Applicant
Robert Rogers

Why do you want to be on the Board of Education for Academy District 20?
I'm the proud parent of two D20 graduates. I've seen what this district accomplishes when educators, students, families, and staff can do the work of public education.

I've also watched the Board bury that work beneath politics, casting the adults at the dais as the district's main characters.

I don't expect the current Board to appoint me, which may be my strongest qualification.

An appointment process that rewards applicants for flattering the people choosing them and performing alignment with the Board's preferred "values" turns public service into court etiquette with a Microsoft Form. The formal question asks why applicants want to serve. The practical test is whether their answer will make the Board comfortable. The Board needs someone who can tell the difference between support and surrender.

I'm applying because this application will become a public record. The public deserves one candidate willing to examine the Board's recent history without politely hiding it at another table.

The proposed GP 4.8 rewrite makes the central problem visible. An accountability body would depend on repeated Board approval while its chair is judged partly for alignment with the Board's governance expectations, mission, and priorities.

Selecting an accountability committee for alignment produces applause with minutes.

Accountability creates friction. It tests the story against the records and becomes most useful when agreement stops being convenient. Once alignment becomes the admission price, oversight turns into supervised agreement.

I don't align with the values this Board has demonstrated, and I won't insult anyone by pretending otherwise.

Loyalty to the Board protects officeholders. Loyalty to the district protects students, employees, families, and the public. Confusing those obligations is how public duty becomes personal loyalty.

The same pattern appears in the Board's treatment of process. A whole-work review of Almost Perfect produced an 87.8 percent retention recommendation, and administration found the process faithful. Three directors reversed it without supplying a better record. That kind of process provides scenery for a decision already made.

The clearest contradiction arrived in the Board's own superintendent oversight. In January, the Board certified compliance and approved a superintendent contract through 2028. Four months later, it moved toward discharge after four executive sessions in eight days.

Whatever happened privately, that public chronology belongs to the Board.

The public can ask whether January's judgment failed, May's judgment failed, or oversight failed between them without seeing a personnel file. Executive sessions may protect lawful confidentiality while leaving the Board responsible for the decisions waiting outside when the doors reopen.

Either the January decision failed or the May decision did. The missing reconciliation requires more than trust us.

Treating senior leadership contracts like impulse purchases leaves taxpayers paying the return shipping.

I want to serve because D20 needs a Board capable of hearing "no" without experiencing it as insubordination and using evidence without sending it back for ideological revisions. It should govern without rummaging through administration for political fingerprints. Five competing voices from the dais turn governance into amateur administration.

Evidence and law should outlast enthusiasm and preference, while professional judgment survives political weather. Students shouldn't have to endure the adults' appetite for theater.

If those values disqualify me, I can live with the rejection. The public should pay attention to the reason.

What would be your top 3 priorities if you joined the ASD20 Board of Education?
My priorities would be to make the district curious again, make every promise carry its cost, and make Board power legible.

First, make the district curious again.

D20 should survey resident families who enroll their children elsewhere, then follow with interviews and listening sessions. Ask what they sought, what they couldn't find here, why they left, and what might persuade them to return. Publish the response rate, findings, actions, and follow-up results.

Use the dashboard to locate the departure, then ask families why they left.

The number of D20-resident students attending other Colorado public systems rose from 1,725 in 2019-20 to 2,812 in 2025-26, an increase of roughly 63 percent. The increase measures the departure while leaving the reasons unknown, so the Board should treat it as feedback.

Families have already supplied an unflattering dataset. The Board should ask why and change course when the answers warrant it.

The Board should set lawful outcomes and guardrails, then allow administrators to investigate problems and act on evidence without ideological supervision. Employment decisions should follow published qualifications, documented performance, consistent process, and anti-discrimination law. End the ideological weather reports.

Second, make every promise carry its cost.

The FY 2026-27 budget package showed a $7.23 million gap between General Fund revenue and expenditures and transfers. The gap may be lawful while still straining future budgets.

Balanced slides can't manufacture recurring revenue.

Every major initiative should identify its recurring funding, staffing obligation, tradeoffs, measurable benefit, and exit criteria. One-time money has a nasty habit of expiring before recurring promises do. A failed program shouldn't become permanent because cancellation would require an honest meeting.

