

The Kenai Peninsula Borough School District's Effective Instruction Handbook



The District's Effective Instruction Framework refers to the broad range of tools, actions, and procedures that are related to the evaluation and professional development needs of certified employees of the KPBSD. This handbook contains background information, procedures, and forms, and was crafted in partnership by members of the KPBSD's Effective Instruction Committee.

With Gratitude

This document reflects thousands of hours of dedicated time invested by KPBSD educators over almost a decade. On behalf of the students who have benefitted from the unwavering commitment to educational excellence, we offer our thanks- both to those who have served on this committee before us and to those who will serve after us. This work will never be easy because it touches on both the personal and public aspects of our profession. As required by regulation, this work has and will continue to inform both the professional development pathways of KPBSD educators, as well as factor into employment decisions about future contracts. Thankfully, those who have served previously and those who serve currently have been supported by many excellent educators, researchers, consultants, and colleagues. We are grateful for your contribution to this tool, and your willingness to engage in personal and professional reflection with the goal of improving the educational opportunities for the public-school students in the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District.

Table of Contents

- With Gratitude 2
- Background 4
- Overview of the Annual E.I. Process 5
- Evaluation Pathways 5
- Due Date Flow Chart 6
- Steps of the Standard Evaluation Process 7
- FAQs (Revised August 2024) 10

Background

In 2006, a team of KPBSD educators participated in a district-sponsored course focused on developing coaching and mentoring skills. As part of this course, Charlotte Danielson, the author of *A Framework for Teaching* (2007, ASCD) worked with the group to introduce her research findings related to the elements of effective teaching practices.

By 2008, a team of teacher leaders and administrators came together and conducted an informal pilot of Danielson's Framework for Teaching (FfT) as a teacher evaluation tool. It was found that by targeting specific areas of the Framework, we could promote deep reflection, engage in practice-changing professional development, and have a positive impact on student learning.

A committee of KPBSD administrators and teachers selected Danielson's FfT because it provides a defensible definition of good teaching that can be understood by all the stakeholders. Additionally, the FfT:

- Clearly defines and recognizes the complexity of teaching with a common language of practice.
- Provides a "road map" for novice teachers and guidance for veteran teachers.
- Provides a point of reference around which conversations about teaching can be focused.
- Organizes the practice of teaching in four domains.
- Provides levels of performance and rubrics that define what teaching looks like at different levels.
- Structures and focuses school-wide and district efforts and provides a common framework around which efforts can be planned.
- Is based upon years of educational research.

In 2009-10, the District piloted their new evaluation system with all non-tenured teachers. This system modified the Danielson FfT to focus on areas of particular importance within the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District and was also tied to all professional development plans. In 2010-11, the new evaluation tool was expanded to use among all certified teachers (both tenured and non-tenured,) and perception data indicated that despite the intense amount of time required to implement the new system, educators at all levels of the organization agreed the system was worth the time and a return to previous methods couldn't possibly be helpful. The evaluation process was formally approved by the Board of Education at its meeting in April 2011. Also in 2011, the district began conducting an annual survey of all KPBSD teachers to gather ongoing input from teachers about their experiences with the evaluation tool. The data from this survey has been used to guide revisions, professional development, and training.

Throughout the evolution of the District's evaluation process, the leadership team responsible for making recommendations and decisions related to the evaluation system became known as the Effective Instruction Committee, while the overarching process that includes the evaluation and professional development needs indicated as a result of the evaluation process became known as the Effective Instruction System. Within that system, the actual evaluation tools and procedures are referred to as the Effective Instruction Process. The process has been refined based on input by multiple stake holders and has been reapproved by the Board of Education in June of 2012, June of 2013, and July of 2015 as changes have been made.

The E.I. Committee continues to review input annually and makes changes to the E.I. Process with consideration for any required regulatory changes. Following any changes, and in accordance with AS 14.20.149(a), the KPBSD Board of Education reviews the certified employee evaluation system around July in any year in which changes were made and considers it for approval.

Overview of the Annual E.I. Process

The following is an overview of the steps that occur during the yearly cycle of the E.I. Process, specific to the main protocol: the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The timeline sometimes requires adjustment to accommodate late hires, changes in teaching assignments mid-year, and completion of a process within a specific course or unit. Regardless of which protocol is used, there is no maximum number of permitted walk-throughs or informal observations; administrators are encouraged to conduct frequent walk-throughs and informal observations, as their schedules may permit. This could mean that within the Standard Evaluation Protocol, the formal observation cycle (which consists of the pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference) may be punctuated by walk-throughs, or informal observations may occur both before and after the formal observation cycle.

