Special Service Provider Induction Program Application

Initial Program Authorization or Renewal Authorization

# Purpose

This document is for use by Special Service Provider (SSP) 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 a BOCES program 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. Most often those services are provided through a BOCES if a district does not have an internal program.

## 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 November to March will be reviewed in April. Applications submitted from April to October will be reviewed in November. 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.

## 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 1.9 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 program has clear, written guidelines for program completion as well as a defined process for extending induction of a SSP who needs more time to develop skills. 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 1.9 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 program leaders 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

# Special Service Provider 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.)** |  |

# Special Service Provider Induction Rubric

Developed from 1 CCR 301-37 Section 8.02

**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.

## SSP Section 1: Program Design

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 1.1 Have clear guidelines for when an induction program is complete and when the program should be extended8.02(3)(h) | Induction program has vague or unwritten guidelines for program completion or for the process for extending induction of a SSP who needs more time to develop skills. | Induction program has some guidelines for program completion as well as a basic process for extending induction of a SSP who needs more time to develop skills. | Induction program has clear, written guidelines for program completion as well as a defined process for extending induction of a SSP who needs more time to develop skills. | Induction program has clear, written guidelines for program completion and a defined process for extending induction if a SSP needs more time to develop skills. These processes are shared with mentors and inductees and are applied consistently. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 1.2 Encourage collaborative relationships within the school system and partnerships between providers, institutions of higher education and community organizations.8.02(b)(ii) | School leaders do not fully support the induction program or do not participate.  | School leaders support the induction program and participate as needed.  | School leaders fully support the induction program and participate. There is some communication between the induction program and other districts, community organizations or universities around induction. | School leaders fully support the induction program and participate deeply. Induction program leaders participate in partnerships with other districts, CDE, community organizations and/or universities to learn about and create successful induction programming. |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 1.3 Provide release time for mentors and inductees8.02(4)(a)(i) | Mentors and/or inductees are not provided with release time to focus on mentoring activities. | Mentors and inductees are provided limited release time to focus on mentoring activities (less than one day per semester). | Both mentors and inductees are provided regular release time to focus on mentoring activities. | Both mentors and inductees are provided regular release time to focus on mentoring activities, including observing each other’s practice |
| 1.4 Provide some form of compensation for mentors8.02(4)(a)(ii) | Mentors are not compensated for their work.  | Mentors are sometimes compensated for their work, either in the form of monetary compensation or time. This may vary by placement. | Mentors are compensated for their work, either in the form of monetary compensation or time.  | Mentors are compensated for their work, either in the form of monetary compensation or time. Compensation is fair and commensurate with the work required. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 1.5 Provide inductees with supervisors who are skilled in working with new employees and mentors skilled in the specific SSP discipline8.02(4)(b)(i) | Supervisors are not necessarily selected for their skill in working with new employees and/or mentors do not have experience in the specific SSP discipline. | Supervisors are sometimes selected for their skill in working with new employees and mentors mostly have experience in the specific SSP discipline, but this is inconsistent. | Supervisors are selected for their skill in working with new employees. Mentors are skilled in the specific SSP discipline. On average, they demonstrate strong skills in this area. | Supervisors are selected for their skill in working with new employees. Mentors are skilled in the specific SSP discipline. On average, they demonstrate excellent skills in this area. |
| 1.6 Clarify expectations for inductees and mentor8.02(4)(b)(ii) | Inductees and mentors do not have a clear understanding of the expectations of the induction program. | Inductees and mentors have a basic understanding of the expectations of the induction program. | Inductees and mentors have a clear understanding of the expectations of the induction program. | Inductees and mentors have a very clear understanding of the expectations of the induction program. They can consistently fulfill expectations and create strong partnerships. |
| 1.7 Provide supports that address potential challenges within the mentor-inductee relationship (i.e. reassignment, conflict management, grievance process)8.02(4)(b)(iii) | Mentors and inductees are not able to be reassigned or have conflict management. | Mentors and inductees are able to be reassigned, file a grievance, or access conflict management if there are challenges but there is not a defined, written process. | There is a clear, written policy in place for overcoming challenges in the mentor-inductee relationship that includes reassignment, conflict management and/or grievance. | There is a clear pathway in place for overcoming challenges in the mentor-inductee relationship that includes reassignment, conflict management and/or grievance. Mentors and inductees understand the pathways and use them when needed. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 1.8 Provide the inductee with a safe, collegial atmosphere where professional growth takes place8.02(5)(e) | Inductees do not report that they work in a safe, collegial atmosphere or there is no mechanism in place to measure this outcome. | Some inductees report that they work in a safe, collegial atmosphere, but this may be inconsistent or vary by school site. | The majority of inductees report that they work in a safe, collegial atmosphere. | The majority of inductees report that they work in a safe, collegial atmosphere and that they have seen significant professional growth as a result of their induction experience. |
| 1.9 Utilize a needs assessment to identity specific and appropriate programming for inductees8.02(5)(a) | 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 significantly to meet the needs of each year’s class of inductees, including choice programming. |

