Principal-Administrator Induction Program Application

Initial Program Authorization or Renewal Authorization

# Purpose

This document is for use by principal-administrator induction program leaders who are seeking initial approval or who are applying for program renewal. The application begins on p. 4.

# Authorization and Reauthorization Process

By statute, any school, district, or BOCES can be authorized to operate an induction program. Applicants must submit a self-evaluation rubric to CDE for initial program approval and resubmit every five years for program renewal.

Note that a school, district, or BOCES can apply for induction approval for all three of the induction audiences or for any combination. A separate application is required for each induction audience: teacher, SSP and principal/administrator. A school could choose to run their own induction program for teachers and then use another organization’s approved induction program (BOCES or neighboring district) for SSP and principal/administrator. That decision is left to the discretion of the program leaders. However, initial licenses are only valid in organizations with a plan in place for induction. If an organization is not going to provide induction for all three groups, then they must designate an alternate agency with an approved program and have plans in place so that all service providers within their district with an initial license have access to induction.

## Initial Applications: Timeline

Initial induction applications can be submitted any time, but they are reviewed twice a year, in April and October. Applications submitted from October 16 to April 15 will be reviewed in April. Applications submitted from April 16 to October 15 will be reviewed in October. Once approved, all program renewals are due on January 15. This means that a program approved in November would have a renewal date of January 15 in just over 5 years (due to the timing of the program approval). For example, an approval in November of 2024 would have a renewal date of January 15 of 2030.

## Renewals: Timeline

All induction programs have a renewal date of January 15. If a program is due for renewal, program leaders will receive notification by September before the renewal along with details on how to submit the renewal/reauthorization application.

## Using the Rubric

The induction rubrics include a set of “MUST” indicators and “SHOULD” indicators. Indicators that are listed as a “MUST” have to be included in a program in order to be approved. Indicators that are listed as a “SHOULD” are strongly recommended.

The induction rubrics also have four possible ratings for each indicator. A score of “meeting” on a rubric indicator is meeting the requirement. A rating of “exceeding” indicates that a program is exceeding the indicator in that area. A rating of “not meeting” means there is no evidence of that indicator in current practice and a rating of “developing” means there is a partial implementation of that indicator. Each indicator has descriptions for what that level of implementation would look like in a program. If program leaders score a “not meeting” or “developing” on a rubric indicator, they should be sure to include a description of their plans for improvement in that area within the narrative.

**Note that there is no minimum score for an approved program**. Program reviewers take a comprehensive look at each induction program along with plans for improvement. This process is intended to facilitate reflection on current practices and areas for growth. Most programs will have a mixture of ratings within any given section. There is no score threshold to meet in order to be an approved program.

## Review Process

Induction program reviewers are typically a combination of CDE staff and induction leaders from across the state. Each program application receives at least two reviews with a third review completed if there are areas of disagreement. Each reviewer provides feedback on each section of the rubric, focusing on any concerns and highlighting areas of excellence. Then the reviewer provides a recommendation of pass or improvement needed based on a holistic review of the application. That feedback is then compiled for the program leaders and shared. If a program is in the “needs improvement” category, the CDE Educator Development team works with the program leaders to discuss concerns and areas for growth. It is possible to resubmit an application if it is not approved. If a program is in the “approved” category, program leaders will receive an approval letter along with feedback from the review team for growth. The review process typically takes 30-60 days to complete, but that can vary depending on how many programs apply in a given review window.

# Completing The Application

The application below is completed differently for programs seeking an initial application versus those completing a renewal application. Please pay careful attention to the directions for your application type.

## Initial Applications

If completing this application for initial approval of an induction program, provide a narrative of no more than 500 words for each section of the rubric that explains how the proposed program will ensure compliance with the indicators in that section. For instance, in section 1 focused on program design, the narrative will explain how the proposed program will comply with indicators 1.1 to 1.3 with an emphasis on overall program design. In section 2, the narrative will focus on professional learning, etc. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the proposed program and how program leaders will implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

## Renewal Applications

For an induction program renewal application, use the highlighter tool in a word processing program to highlight the descriptors for each section of the rubric that most clearly describes the current program implementation. For instance, for indicator 1.1, if the current implementation falls in the “meeting” category, highlight the text in the “meeting” section of the rubric like this: Induction programming includes opportunities for training, coaching and mentorship to orient the new leader to the profession, network with other leaders, build technical skills, plan for school improvement and develop leadership capabilities. Every standard should have a descriptor highlighted.

