



**Summary of LEAD Compact Recommendations  
December 3, 2013**

**Note:** Over the course of seven plenary and many smaller work group meetings, LEAD Compact participants identified the following 10 problem statements and corresponding recommendations associated with strengthening and/or aligning the educator continuum (preparation, licensure, early career support, professional development, and career pathways). The far right column of this document provides information regarding LEAD Compact participants' levels of comfort around each set of recommendations, which were indicated either in person at the December 3 meeting or in follow-up calls afterward, according to the following categories:

- "Green" – I support the recommendations as written.
- "Yellow" – I can live with the recommendations, but encourage legislators to consider...
- "Orange" – I do not know yet if I support or oppose these recommendations.
- "Red" – I oppose the recommendations as written.

Those whose opinions are indicated below represent 28 of the 34 LEAD Compact participants. For the purposes of developing the final set of recommendations, it was presumed that participants were participating as individuals with experience and networks, not officially on behalf of organizations. *A majority of LEAD Compact participants supported each suite of recommendations as written (i.e. indicated a green or yellow level of comfort)*; indicated below are only the comments of those who fell into the "yellow," "orange," or "red" categories, along with their comments where applicable. As legislators begin drafting proposed legislation, comments included in the "Levels of Comfort" column are meant to provide an indication of which recommendations may need additional attention in order to strengthen language and/or secure broader support.

If you have any questions or comments about this document, please reach out to Leslie Colwell at [lcolwell@keystone.org](mailto:lcolwell@keystone.org) or 303-468-8865.

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Colorado’s educator identifier system does not necessarily track data associated with educator candidates from all pathways into the profession, making comparisons among the pathways difficult.</p>	<p><b>Revised data collection under the educator identifier system:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and support state-level infrastructure for data collection, analysis, and reporting that provides feedback, support, and resources to educator preparation programs/pathways for continuous improvement and informs hiring practices and professional learning.</li> <li>• Apply outcomes-based data collection to <i>all</i> programs preparing teachers and principals, including traditional and alternative programs at public and private institutions of higher education, alternative programs outside of higher education institutions, and residency programs. Candidates entering the profession through the Alternative 2 pathway should also be tracked to the extent possible (without the prep program link).</li> <li>• Ensure that the statutory reporting requirements under SB10-036 are robust enough to ensure that outcomes sufficiently give a comprehensive picture of programs’ strengths. Additional metrics to consider include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Performance on written exams like the PLACE/Praxis and performance-based assessments like the edTPA</li> <li>○ Diversity of candidates prepared</li> <li>○ Satisfaction of teachers with the preparation provided by their program</li> <li>○ Surveys of district employers</li> <li>○ Placement of graduates in hard-to-staff schools in urban and rural settings and how placement compares to demand for candidates statewide</li> <li>○ Quality of partnerships with schools</li> <li>○ Number and percent of candidates who receive a license and secure a teaching position in a Colorado school within one year</li> <li>○ Persistence rates in the profession</li> <li>○ Rate at which candidates earn Professional and Master licenses (if implemented)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In its collection of human resources data from districts, CDE should collect information that shows what preparation program candidates came from (if any) and links to their performance over time <i>at the element level</i>. Understanding that a significant percentage of educator licensees in Colorado were prepared outside of the state, the LEAD Compact recommends that CDE track the out-of-state institutions preparing teachers through its human resources data collection and ensure that incoming educators from out of state enter the licensure system in the same fashion as Colorado educators.</li> <li>• Dedicate state funding to support CDE/CDHE in data collection, review, analysis and public dissemination of summaries of program outcomes-based data enumerated above.</li> </ul> <p><b>Revised state role in facilitating high-quality educator preparation, PD and district partnerships:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicate state funding to the identification and expansion of high-quality professional development and the assessment and dissemination of promising/innovative concepts at Colorado preparation programs (possibility of regional data centers led by R1 institutions that provide service to smaller institutions).</li> <li>• Incentivize strong partnerships between districts and higher education institutions/vendors providing high-quality early career support and professional development.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including three participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assembling representatives from educator preparation programs to propose the complete set of reporting metrics to be included in the legislation.</li> <li>• The burden that collecting evaluation data at the element level (versus just the standard level) may place on district human resources departments.