All forms related to the E.I. Process are available online at KPBSD < Human Resources < Certified Teacher Evaluation (<http://www.kpbsd.k12.ak.us/departments.aspx?id=19400>) and information from each meeting of the E.I. Committee can be found at the E.I. Blog (<http://effectiveinstruction.blogs.kpbsd.k12.ak.us/wpmu/>). An overview of the various protocols is provided on the KPBSD's Continuous Growth System that is shown below and available online.


Evaluation Pathways

As shown on the [Teacher Evaluation Continuous Growth System](#), there are **four** pathways for the certified evaluation process to follow. They are non-tenured evaluation plan, tenured evaluation plan, directed assistance plan, and needs improvement plan.

TEACHER EVALUATION CONTINUOUS GROWTH SYSTEM			
NON-TENURED EVALUATION PLAN	TENURED PLAN	DIRECTED ASSISTANCE PLAN	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT PLAN
<p>Purpose: To support the inductee in learning and achieving the performance standards of the profession and the District.</p>	<p>Purpose: To provide tenured teachers a structured, supportive, and collaborative environment for enhancing their on-going personal professional growth, ensuring that all staff continues to meet the standards for professional practice.</p>	<p>Purpose: To provide non-tenured or tenured teachers structure, assistance, and guidance towards meeting standards for professional practice.</p>	<p>Purpose: To provide organizational support and assistance to teachers who are not meeting the standards for professional practice.</p>
<p>Standard Evaluation Plan</p> <p>For teachers who are non-tenured in the District. Follows the protocol once each year with 2 formal observation cycles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training – Emphasis on the importance of conversations, trust, honest reflections, and all domains of the evaluation tool. • Self-Reflection/Calibration – Teacher engages in self-reflection using the rubric appropriate to their teaching assignment, calibrates their understanding of the performance expectations with the administrator, and presents SGM drafts. • Informal Observations – Minimum of 1 observation per semester with a minimum duration of 10 minutes each. Dates are recorded on the evaluation. • Pre-Conference – Address the upcoming formal observation & must be directed by guiding questions. • Formal Observation – Must be scheduled in advance. Minimum of 30 min. Follow up must occur within 5 work days. • Post Conference – Must be completed within 10 days. Focus: conversation/reflection on the lesson observed. • Evaluation Conference – Discuss evidence gathered over time indicating how the teacher is teaching. Must be separate from Post Conference. 		<p>Follows the protocol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenured teachers with more than 25% <i>basic</i> within any domain will move to a Directed Assistance Plan. • This is a directed evaluation period that focuses on any domains that are not in the <i>proficient</i> range. • A Directed Assistance Plan will be in place for no longer than 90 days. <p>Note: Superintendent (or designee) must be consulted BEFORE a teacher moves to Directed Assistance Plan or Needs Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>Follows the protocol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an intensive evaluation period that focuses on components and/or elements from any domain that are in the <i>unsatisfactory</i> performance range or that have remained in <i>basic</i> since the previous evaluation. • A Needs Improvement Plan will be in place between 90 and 180 days. • A Needs Improvement Plan will be written and administered according to Alaska State Statute AS 14.20.149. <p>Note: Superintendent (or designee) approval required BEFORE a teacher moves to Directed Assistance Plan or Needs Improvement Plan.</p>
<p>Evaluation is based on the criteria in Danielson's Framework for Effective Teaching.</p> <p>When <i>basic</i> or <i>unsatisfactory</i> performance is identified with non-tenured teachers, a Directed Assistance Plan may be implemented at the discretion of the principal and Human Resources.</p>	<p>For tenured teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In first tenured year • Continuing as tenured • Designated by administrator to remain on Standard protocol • Who completed a year on the Alternate protocol. • Have a significant change in assignment <p>Tenured teachers that have more than 25% of <i>basic</i> element and/or component ratings in any domain will move to the Directed Assistance Plan.</p>	<p>Non-tenured teachers that have more than 25% of <i>basic</i> element and/or component ratings in any domain may move to the Directed Assistance Plan. Tenured teachers that have more than 25% of <i>basic</i> element and/or component ratings in any domain will move to the Directed Assistance Plan. If successfully completed, a teacher returns to prior status. If unsuccessful, a teacher proceeds to the Needs Improvement Plan if tenured. If completion of the plan is progressing, it can be continued at the discretion of administration and Human Resources.</p>	<p>For any tenured teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose performance at any point does not meet the performance criteria in the Evidence of Effective Teaching or who has failed to make adequate progress toward identified goals, or • Who received an <i>unsatisfactory</i> rating on any elements, components, or domains in the previous evaluation period. • Teachers on this plan are held here until all objectives of the Needs Improvement Plan are met. <p>If unsuccessful, the district will follow Alaska State Statute AS 14.20.149.</p>

