current system
12:30 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Succession Planning ● Objectives: ○ Identify gaps in current process ○ Identify path forward for succession planning
2:00 - 2:15	Review next steps
2:15 – 4:00	Regular Board Meeting

	• Approve minutes from 7/31/18 Meeting • ED Update • Review, update, and/or finalize various policies • Discuss renewal timeline • Update on DGS expansion plans • Discuss future meeting dates
4:00 – 5:00	• Executive Session: Executive Director Evaluation Discussion

The meeting will be held at the Gates Family Foundation, 1390 Lawrence Street, Suite 400, Denver, CO 80204

LLN Board Retreat 9.18.18
Minutes

Attendees:
- Mary Seawell, President | Senior Vice President for Education, Gates Family Foundation
- Jen Walmer, Vice President | ED, ERN Colorado
- Savinay Chandrasekhar, Secretary | CEO, Minds Matter Denver
- Frank Coyne, Director | Lead Partner, Denver Green School
- Janet Lopez, Director | Sr Program Officer, Rose Community Foundation
- Jessica Roberts | ED, Luminary Learning Network
- Julia Shepherd | Principal, C3 Elementary
- Brett Alessi, Facilitator | Empower Schools
- Cara McKenna, Facilitator | Empower Schools

Board Composition
Brainstormed potential board candidates

Phasing:
- Goal is to fill 2 new spaces by 11/1 (in time for application renewal)
- Potentially roll off J. Walmer in December, another board member in April and the last in June with the goal of having the board re-constituted by June 2019. Important to think about having political clout on the LLN board, especially in light of how District - Zone Council comes together (or doesn't).
- Select officers after board filled
- Revise by-laws?

Zone Collaborative Council

- Reviewed goals for the Council
- Process update from Jess
- Discussion
  - Inclusion of Single-Site Innovation schools; used to be a charter roundtable 3x per year
    - Not a problem to have a single site rep on that group
    - Expressed need to make room for single site innovation schools, there are 54 other schools, long term strategy
      - How does this work with SBB+ being different for zones?
    - Zone schools are different, innovation schools are managed by the district, Zone schools have different processes-willing to go above and beyond to do application and renewal process
    - Concern that making this just about Zones might dilute the power of the council
      - Would rather push on idea to push policy rather than just makeup

- How did charter collaborative work?
  - Autonomous, so could say no
  - Had a compact and shared expectations, council came out of the compact
- Concern that statement of focus sounds really soft
  - Primary goal should be advancing the needs of Zones
  - Secondary goal is sharing learning
  - Wants this to advance autonomy, be more on the offense
  - Maybe including language like "protection and promotion of autonomies"
  - Draft feels more like an Innovation council, rather than Zone council
  - Is there a space to do something Zone specific
- Need clarity on the model
  - How to have a structure that is both inclusive and gets things done
  - What parts of this are voting? Non-voting?
    - Currently a consensus model
  - Charter collaborative council starts with Commitments--should include that here
    - Sustaining Innovation Autonomy should be one of these
  - Could create working groups like
    - SBB?
    - Zone group?
  - Group would have mostly Zone representation, but also single site representative
    - Then working groups

- Need to change process
  - One big stumbling block has been that not everyone is at the table
  - Feels like district is taking too much ownership of this
  - Possibility of a grant tied to participation of stakeholders
  - Can we avoid getting hung up in the document--make it strong and get going
- Overall Feedback
  - Add values at the beginning (Goals or Commitments)
    - Possibly use Charter Collaborative Council language (easier to use DPS language)
  - Amend statement of purpose to be more specific to Zones
    - Advancing the purpose of Innovation Zones
    - Getting engagement and communication from the larger group
    - Elevate the voice and position of Innovation Zones (and IMOs?)
  - Change composition
  - Make decision making more tangible
    - Consensus might be preferred, but can we say that dissenting votes or ideas will be shared "for the record"
    - If doing vote-getting, could clarify who gets a vote

- - ■ Quarterly Innovation Roundtables (quarterly) with monthly Zone council meetings
        - ● Innovation Council could be focused on shared learning
        - ● Zone Council does more of the work around SBB+, MOU etc.
  - ○ Options
    - ■ 1. Based on NDIZ application, start there, make changes to Innovation Zone council including amending statement of purpose to include advancing autonomous innovation zones (not just shared learning). This would impact council makeup and potentially decision-making (i.e. not consensus)
    - ■ 2. Umbrella Innovation Council, smaller Zone council

Accountability
- ● LLN Data Presentation
  - ○ SPF released Thursday to Principal's, and then two week appeal process before release
  - ○ Proficiency, ELA
    - ■ Ashley significant increase, will get boost in SPF for this
    - ■ Cole decreased
    - ■ C3 the same
    - ■ DGS the same
    - ■ Valdez small increase
  - ○ MGP, ELA
    - ■ Ashley significant increase
    - ■ Cole significant increase
    - ■ C3 small decrease
    - ■ DGS decrease
    - ■ Valdez decrease
    - ■ Ashley and Cole standards based, Ashley working with ANet
      - ● Frustrated with proficiency
      - ● Ashley half a point away from a "high growth" school
      - ● Cole using a new data feedback cycle this year, each teacher will be met with weekly (Kia is more data focused than Jen was)
  - ○ Proficiency, Math
    - ■ All but Cole demonstrated moderate growth
  - ○ MGP, Math
    - ■ Gains at Ashley
    - ■ Huge gains at Cole
    - ■ Dip at C3
    - ■ Significant growth at DGS
    - ■ Small dip at Valdez
  - ○ LLN ELA MGP, +1 over last year, excludes Valdez
  - ○ LLN Math MGP, +17.5 over last year, excludes Valdez
    - ■ Highest year over year increase across governance types in district

- State SPFs are out
- Which metrics should be used in renewal process?
  - Concern and frustration is that three years of data is supposed to be used, now renewing on two years of data
  - Timeline
    - We can meet this fall, but in new application, delineate a new timeline for full use of data
    - Challenge is that 3 schools are up for innovation renewal--Valdez, DGS, Ashley while Zone renewal is happening
      - Need to separate these--vote on your school plan, then voting on the Zone
  - Has anyone looked at the Collective Bargaining agreement?
    - Statute says you only need to vote if your school or zone plan changes substantially; school vote was given away in a negotiation
  - In renewal application, do we continue to use the SPF?
    - Can we include an asterisk that says if the SPF changes significantly we have option to change metric?

Succession Planning
- 2 processes for school leader succession: 1) if we have an internal candidate, and 2) if we don't.
- For 1, make sure it is in innovation school plan
- 2 year succession plan - schools share that with LLN board for approval. Bring person in and do due diligence on candidates.
- School succession planning suggested wording:
  - School leaders can optionally develop a succession plan (and likely will do so during innovation renewals) for approval by the LLN Board
  - School leaders can also alter/create a new succession plan at any time and bring it to the LLN Board for review
    - If a school leader with an LLN Board approved succession plan vacates the role, then the LLN Board will interview the candidate identified in the plan and provide a recommendation on the candidate
    - If a school leader *without* an LLN-Board approved succession plan vacates the role, than the standard "LLN Leadership Succession" process will be followed
- LLN ED succession planning
  - Normal hiring process. What are values and what is important for schools?
  - Key qualifications and values