</li> <li>• Ensuring that data concerning preparation programs and pathways is easy to access and understand using a performance rating system that provides market signals for prospective candidates choosing between programs and for hiring managers to clearly identify their best pipelines; additionally relating the rating system to a sliding scale accountability system with autonomy and incentives for high performers and possible closure for poor performers.</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>A primary purpose of the educator preparation program approval process is to ensure accountability to the public, students, and the education profession that preparation programs are producing candidates with the potential to be effective, but the state's current process is entirely inputs-based and often burdensome to programs.</p>	<p><b>Revised educator prep program approval/reauthorization process:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt and implement rigorous outcomes-based program approval standards that take into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Criteria that includes mastery of content and pedagogy</li> <li>○ High-quality clinical practice(s) demonstrated by measured outcomes</li> <li>○ Impact of candidates on student achievement once in the profession</li> <li>○ Innovative practices that are shown to be effective in preparing quality candidates</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Replace current statutory requirements that involve review of course offerings and other inputs with the outcomes-based metrics listed above.</li> <li>• Allow educator preparation programs of all types to choose between the state's program approval/reauthorization process and CAEP's national accreditation process without having to do both.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including one participant who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicating state funding for a research agenda to analyze inputs such as program content and how those inputs relate to program outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>One participant indicated they did not know if they support or oppose these recommendations, because they did not support eliminating review of program course offerings.</p>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Due to recent changes, there is now a lack of alignment within the education system in Colorado where new educators are prepared using a different set of standards than the ones they will be evaluated on once they enter and progress through the profession.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the State Board of Education and Commission on Higher Education align all sets of standards currently in rule and statute with the Educator Quality Standards so that new educators are prepared for the standards that they will be evaluated on once they enter and progress through the profession.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including three participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The resources that CDE may require to fully align standards.</li> <li>Recognizing that districts should be able to align but also innovate/be flexible.</li> <li>Recognizing that the Educator Quality Standards are less specific/detailed than the current performance-based standards and there may be elements that preparation programs still want to include.</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Induction experiences differ greatly between schools and districts. There is little alignment across the continuum of learning from preparation to induction to professional development.</p>	<p><b>Revised role of the State in early career support:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace “induction program completion” with the requirement that educators show successful completion of their professional growth plan for a determined period of time to make the move from an Initial to Professional license.</li> <li>• Conduct an inventory of current programs and assessment of best models and practices.</li> <li>• Update current statewide standards for early career support based on the components of the support that is most effective and meaningful for educator improvement.</li> <li>• Establish a rubric to help assess impact of support and a system that represents the likely effectiveness of early career support offered based on what is known to work.</li> <li>• Use current reporting requirements under CDE’s human resources data collection to connect new teachers to their evaluation ratings in the first five years of the profession and aggregate at the district level.</li> <li>• Establish a “feedback loop” mechanism, where information reported from districts on the quality of educator candidates is communicated to preparation programs/pathways as a way to help continuously improve support.</li> <li>• Make early career support survey info public on CDE website for prospective teachers and other interested stakeholders along with explanations of context.</li> <li>• Establish dedicated state funding to elevate early career support quality and enhance mentor capacity.</li> <li>• Establish an online clearinghouse of early career support best practices across the state, with special attention paid to facilitating successful models for the state’s rural districts and BOCES.</li> </ul> <p><b>Revised role of school districts in early career support:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct appropriate mentor/mentee matching, incorporating creative staffing where possible (utilizing retired educators, employing alternative models to “1-to-1” mentorship).</li> <li>• Conduct a survey of first- and second-year teachers on the quality of support provided to them, and report that data to CDE for dissemination.</li> <li>• Ongoing data collection and reporting for continued programmatic improvement.</li> <li>• Utilize performance assessments, ongoing evaluations, and/or professional development plans to provide more individualized support.