Due Date Flow Chart

Effective Instruction Evaluation Process Timeline



Steps of the Standard Evaluation Process

The formal evaluation is the evaluation protocol for all non-tenured teachers and tenured teachers designated by their site administrator for the formal evaluation cycle. The only difference in the process for tenured versus non-tenured teachers is that non-tenured teachers must participate in a minimum of two formal observation cycles (steps five through seven) twice each school year, while tenured teachers are required to have a minimum of one formal observation cycle.

In accordance with AS 14.20.149(b)(4), a tenured teacher who has exceeded the district's performance standards may undergo a formal evaluation once every two school years. A tenured teacher exceeds the district's performance standards by achieving an "Overall Proficient" rating in all four domains, with at least one rating of "Exemplary" in any component. Teachers meeting this criterion may be designated by their site administrator for evaluation every other year. However, the site administrator and the school district reserve the right to revert to an annual evaluation cycle. Tenured teachers evaluated every other year will still participate in steps 1-4.

Step	Date	Title	Description
1	July-August	Administrator Training	Annual training in the E.I. System for all administrators occurs during the start-of-year administrator trainings.
		Teacher Training	Certified teachers receive training in the E.I. System during the start of the year in-service sessions. Site administrators may follow up by providing more site-specific training in the process. Evaluation is based on Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, with special (not exclusive) emphasis on the domains, components, and elements included on the summative evaluation document that may be unique to various teaching assignments.
2	September-October	Self-Reflection/ Calibration Conference	<p>Certified teachers engage in self-reflection using the rubrics appropriate to their teaching assignment. Documentation of the evidence from the previous months and evidence expected to be available during the upcoming evaluation cycle is noted in the self-reflection document, and a copy is provided to the evaluator by the teacher at the Calibration Conference. The evaluator and the teacher engage in a calibration conversation using the Calibration Conversation Guide, during which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administrator provides clarity on the performance expectations at the site in relationship to the teacher's unique assignment. • The teacher shares a written draft of his/her professional growth goal for the administrator's review. • A shared understanding regarding what 'proficiency' looks like in the teacher's assignment is achieved.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement is reached regarding what evidence can be expected in relationship to discussed levels of performance. • Potential activities that could support the teacher’s professional growth goal are discussed. • Potential methods the administrator can support the teacher in overcoming challenges and achieving goals are discussed.
3	Ongoing	Walk-throughs	Walk-throughs are short in duration and are comprised of any observations an administrator may make of a teacher. These observations may occur both in the classroom and in settings outside the classroom, such as meetings or hallways, and may or may not result in feedback. If concerns are noted, they will be immediately brought to the attention of the teacher for discussion. There are no limits to the frequency or duration of walk-through observations. While walk-throughs will most frequently result in evidence related to domains 2 and 3, opportunities may arise during collaboration, in-service, or the performance of other work activities for walk-through observations that may be relevant to domains 1 and 4.
4	Ongoing	Informal Observations with Documented Feedback	Minimum of 1 observation per semester with a minimum duration of 10 minutes each. Dates are recorded on the evaluation and feedback is provided to the teacher either verbally or electronically. Informal observations may be related (like any other part of the process) to any domain.
5	Must occur before the formal observation Non-tenured teachers must participate in the formal observation cycle (steps five through seven) twice each school year.	Pre-Observation Conference	The pre-observation conference is held to address the upcoming formal observation & must be directed by guiding questions. Since domains 2 and 3 are generally easily observable, special emphasis on domains 1 and 4 should occur during the conference as an opportunity to evaluate evidence of the ‘off-stage’ aspects of the teacher’s practice. Any relevant information regarding student growth data and the teacher’s professional growth goal should also be reviewed during this conference.
6	Must be scheduled in advance	Formal Observation with Follow Up	The formal observation is required to last a minimum of 30 minutes. The administrator must provide written, or verbal follow up to the teacher within 5 workdays. The follow up may occur as part of the post-observation conference, but if the post-observation conference is scheduled for more