**SSP 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 1.9. 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 1.9. 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** |
|  |

## SSP Section 2: Professional Learning

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 2.1 Provide demonstrations of high-quality instructional practices and/or evidence-based practices specific to the discipline8.02(1)(a)(i) | Induction programming does not include demonstrations of high-quality instructional practices or evidence-based practices specific to the SSP discipline. | Induction programming includes limited demonstrations of high-quality instructional practices and/or evidence-based practices specific to the SSP discipline. | Induction programming includes multiple demonstrations of high-quality instructional practices and/or evidence-based practices specific to the SSP’s discipline. | Induction programming includes multiple demonstrations of high-quality instructional practices and evidence-based practices specific to the SSP’s discipline, including utilizing strong instructional techniques in the delivery of induction programming. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 2.2 Provide professional development opportunities or mentoring support that includes: * improving the educational experiences of all students
* ways to accommodate diverse student populations
* a thorough orientation to the Local Education Provider’s (LEP) SSP effectiveness evaluation model
* information on SSP roles and responsibilities, including moral and ethical obligations
* information relating to the Special Services Provider Standards and how the specific SSP interacts with the Colorado Academic Standards
* information related to LEP policies and procedures, including how policies, procedures and practices get updated
* LEP goals and content standards
* information about the school community

8.02(1)(a)(ii-iv), 8.02(3)(a-f) and 8.02(1)(b)(iii) | Induction programming is missing 3 or more of the topics required in 2.2.  | Induction programming includes information on most of the topics in 2.2. Programming on these topics may lack depth in some areas or be missing 1-2 topics. | Induction programming includes information on all required 2.2 topics. | Induction programming includes information on all required 2.2 topics that is distributed in time across the induction program and includes participant reflections. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 2.3 Build a foundation for the continued study of the SSP discipline8.02(1)(b)(i) | The induction program does not address continued study of the SSP discipline. | The induction program encourages inductees to continue studying their discipline but does not provide specific techniques. | The induction program introduces inductees to a variety of techniques for continuing to study their discipline (i.e. professional organizations, professional literature, social media, etc.). | The induction program introduces inductees to a variety of techniques for continuing to study their discipline and has the inductee try out at least one of those techniques during induction (i.e. joining a professional organization, reading professional literature, utilizing social media for professional learning, etc.). |
| 2.4 Provide an orientation for new SSPs to the application of the profession in the educational context, including the culture of the school system, the Local Education Provider (LEP) and the community8.02(1)(b)(iii) | The induction program does not provide a basic orientation for new SSPs to the application of the profession in the educational context, including the culture of the school system, the LEP and the community. | The induction program provides a basic orientation for new SSPs to the application of the profession in the educational context, including the culture of the school system, the LEP and the community. | The induction program provides a strong orientation for new SSPs to the application of the profession in the educational context, including the culture of the school system, the LEP and the community. | The induction program provides a strong orientation for new SSPs to the application of the profession in the educational context, including the culture of the school system, the LEP and the community that is embedded throughout the school year. |
| 2.5 Provide substantive feedback to the inductee about performance8.02(3)(g) | Inductees do not receive consistent feedback about their performance or this varies by school site. | Inductees receive basic feedback about their performance | Inductees receive substantive job-embedded feedback about their performance | Inductees receive substantive job-embedded feedback about their performance throughout the school year |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 2.6 Promote a sequential learning plan for inductees based on current level of knowledge and skills8.02(5)(b) | 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. |
| 2.7 Provide differentiated, meaningful professional learning to the specific roles and tasks of the SSP8.02(5)(c) | SSP inductees do not receive differentiated content specific to their role and/or participate primarily in teacher induction trainings | SSP induction is conducted with generic information that applies for all SSP roles | SSP induction includes differentiation in resources and readings by role within shared trainings for all SSPs | The inductee participates in several trainings that are specific to their individual role, not just SSPs in general |
| 2.8 Cultivate capacity for collaboration and self-advocacy to enhance the working conditions, job satisfaction and job efficacy of SSPs8.02(5)(d) | SSP induction does not include information on how to advocate for the role of the SSP | SSP induction includes a basic mention of how to advocate for the role of the SSP | SSP induction includes content focused on how to collaborate with school-level personnel to enhance working conditions, job satisfaction and/or job efficacy for SSPs | SSP induction includes individual coaching in self advocacy and how to collaborate system-wide to enhance working conditions, job satisfaction and job efficacy for SSPs |

**SSP 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 2.8. 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 2.8. 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** |
|  |