We anticipate that there will be a variety of ratings within any section of the rubric based on the current program implementation. Please prioritize an honest self-assessment. It would be highly unusual for a program to score all “exceeding” or all “meeting” on the indicators.

After each section of the rubric, write a narrative of no more than 300 words that explains how the program is currently implementing the indicators in that section of the rubric. For instance, in section 1 focused on program design, the narrative will explain how the program implements indicators 1.1 to 1.3 with an emphasis on overall program design. For any indicator marked as “not meeting” or “developing,” please describe plans to improve in that area in the next five-year renewal period. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the program and how program leaders implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

## Supplementary Materials

Induction programs also have the option to submit supporting program documentation such as survey results, program data or an induction handbook. This documentation is not required for program approval, but it can be helpful in providing additional context for reviewers. Reviewers rely primarily on the induction rubric and accompanying narratives to complete their induction review. This accompanying documentation will only be considered if induction reviewers need additional context for any statements in the narrative or rating within the rubric.

## Submitting the Application

Once the application is complete, it can be submitted to educator\_development@cde.state.co.us along with any supplementary application materials such as an induction handbook (see details above). If using a Google doc version of the application, please download the doc in a .docx or .pdf format and send as an attachment.

## Application Support

The Educator Development team at CDE is available to support program leaders throughout the induction application process. Please reach out to educator\_development@cde.state.co.us

# Principal-Administrator Induction: Program Application

Please refer to the induction handbook for detailed information on the submission process and best practices in the rubric.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of School, District, or BOCES** |  |
| **Address** |  |
| **Induction Program Main Contact** |  |
| **Title or Role** |  |
| **Email Address** |  |
| **Phone Number** |  |
| **Length of Induction Program** | 1 year2 years3 yearsVaried (1-3 years), explain below. |
| **Explanation of Varied Program Length** | *If program length is anything other than one, two, or three years (such as for two years for new vs. one for transferred teachers), explain here.* |
| **Any Partnerships Involved in This Induction Program (outside content providers, BOCES, Institutes of Higher Education, etc.)** |  |

# Principal-Administrator Induction Rubric

Developed from 1 CCR 301-37 Section 9.00-9.04

**Initial applications**: Include a narrative after each section of the rubric.

**Renewing programs**: Please use the highlighter tool in Microsoft Word or Google docs to highlight the text in the descriptor of each rubric indicator below that best describes the current program implementation. Highlighted text should look something like this. Each indicator should have a descriptor highlighted. Also include a narrative after each section of the rubric.

## Principal/Admin Section 1: Program Design

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 1.1 Be designed to meet five purposes: orientation, professional networking, technical skill development, school improvement planning and leadership development.9.01(2)(a-e) | Induction programming is missing one or more of these key elements: orient the new leader to the profession, network with other leaders, build technical skills, plan for school improvement and develop leadership capabilities. Or opportunities vary by placement site. | Induction programming includes basic training to orient the new leader to the profession, network with other leaders, build technical skills, plan for school improvement and develop leadership capabilities. | Induction programming includes opportunities for training, coaching and mentorship to orient the new leader to the profession, network with other leaders, build technical skills, plan for school improvement and develop leadership capabilities. | Induction programming includes extensive opportunities for training, coaching and mentorship to orient the new leader to the profession, network with other leaders, build technical skills, plan for school improvement and develop leadership capabilities that are distributed throughout the school year. |
| 1.2 Train site administrators in the Colorado Academic Standards and in the Principal and Administrator Quality Standards9.01(3)(a) | Induction site administrators have not been trained in the Colorado Academic standards and/or the Teacher, SSP, or Principal Quality Standards. | Induction site administrators are exposed to the Colorado Academic standards and the Teacher, SSP and Principal Quality Standards. Training may lack depth. | Induction site administrators are fully trained in the Colorado Academic standards and the Teacher, SSP and Principal Quality Standards. | Induction site administrators and principals are fully trained in the Colorado Academic standards and the Teacher, SSP and Principal Quality Standards, including annual updates. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 1.3 Utilize a needs assessment to identity specific and appropriate programming for inductees9.04(1) | The program does not conduct a needs assessment and/or does not adjust programming to meet the needs of inductees. | The program utilizes an informal needs assessment and modifies some programming to meet the needs of each year’s class of inductees. | The program utilizes an annual needs assessment and then provides choice programming to meet the needs of each year’s class of inductees. | The program utilizes an annual needs assessment and then adjusts induction programming to meet the needs of each year’s class of inductees, including choice programming. |