Leadership reversals belong on the same ledger. In 2025, the District gave General Counsel Tonya Thompson a three-year contract. Within months, it entered a separation agreement

stating $360,000 in compensation. Whatever the undisclosed personnel details, taxpayers assumed a substantial obligation almost immediately after the District made a much longer commitment.

The Thompson separation and the superintendent action involved different facts. They still demand the public chronology, authorization trail, total cost, oversight failure, and corrective action. The Board owes that explanation after the vote.

Third, make Board power legible.

Once consequential action is over, public comment becomes a customer-satisfaction survey attached to a receipt.

Consequential public comment should occur before the vote. Major policy changes need public redlines, version histories, sponsors, and explanations. Material contracts should disclose their purpose, selection method, continuing cost, and measurable result.

Major leadership reversals need a lawful public after-action account. Personnel details can remain confidential. The prior monitoring record, public chronology, aggregate cost, lawful disposition, and corrective steps belong in the public account. Privacy should protect people rather than camouflage the Board's oversight.

The Board should govern collectively through policy and hold the superintendent accountable for measurable results. It shouldn't become an amateur operating department with a gavel.

Outside counsel should face periodic competitive review under disclosed criteria for independence, public-law competence, conflicts, cost discipline, and service quality. Counsel should restrain unlawful power even when the advice makes the Board uncomfortable. No public contractor should acquire tenure by invoice.

A Board that treats students as props and employees as ideological accessories will drain trust faster than it can rename the deficit engagement.

Which Board policy do you believe should be changed/removed/updated and why?
In a properly governed district, I would use this answer to discuss concurrent enrollment, school access, graduation pathways, student privacy, or discipline. Those policies shape

where students learn, the opportunities they can pursue, whether they graduate, and when their education can be interrupted.

Instead, I have to begin with GP 4.8 because the Board has made the independence of its own accountability committee an unresolved governance problem.

I'd rather discuss how students reach college. The Board has instead forced a preliminary question about whether accountability may disagree with the people being held accountable. The Board's response will define its demonstrated "values."

I would rewrite GP 4.8 before the Board turns the District Accountability Committee into a committee for managing accountability.

The latest captured proposal would require school-representative candidates to be submitted annually for Board approval. The Board could appoint additional ad hoc members. The superintendent's facilitator and committee membership would receive annual Board approval. The Board would select the DAC chair from finalists using alignment with governance expectations, collaborative leadership, mission, and strategic priorities.

An earlier packet version also said failure to meet committee expectations could constitute grounds for removal. The latest captured version deleted that sentence.

Deleting the most conspicuous threat was the minimum sensible edit, but the machinery remained.

The Board still controls appointments and annual approval, including selection of the chair, while asking members to support the governance responsibilities of the institution they're supposed to examine. The word accountability cannot confer independence on a committee the Board appoints, chairs, approves, and annually reapproves.

The design creates the conflict regardless of who occupies the seats.

Civility should govern conduct, while political or other differences of opinion cannot justify rejecting an otherwise qualified applicant without turning appointment into viewpoint discrimination.

I would replace alignment with objective duties. Members should follow the law, disclose conflicts, attend meetings, protect legitimately confidential information, examine evidence, represent their constituencies, and perform the statutory work. Political obedience appears nowhere on that list.

Under C.R.S. 22-11-301(5), DAC members select a parent representative to serve as chair or co-chair. The Board establishes the length of the term. The statute gives the Board no role in choosing finalists or imposing alignment criteria, and it reserves no confirmation power. Political discomfort provides no basis for rejection and may signal that the committee has finally reached the useful part.

School representation should be presumed valid when a school uses a lawful and publicly described selection process. Any Board rejection should require written findings. Additional Board appointments should carry a written justification and a cap that preserves the weight of school-selected representatives.

The policy should protect minority reports. The right to advise is meaningless if the advice must arrive pre-approved. Mandatory consensus is often dissent sent through document control until it disappears.

Future revisions should include a public redline, version history, explanation of the changes, and enough time for DAC members and the public to respond. The public shouldn't need to practice policy archaeology to discover what its Board intends to change. Packet comparison shouldn't be the district's unofficial transparency portal.