## SSP Section 3: High-Quality Mentoring

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 3.1 Establish standards for the selection and training, including ethics, of mentors who work with new special service providers8.02(2)(a) and 8.02(1)(b)(v) | 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, but experiences vary by placement. | There are clear, written guidelines in place for the selection of mentors and for their training, which includes content focused on ethics. | 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 special service providers, including ethics. These guidelines are developed or reviewed in conjunction with multiple stakeholders, including inductees. |
| 3.2 Establish a process for the matching of mentors with inductees8.02(2)(c) | There is no clear process in place for matching mentors with inductees or the process is not followed consistently. | There is an unwritten process in place for how mentors are matched with inductees. The matching process may vary some by school. | There is a clear, written process in place that includes guidelines for how mentors are matched with inductees. | There is a clear process in place that includes guidelines for how mentors are matched with inductees. This process is developed in conjunction with multiple stakeholders, including inductees. |
| 3.3 Establish the primary role of the mentor as coach, advocate, supporter, guide and nurturer of new SSPs8.02(2)(d) | Training for mentors does not include guidance around how to coach, advocate for, support, nurture and/or guide new SSPs. | Training for mentors includes some guidance around how to coach, advocate for, support, nurture and guide new SSPs. | Training for mentors includes guidance around how to coach, advocate for, support, nurture and guide new SSPs. | Training for mentors includes guidance around how to coach, advocate for, support, nurture and guide new SSPs, including specific training in coaching adult learners. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 3.4 State whether mentors will be included in the evaluation of inductees. 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 8.02(2)(e) | There is no clear communication about whether mentors are included in evaluations. | 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. |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 3.5 Adopt guidelines for mentor selection that include: * Mentor agrees to serve as mentor
* Mentor is an experienced professional within the SSP discipline
* The mentor is skilled in working with adult learners and is sensitive to the viewpoints of others
* The mentor is an active and open learner who is competent in interpersonal skills and has a record of being an ambassador for the LEP and the profession

8.02(4)(c)(i-iii) | Mentor selection guidelines are unwritten or inconsistently applied. | Mentor selection guidelines prioritize experienced SSPs but may not necessarily include skill in working with adult learners or disposition as an open learner. | Mentor selection guidelines prioritize mentors who are strong SSPs, who are skilled in working with adult learners and who model active learning as an ambassador for the LEP and the profession. | Mentor selection guidelines prioritize mentors who are strong SSPs, who are skilled in working with adult learners and who model active learning as an ambassador for the LEP and the profession. These guidelines are developed and/or reviewed with multiple stakeholders, including inductees. |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| 3.6 Adopt guidelines for mentor assignment that include:* Mentor is closely matched to the inductee in terms of discipline and assignment
* Mentor should be located, when possible, in proximity to the inductee

8.02(4)(d)(i-ii) | Mentor assignment guidelines do not exist. | Mentor assignment guidelines are unwritten or inconsistently applied. In larger programs, mentor guidelines vary significantly by placement. | Mentor assignment guidelines prioritize similar assignments and mentor proximity. | Mentor assignment guidelines prioritize similar assignments and mentor proximity. These guidelines are developed and/or reviewed with multiple stakeholders, including inductees. Mentors are often in a similar assignment and in close physical proximity to inductees. |
| 3.7 Ensure, when possible, that mentors do not serve as evaluators8.02(5)(g) | Mentors are always included in evaluation. | Mentors sometimes serve as evaluators or provide data for evaluations. | Mentors, when possible, do not serve as evaluators. Any evaluation data provided by a mentor is with the knowledge and consent of the inductee. | Mentors do not serve as evaluators or provide evaluation input. |

**SSP 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 3.7. 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 3.7. 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** |
|  |

## SSP Section 4: Continuous Program Improvement

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Not Meeting** | **Developing** | **Meeting** | **Exceeding** |
| **Induction programs MUST** |
| 4.1 Establish an assessment model to review, evaluate and guide the induction program8.02(2)(b) | There is no assessment model in place to review the induction program, evaluate successes and/or guide improvements. | There is an informal assessment model in place to review the induction program, evaluate successes and guide improvements. | There is an assessment model in place to review the induction program, evaluate successes and guide improvements. | There is an assessment model in place to review the induction program, evaluate successes and guide improvements. Multiple stakeholders participate in assessment. |
| **Induction programs SHOULD** |
| 4.2 Promote systemic change and continuous improvement, including input from inductees and a program emphasis on student learning8.02(5)(f) | The induction program conducts program review every five years for CDE renewal only. | The induction program conducts program review every five years for CDE renewal and uses that review to guide program updates. The review includes some stakeholders, but primarily focuses on leadership. | The induction program conducts an annual program review and uses that review to guide program updates. The annual review includes all stakeholders, including inductees. Each year the program is re-evaluated to ensure an emphasis on student learning. | The induction program conducts program review annually but gathers and evaluates data throughout the year with an emphasis on student learning. Program leaders use that data to guide program updates. The annual review includes all stakeholders, including inductees. |

**SSP 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