**Principal-Administrator Section 1: Program Design**

**Program Narrative**

**Initial applications**: Provide a narrative of no more than 500 words that explains how the proposed program will ensure compliance with the indicators in the program design section of the rubric, indicators 1.1 to 1.3. Your narrative should describe your specific program policies and procedures. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the proposed program and how program leaders will implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

**Renewing programs**: Provide a narrative of no more than 300 words that explains how the program is currently implementing the indicators in the program design section of the rubric, indicators 1.1 to 1.3. For any indicator marked as “not meeting” or “developing,” please describe plans to improve in that area in the next five-year renewal period. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the program and how program leaders implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Design Narrative** |
|  |

## Principal/Admin Section 2: Professional Learning

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 2.1 Provide inductees with support for school improvement planning processes9.01(1)(a) | New leaders are not provided training on the Local Education Provider’s (LEP) school improvement processes or that training varies by placement site. | New leaders are provided basic training on the LEP’s school improvement processes. | New leaders are provided training, mentoring and coaching on the LEP’s school improvement processes. | New leaders are provided training on the LEP’s school improvement processes early in the school year as well as mentoring and coaching throughout the year on school improvement planning. Coaching includes opportunities for reflection. |
| 2.2 Provide inductees with support for the application of effective, research-based teaching practices in an emotionally, intellectually and physically safe learning environment9.01(1)(b) and 9.01(2)(b) | New leaders are not provided training on effective research-based teaching practices in a safe learning environment or that training varies by placement site. | New leaders are provided basic training on effective research-based teaching practices in a safe learning environment. | New leaders are provided training on effective research-based teaching practices in a safe learning environment as well as mentoring and coaching on serving as a building instructional leader. | New leaders are provided training on effective research-based teaching practices in a safe learning environment early in the school year as well as mentoring and coaching throughout the year on serving as a building instructional leader. Coaching includes opportunities for reflection. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 2.3 Provide assistance with systems of collaboration to include families, colleagues, instructional teams and the broader educational community, ensuring the success of all students9.01(1)(c) | New leaders are not provided training on how to build a collaborative school community that includes families, colleagues, instructional leadership teams and the broader context or that training varies by placement site. | New leaders are provided basic training on how to build a collaborative school community that includes families, colleagues, instructional leadership teams and the broader context. | New leaders are provided training on how to build a collaborative school community that includes families, colleagues, instructional leadership teams and the broader context as well as mentoring and coaching on collaborative school communities. | New leaders are provided training on how to build a collaborative school community that includes families, colleagues, instructional leadership teams and the broader context early in the school year as well as mentoring and coaching on collaborative school communities throughout the school year. Coaching includes opportunities for reflection. |
| 2.4 Provide assistance with developing, advocating for and supporting inclusive and rigorous learning environments that honor students’ diversity9.01(1)(d) | New leaders are not provided training on how to develop, advocate for and support inclusive and rigorous learning environments that embrace students’ diverse backgrounds or that training varies by placement site. | New leaders are provided basic training on how to develop, advocate for and support inclusive and rigorous learning environments that embrace students’ diverse backgrounds. | New leaders are provided training on how to develop, advocate for and support inclusive and rigorous learning environments that embrace students’ diverse backgrounds as well as mentoring and coaching on how to support an inclusive and rigorous learning environment. | New leaders are provided training on how to develop, advocate for and support inclusive and rigorous learning environments that embrace students’ diverse backgrounds early in the school year as well as mentoring and coaching on how to support an inclusive and rigorous learning environment throughout the school year. Coaching includes opportunities for reflection. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 2.5 Provide training in the legal and ethical obligations of school leaders to support the diverse learning needs of all students.9.01(1)(e) | New leaders are not provided training in the ethical obligations of school leaders, including related laws or that training varies by placement site. | New leaders are provided basic training in the ethical obligations of school leaders, including related laws. | New leaders are provided training in the ethical obligations of school leaders, including related laws, as well as mentoring and coaching on legal and ethical obligations. | New leaders are provided training in the ethical obligations of school leaders, including related laws, early in the school year as well as mentoring and coaching on legal and ethical obligations throughout the school year. Coaching includes opportunities for reflection. |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 2.6 Promote a sequential learning plan for inductees based on current level of knowledge and skills9.04(2) | The induction program does not follow a sequential learning plan. | The induction program follows a sequential learning plan. This plan is not necessarily differentiated for the inductee’s skill level. | Each inductee has a sequential learning plan that provides at least some choice to differentiate for their current level of knowledge and skill. | Each inductee designs a sequential learning plan that is personalized for their individual level of knowledge and skill. |