</li> <li>• Track and compile best practices for dissemination on CDE website as needed.</li> <li>• Where possible, partner with institutions of higher education, BOCES, and professional associations to build capacity and resources.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including four participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The time and funding that will be required for CDE and districts to set up the infrastructure for this system and facilitate high-quality early career support, including reporting and tracking best practices.</li> <li>• Increasing the focus on softening the boundary between educator preparation and early career support.</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>There is a current and projected lack of an adequate supply of teacher and principal candidates for some geographies, some hard-to-staff circumstances, and in some content areas (science, math, special education, etc.)</p>	<p><b>Revised pathways into the profession for teachers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish “Alternative with District/School Support” or “Alternative 2” pathway for rural and hard-to-staff positions as defined by the district, where candidates are eligible for an Initial license if they have a bachelor’s degree, pass a background check, and have one of the following: (1) a passing score on the PLACE and/or Praxis II, (2) a passing score on a performance-based assessment, (3) a relevant experience portfolio, CDE establish database of best practices to support Alternative 2 teachers (and for early career support purposes).</li> </ul> <p><b>Revised pathways into the profession for principals:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Initial principal license may be granted to candidates who: (1) have completed a traditional preparation program, (2) are enrolled in an alternative program, or (3) have prior teaching experience and an endorsement from a district, along with evidence of an individualized professional development plan that is aligned with the principal quality standards,</li> <li>A new “Administrator” or “Apprentice Principal” license may be granted to candidates who: (1) are appointed by a superintendent to serve as the administrative leader of a school that has adopted an alternative leadership structure and has demonstrated an instructional support plan.</li> <li>Make an initial infrastructure investment at the state level for web-based sharing of best practices, data tracking and evaluation of preparation programs, different routes into the profession, professional development tools, and support for principals in implementing the evaluation system, and tools/technical assistance with best practices around hiring quality principals; additionally establish a dedicated funding stream to support investments in results-based training programs (whether led by districts, BOCES, non-profits, or successful CMOs) and on-going data collection and analysis. Considerations should be given for small/rural districts to ensure that resources are allocated equitably according to need.</li> </ul> <p><b>Revised role of the state in pathways into the profession:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the end of five years and beyond, evaluate pathways into the teacher and principal professions with reporting on educator effectiveness, ability to attract racially and ethnically diverse candidates, and retention. This information should be available for hiring managers to customize their district’s strategies and also be used to assess and compare the pathways.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including six participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting a research agenda regarding the value and predictability of various pre-service assessments.</li> <li>The intersection of the emergency authorization and an Initial license for Alternative 2 pathway teachers.</li> <li>Setting rigorous criterion for what could constitute an experience portfolio.</li> <li>Requiring a hiring superintendent to justify hiring an Alternative 2 teacher candidate.</li> <li>Making it more clear that “hard-to-staff” includes positions that are difficult to fill because of a specialty content or skill set.</li> </ul> <p>Three participants did not support the recommendations, citing these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The “Alternative 2” path for teachers does not require candidates to verify their ability to teach before they enter the classroom.</li> <li>The belief that only the emergency authorization should be maintained as an alternative pathway.</li> </ul> <p>Questions for the legislators to consider that are not addressed by these recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the “Apprentice Principal” license ever become a Principal license, or is prior teaching experience always a requirement?</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Attracting and retaining racially and ethnically diverse candidates to the education field is a challenge in most schools and districts.</p>	<p><b>Revised role of the state in attracting and retaining racially and ethnically diverse candidates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect demographic data on the various pathways into the profession to assess whether there is an impact over time on recruitment of racially and ethnically diverse candidates to the education field.</li> <li>• Encourage more research into entry barriers for racially and ethnically diverse candidates, as members of the Compact suspect that status of the profession and salary may be more significant obstacles.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including one participant who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How cut scores for assessments such as the PLACE and Praxis II relate to candidate diversity.