Lawfulness, competence, candor, and the capacity to hear "no" belong among the Board's values.

An accountability committee designed to avoid friction will miss the danger it was created to detect.

Please list any committees, associations or other roles you have had within school is ASD20, or schools outside of our District.

I haven't held a formal D20 or outside-school committee role, so I have no committee title to inflate. I'm the parent of two D20 graduates. Since their graduation, I've continued through public-meeting observation, records research, policy and budget analysis, source preservation, and public accountability work. I've spent years reading the packets, policies, contracts, budgets, campaign filings, litigation records, and meeting transcripts that

residents are routinely expected to understand after work, dinner, homework, and bedtime. I've helped make those records usable for people who don't have the time or technical appetite to navigate systems that reward persistence more than accessibility. I know where decisions leave records and where the record goes thin. I also know when a polished conclusion outruns the evidence beneath it. I've done the work before anyone granted permission or supplied a title. The public record gave me the assignment.

If you have students in the district, which school(s) do they attend?
I decline to answer this question as framed. Whether an applicant currently has children enrolled in D20 is not a statutory qualification for Board service, and it should not become an informal one.

The question asks the Board to sort applicants by family circumstance. Used as a selection criterion, that can invite discrimination or create the appearance of a protected-class screen. A vacancy appointment should not turn parenthood, caregiving, or a child's enrollment status into a proxy for who is worthy to serve.

I am a district elector, taxpayer, and proud parent of two recent D20 graduates, one from [redacted] and one from [redacted]. Their diplomas ended enrollment. They did not end my citizenship, my stake in the district, or my responsibility to insist on competent public governance.

The relevant questions are whether an applicant is legally qualified, exercises independent judgment, and will represent every student, family, employee, and taxpayer. That is what I offer.

Outside of education, what are you most passionate about/what motivates you?
I'm passionate about finding the moment when a system's language and behavior stop matching.
Power gets easier to hide when it is scattered. A contract, an invoice, a revised policy, and a vote months later can each seem routine. Put them in chronological order, and the explanation sometimes stops matching the record.

I test claims against their own paperwork. Documents can expose a broken story without supplying a villain or conspiracy.

My work is to make records stop behaving like strangers.

Recently, that work has led me to the money moving through El Paso County school-board races. In 2021, Colorado TRACER records show $180,000 in Colorado Springs Forward-labeled contributions to Springs Opportunity Fund, which then reported $179,998.94 in advertising spending.

In 2023, Colorado Dawn contributed $586,702.42 to Springs Opportunity Fund. The committee reported $586,176.25 in spending on mail, digital advertising, text messages, canvassing, video, and research.

In 2025, Springs Opportunity Fund reported $45,101.40 in spending. Advance Colorado Action contributed $125,000 to D11 Parents and Teachers, which reported $210,642.40 in spending. Families for D49 reported another $12,676.43 in D49 spending after recording a net $12,676.43 contribution from Taxpayer's Advocacy Fund.

Across the five El Paso school-board IEC committee-year windows I have identified, reported spending totals $1,034,595.42. The figure measures committee expenditures. It cannot serve as a unique-dollar total for Advance Colorado or assign an upstream dollar to a particular candidate communication.

That is enough to raise the question that most motivates this work.

What do these funders expect to accomplish by investing so heavily in a recognizable type of school-board candidate, one whose politics often appear more animated by culture-war combat than by the patient work of public education?

I don't presume the answer. I follow the filings, the mail, the votes, the contracts, and the results. I want to know whether public education remains the goal or merely the terrain on which a more politically dependable governing majority is built. The money tells the public where to look and which explanations deserve more than a press release.

Cynicism assumes accuracy is wasted because nothing changes. I take the opposite view. Institutions can be questioned, corrected, and occasionally embarrassed by their own records.

Trust follows evidence rather than office.

Rob Rogers

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP / FISCAL STEWARDSHIP / PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

COLORADO SPRINGS, CO / 7 / /

Executive leader, board president and treasurer, and United States Air Force veteran with more than 30 years directing complex organizations, multimillion-dollar budgets, contracts, and high-consequence delivery. Led Agile operations for a nearly $1 billion program supporting a federal national-security mission across three Agile Release Trains and a multi-contractor environment. Brings strategic judgment, fiscal discipline, technical depth, and a practiced command of public governance and institutional accountability.