**Principal-Administrator Section 2: Professional Learning**

**Program Narrative**

**Initial applications**: Provide a narrative of no more than 500 words that explains how the proposed program will ensure compliance with the indicators in the professional learning section of the rubric, indicators 2.1 to 2.6. Your narrative should describe your specific program policies and procedures. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the proposed program and how program leaders will implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

**Renewing programs**: Provide a narrative of no more than 300 words that explains how the program is currently implementing the indicators in the professional learning section of the rubric, indicators 2.1 to 2.6. For any indicator marked as “not meeting” or “developing,” please describe plans to improve in that area in the next five-year renewal period. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the program and how program leaders implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

|  |
| --- |
| **Professional Learning Narrative** |
|  |

## Principal/Admin Section 3: High-Quality Mentoring

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 3.1 Establish standards for the selection and training of mentors who work with new leaders9.01(3)(b) | There are not guidelines in place for the selection of mentors and/or mentors do not receive formal training. | There are guidelines in place for the selection of mentors and a basic training plan for mentors. | There are clear, written guidelines in place for the selection of mentors and for their training. | There are clear, written guidelines in place for the selection of mentors and clear, written standards for what skills mentors need to develop in order to work with new leaders. These guidelines are developed or reviewed in conjunction with multiple stakeholders, including inductees. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 3.2 Select mentors that demonstrate:* leadership and effectiveness as a school principal or district administrator
* a deep understanding and knowledge of the Principal Quality Standards;
* well-developed interpersonal skills including the ability to empathize with others, listen and question effectively and explore multiple solutions to problems
* effective oral and written communication skills and
* a contextual awareness of the political, social and practical realities of the inductee

9.01(3)(b)(i-v) | Mentors are not generally selected for their effectiveness as a leader, understanding of the principal quality standards, well-developed interpersonal skills, effective communication skills or knowledge of the realities of the inductees’ context. | Mentors are generally selected for their effectiveness as a leader, understanding of the principal quality standards, well-developed interpersonal skills, effective communication skills and knowledge of the realities of the inductees’ context but these qualities are not included in mentor selection criteria. | Mentors are selected for their effectiveness as a leader, understanding of the principal quality standards, well-developed interpersonal skills, effective communication skills and knowledge of the realities of the inductees’ context. These qualities are included in formal written guidelines for mentor selection. | Mentors are selected for their effectiveness as a leader, understanding of the principal quality standards, well-developed interpersonal skills, effective communication skills and knowledge of the realities of the inductees’ context. These qualities are included in formal written guidelines for mentor selection. Mentors consistently model these skills in their interactions with their inductees. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 3.3 Implement a staff development plan for mentors which includes, but is not limited to:* orientation to the skills of mentoring and coaching
* training in how to support inductee development in the knowledge and skills contained in the Principal Quality Standards
* training in providing growth-producing feedback