</li> </ul> <p>Three participants did not support these recommendations, citing the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More reports on diversity will not help recruit or retain diverse candidates – this requires a significant, concerted effort to invest in “grow your own”-type programs.</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Expectations have evolved for teachers and principals in Colorado. Hiring and selection processes have not evolved in line with these expectations and therefore may be <i>insufficient</i> predictors of who will be a successful educator under the quality effectiveness standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While not choosing to recommend a legislated requirement that preparation programs require teacher candidates to pass a teacher performance assessment, the LEAD Compact is supportive of preparation programs exploring and implementing such assessments as a potential way to fast-track a Professional license and as a predictive tool for hiring managers about whether a candidate is likely to be successful in their school’s context.</li> <li>• Teaching licenses should indicate the following information for hiring managers: (1) grade level and subject area, (2) pathway into the profession, (3) date issued and expiration date, (4) all CDE-approved assessments passed, and (5) earned endorsements (would need to be established) that recognize specialized experience in certain geographies (i.e. urban or rural) and hard-to-staff contexts.</li> <li>• Principal licenses should indicate the following information for hiring managers: (1) pathway into the profession (traditional preparation, alternative preparation, prior teaching experience with district endorsement, or alternative leadership structure with instructional plan), (2) date issued and expiration date, (3) all CDE-approved assessments passed, and (4) earned endorsements that recognize specialized experience in certain geographies (i.e. urban or rural) and hard-to staff contexts.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including six participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not just one performance-based assessment – many programs have their own rigorous test that candidates must pass.</li> <li>• The impact of these changes on educators who already have a Professional license.</li> <li>• The importance of continuous improvement on the pre-service assessments approved by the state, and making sure those assessments align with whatever new system is established.</li> <li>• How “earned endorsements” would be identified and earned by educators.</li> </ul> <p>Two participants indicated they did not know whether they support or oppose these recommendations, citing these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential for unintended consequences.</li> <li>• The need to seek feedback from human resources professionals.</li> </ul>



Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Established in 1991, Colorado’s current licensure system lacks alignment with the state’s education landscape. Focused primarily on inputs, the system is not set up to adequately prepare educators for the outcomes-focused education system the state has established.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a tiered licensure system where an educator license signals a level of professionalism, quality, and effectiveness</li> <li>• Grant an Initial teacher license to all candidates who enter the profession through an authorized pathway.</li> <li>• Allow full-time educators who submit one of the following to advance to a Professional teacher license, which is renewable indefinitely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Completion of professional growth plan aligned to quality standards for a determined period of time (3-year renewal).</li> <li>○ A passing score on the edTPA (5-year renewal).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Allow educators who submit one of the following to advance to a Master teacher license: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Three consecutive years of highly effective ratings (5-year renewal).</li> <li>○ Three years of effective ratings plus completion of National Board Certification (5-year renewal) and/or meeting a certain cut score on the edTPA.</li> <li>○ Allow educators with a current “Master Certificate” to transition to a Master license.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Encourage ongoing dialogue and feedback loops between CDE and education stakeholders regarding implementation of SB10-191.</li> <li>• The development of a new licensure model for principals should reasonably follow the same framework as that laid out for teachers.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including three participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At a minimum, requiring highly effective ratings over time to earn a Master license (as opposed to effective ratings).</li> <li>• Tying a Professional license to effectiveness to signal quality and/or taking bolder steps in shifting from inputs to outcomes as a signal of quality.</li> <li>• More clarity around how tracking/data will inform legislators and other stakeholders about which candidates earning Professional and Master licenses are actually the most effective and how often reports would occur.</li> </ul> <p>One participant said they did not know whether they support or oppose, saying it is unclear how the state will transition from the current licensure system. Two participants did not support these recommendations, citing their opposition to connecting evaluation data to earning a Master license.</p> <p>Questions for the legislators to consider that are not addressed by these recommendations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can educator preparation program candidates and/or out-of-state candidates with a passing edTPA score immediately earn a Professional license?</li> <li>• Will principals be able to use any of the components of the TPA portfolio, including video segments, reflection documents, student work, etc.?