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

BOARD GOVERNANCE / BUDGETS & FIDUCIARY OVERSIGHT / STRATEGIC PLANNING / CONTRACTS & PROCUREMENT / POLICY & RISK / STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT / DATA GOVERNANCE / ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Subterra Insights

FEB 2024-PRESENT

Founder and Principal Consultant / *Colorado Springs, CO*

- Founded a research and strategic-analysis practice serving commercial organizations, government contractors, political campaigns, journalists, and public-interest stakeholders.
- Architect real-time data-ingestion pipelines and analytical platforms in support of a national-security mission, validating, normalizing, and transforming high-volume public and operational data into visible measures of risk, performance, and outcomes.
- Design accountable AI and large-language-model solutions for structured extraction, classification, retrieval, summarization, and human review; manage secure AWS environments as code through Terraform and develop graph-based analysis of source-backed relationships.

Parsons Corporation

JUN 2018-JAN 2024

Vice President, Lean Agile Center of Excellence / Vice President, Operations / *Colorado Springs, CO*

- Served as the primary SAFe Practice Consultant and Solution Train Engineer for a nearly $1 billion program supporting a federal national-security mission.
- Led Scaled Agile implementation across three Agile Release Trains, coordinating planning, dependencies, risk, priorities, and delivery across technical teams, contractors, program leadership, and government stakeholders.
- Directed multimillion-dollar budgets and built integrated reporting that gave leaders near-real-time visibility into cost, capacity, priorities, dependencies, and delivery progress.
- Trained more than 1,000 employees and customers in Scaled Agile practices, collaborative planning, organizational improvement, and outcome-focused delivery.

Polaris Alpha

NOV 2016-JUN 2018

Vice President, Mission Solutions / *Alexandria, VA*

- Directed mission-critical technology and analytical work for defense and intelligence customers, managing contracts, forecasts, delivery commitments, resources, and senior stakeholder relationships while integrating organizations after a corporate merger.

Intelligent Software Solutions

MAR 2001-NOV 2016

Vice President / Director / Engineering Manager / Senior Field Engineer / *Alexandria, VA / Key West, FL*

- Progressed from field engineering to executive leadership while leading federal contracts and technical organizations supporting public safety, homeland security, law enforcement, defense, and intelligence missions.
- Managed budgets, cost estimates, staffing plans, schedules, contracts, engineering teams, and senior stakeholder relationships; consolidated fragmented analytical systems into sustainable platforms that reduced support burdens and improved operational usefulness.

United States Air Force

FEB 1992-MAR 2001

Radar Performance Evaluator / Tracking Technician / *Hill AFB, UT / NAS Key West, FL / Elmendorf AFB, AK*

- Served nine years in operational, analytical, supervisory, and training assignments supporting continuous radar-surveillance and data-fusion operations, including system evaluations and aircraft-accident investigations.
- Developed qualification materials, trained operations personnel, and supported cross-functional process improvement and major system modernization.

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Huntley Meadows Homeowners Association

2014-2016

Board President and Treasurer

- Appointed in June 2014 and elected by the membership as Board President to a full two-year term in December 2014; led fiduciary governance of an 86-unit townhome community beside historic sites, including budgets, contracts, shared assets, and long-term resident priorities.
- Secured and administered grants for historically compatible property improvements and Virginia-native wildscaping, including contractor selection and oversight.

CURRENT D20 CIVIC WORK

Academy District 20 Civic Research

CURRENT

Independent Research and Public Engagement / *Colorado Springs, CO*

- Conducts source-based analysis of district governance, board actions, policies, budgets, enrollment, public records, and institutional decision-making.
- Builds and publishes evidence trails from official materials and public datasets that distinguish documented facts, attributed statements, interpretations, unresolved questions, and allegations.
- Designed a comprehensive training program on Colorado Open Records Act requests, helping residents identify records, draft focused requests, evaluate productions, and use public information for effective self-governance and accountability.

EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

Saint Leo University / B.S., Computer Information Systems, 2004 / Summa Cum Laude

SAFe 6 Certified Practice Consultant (SPC) / Active as of June 1, 2026