			than 5 days after the observation, follow up must be done separately within 5 days of the observation.
7	Must be completed within ten days of the formal observation.	Post-Observation Conference	<p>The post-observation conference must be completed within 10 days of the observation. The focus of the conference is formal observation and both the teacher, and the administrator are expected to share their perceptions of what occurred during the lesson based on observational data and evidence of student learning.</p> <p>Documents from the pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference are all kept by the building administrator; they are not submitted to HR with the summative evaluation document.</p>
8		Summative Evaluation	<p>The summative evaluation conference is an entirely separate meeting from the post-observation conference.</p> <p>A draft of the evaluation should be provided to the teacher 24 hours before the summative evaluation meeting. Any other relevant data should be provided by the teacher to the administrator 24 hours before the summative evaluation meeting.</p> <p>During this meeting, the principal shares the evidence gathered over time and provides the principal's evaluation of where on the rubric the evidence indicates the teacher is generally teaching. Progress on the professional and student growth goals established by the teacher is discussed. The teacher is invited to share any additional evidence not yet considered, and the principal may decide to modify the summative evaluation document. The teacher may provide a written response to the evaluation that will be attached to the evaluation document in the teacher's personnel file, provided the response is received by the district within 5 days of the summative evaluation being signed.</p>

FAQs

Why doesn't every teaching assignment have a specialized rubric and evaluation form?

Danielson's Framework for Teachers provides both general and specialized rubrics for educators that have been adopted by the KPBSD. In most circumstances, the E.I. Committee elected to use the same general evaluation summary form for the majority of educators. Although components and elements may look slightly different in various settings, it is expected that the unique characteristics of any specific teaching assignment and the evidence that constitutes various performance levels will be discussed during the calibration conference. For example, employing culturally sensitive practices is expected of all teachers but how the expectation is manifested will be influenced by the community in which the school exists along with the age or developmental level of students the teacher serves. Similarly, the specifics of what 'questioning and discussion techniques' are expected to look like in a general education classroom, a self-contained special education classroom, or an online learning environment, would be discussed during the calibration conference. There are some positions that are distinctly different, so specialized evaluation forms have been developed. For example, because of the significance of the Individualized Education Plan paperwork and meeting processes, the evaluation form for special education teachers includes those criteria. Additionally, there are educators that are exempt from the student learning data requirement, and specialized forms have been adopted to reflect requirements for their positions.

What happens when a teacher teaches in more than one school, has more than one teaching assignment, or is otherwise split?

The two formal observations of non-tenured teachers should occur in different settings to ensure the evaluator has a well-informed understanding of the performance of the non-tenured teacher in the multiple settings or roles he or she may be assigned to. In the case of both non-tenured and tenured teachers with multiple work locations, the employee's primary location shall determine who the teacher's primary evaluator will be. In that circumstance, the primary evaluator is expected to consult with the other supervising administrator for input into the employee's evaluation and informal or walk-through observation data should be shared between the two supervisors to ensure a well-informed understanding of the educator's performance is reflected in his/her summative evaluation. In circumstances where an employee has two totally different roles, the principal may alternate between the two evaluation documents on a year-to-year basis. In all circumstances where a teacher is responsible for the instruction of students, the SGM process shall be employed in the evaluation process.

Where can I find out more information about the state regulations?

The Alaska Department of Education and Early Development offers links to the regulations and the Department's guidance to districts on how to implement the regulations at <https://education.alaska.gov/> by clicking on the green "Accountability" star.

What merits checking the "Overall Proficient" box for a Domain?

50% or more of the boxes within a Domain must be marked as proficient or higher, in order to merit a rating of "Overall Proficient" for a Domain on a summative evaluation.

What is the purpose of the "Overall Proficient" rating?

The rating of Overall Proficient for each Domain helps inform general professional development needs and calls attention to the need for more detailed calculation if a Directed Assistance or Needs Improvement Plan is warranted.

The Teacher Evaluation Continuous Growth System provides further details about the point at which a Directed Assistance or Needs Improvement Plan is required.