</li> <li>• Does there have to be a sponsoring institution for someone to complete a TPA, or could it be completed as a “one-off” once in the classroom?</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>Professional development hours are mandated for every educator to renew their license, but that PD may be unrelated to an educator’s areas for improvement and/or not aligned with an educator’s professional development plan under SB191.</p>	<p><b>Revised professional development requirements for teachers and principals:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educators who are shown to be consistently effective or highly effective should have a reduced requirement for PD hours in order to renew their license and/or a more streamlined renewal process. Educators who are shown to be consistently ineffective or partially effective should have an increased requirement for PD hours that align to an educator’s professional growth plan.</li> <li>• Where appropriate, partner with organizations that can help provide tools and resources to support educators. School districts, professional associations and post-secondary education institutions should be directly involved in the development of tools and resources to support educators.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including seven participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new paradigm for professional development that is not at all based on seat time, but rather customized goals for educators that align with professional growth plans.</li> <li>• Building in incentives for educators to pursue advanced degrees as professional development.</li> <li>• Further streamlining renewal for educators who are shown to be consistently effective or highly effective, but not necessarily reducing their professional development requirement.</li> </ul>

Problem Statement	LEAD Compact Recommendation(s)	Level of Comfort and Comments
<p>There are limited formal career pathways for educators in the field. This lack of clear career growth mechanisms may limit the field’s ability to recruit and retain the best educators.</p>	<p><b>Revised role of the State in recognizing and rewarding effective educators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish dedicated state funding for a pilot of career lattices that will increase capacity over time.</li> <li>• Cross-reference the Teacher Leader Model Standards with Colorado’s Educator Quality Standards to set guidance for roles within pathways at the district level; provide information about best/innovative practices that have been shown to work.</li> <li>• In addition to setting guidance for and approving district-level career lattice systems seeking state funding, establish a limited number of state-level roles that benefit all teachers in the state (State Model System Raters, Expert Teachers who document and share lesson/unit plans/ teaching videos online, etc.) and provide oversight over those roles. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Create online portal for documenting and sharing best practices, lessons plans, videos, etc. of highly effective educators serving in state-level career lattice roles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure that a certain percentage of state funds for career lattices are paid directly to educators (vs. overhead/administration costs).</li> <li>• Encourage and incentivize district/professional association collaboration and innovation in setting salary schedules and reorganizing budgets to reallocate funds toward district career pathway programs and/or release time (state match for dollars, etc.).</li> <li>• Encourage and incentivize highly effective educators to teach or lead in hard-to-serve schools and districts (specific career lattice roles, tuition assistance, hard-to-serve endorsement on license, etc.).</li> <li>• Grant educators with a current Master Certificate a Master License under the new system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Revised role of school districts in recognizing and rewarding effective educators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose systems of career pathways and compensation for educators that contain differentiated, multiple leadership roles that align with local goals, and set up a rigorous selection process that uses measures of effectiveness and professional growth for placement into educator leadership positions.</li> <li>• Identify effective/highly effective educators to serve as mentors and facilitate mentor/mentee matches (related to early career support).</li> <li>• Review and revise master agreements for better alignment.</li> </ul>	<p>A majority of the LEAD Compact supported these recommendations, including four participants who said they could live with them but encourage legislators to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A graduated state/local match that scales according to ability to pay for districts with high Title I populations.</li> <li>• More clarity around the state vs. district lattice models – approval process for district programs, application criteria, etc.</li> <li>• More clarity around how to invest in attracting/retaining Master educators in hard-to-serve districts.</li> <li>• More clarity around whether the career lattices program would only be a pilot in certain districts.</li> <li>• Encouraging districts to work with their professional associations on funding educator stipends rather than creating a new role for the state to fund career lattice roles.</li> <li>• Allowing educators without Master licenses to serve in district-run career lattices programs, whether it is state- or district-funded.</li> </ul> <p>Two participants did not support these recommendations, citing these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state should not play a role in recognizing and rewarding educators.</li> <li>• Opposition to dedicating funds to a new state program at the exclusion of other district needs.</li> </ul>