9.01(3)(d)(i-iii) | Mentor training is missing one or more of the required elements in 3.3. | Mentor training contains basic information on all three required elements in 3.3. | Mentor training contains all three required elements in 3.3 with sufficient depth and practice. | Mentor training contains all three required elements in 3.3 with significant depth and practice.  |
| 3.4 Ensure, when possible, that mentors do not serve as evaluators. If mentors are to be involved in such evaluations, policies must state the specific roles and responsibilities of the mentor in evaluations and provide training for mentors in those roles 9.01(3)(e) and 9.01(3)(e)(i) | There is no clear communication about whether mentors are included in evaluations or mentors are always included in evaluation. | Mentors are sometimes included in evaluations, but inductees are usually warned about their participation. | There is a clear, written policy in place that explains the mentor’s role in evaluation, understood by both the mentor and inductee. If the mentor will be included in evaluation, they are trained for that role. | There is a clear, written policy in place that explains the mentor’s role in evaluation. If the mentor will be included in evaluation, they are trained for that role. Mentors consistently educate inductees about what will and will not be included in evaluation data. |

##

**Principal-Administrator Section 3: High-Quality Mentoring**

**Program Narrative**

**Initial applications**: Provide a narrative of no more than 500 words that explains how the proposed program will ensure compliance with the indicators in the high-quality mentoring section of the rubric, indicators 3.1 to 3.4. Your narrative should describe your specific program policies and procedures. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the proposed program and how program leaders will implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

**Renewing programs**: Provide a narrative of no more than 300 words that explains how the program is currently implementing the indicators in the high-quality mentoring section of the rubric, indicators 3.1 to 3.4. For any indicator marked as “not meeting” or “developing,” please describe plans to improve in that area in the next five-year renewal period. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the program and how program leaders implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

|  |
| --- |
| **High-Quality Mentoring Narrative** |
|  |

## Principal/Admin Section 4: Continuous Program Improvement

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 4.1 Conduct a self-evaluation and submit to the Department for program renewal every five years9.00 | The induction program does not conduct program review. | The induction program does not consistently conduct program review. | The induction program conducts program review every five years for CDE renewal. | The induction program conducts program review every five years for CDE renewal, but data is reviewed more frequently, including stakeholder feedback. |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 4.2 Engage in annual program review, including all stakeholders, in order to promote systemic change and continuous improvement9.04(3) | Program review is conducted on less than an annual basis or does not include stakeholders. | Annual program review includes some stakeholders, but primarily focuses on leadership. | Annual review includes all stakeholders. Program review is used to guide program updates. | The annual review includes all stakeholders, including inductees. Program review includes multiple data points used to guide substantive program improvements. |

**Principal-Administrator Section 4: Continuous Program Improvement**

**Program Narrative**

**Initial applications**: Provide a narrative of no more than 500 words that explains how the proposed program will ensure compliance with the indicators in the continuous program improvement section of the rubric, indicators 4.1 to 4.2. Your narrative should describe your specific program policies and procedures. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the proposed program and how program leaders will implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

**Renewing programs**: Provide a narrative of no more than 300 words that explains how the program is currently implementing the indicators in the continuous program improvement section of the rubric, indicators 4.1 to 4.2. For any indicator marked as “not meeting” or “developing,” please describe plans to improve in that area in the next five-year renewal period. It is helpful to reviewers if the narrative is a cohesive whole focused on a description of the program and how program leaders implement the indicators in that section of the rubric rather than using a list or organizing the description indicator-by-indicator.

|  |
| --- |
| **Continuous Program Improvement Narrative** |
|  |

**Supplementary Materials (optional)**

If the application includes any supplementary materials such as a program handbook, survey data, etc., please provide a list of the materials submitted along with a brief description of each.

*
*

Submit completed application to educator\_development@cde.state.co.us