USD 305 PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL MANUAL

2026-2027

Contents

1 PHILOSOPHY OF USD #305'S APPRAISAL SYSTEM 3

2 OVERVIEW OF THE PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM 4

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN 5

3 FRAMEWORKS 6

3.1 WHY CHARLOTTE DANIELSON'S FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING? 7

3.2 PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY DOMAINS 12

DOMAIN 1: Planning and Preparation 12

DOMAIN 2: The Classroom Environment 12

DOMAIN 3: Instruction 12

DOMAIN : Professional Responsibilities 12

4 APPRAISAL PLAN 13

4.1 APPRAISAL PLAN 14

4.2 INDUCTION PROGRAM 14

4.3 COMPREHENSIVE PAS TIMELINE 15

4.4 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 1 16

4.5 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 2 17

4.6 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 3 & ON 18

4.7 TEACHER PRE-OBSERVATION FORM 19

4.8 TEACHER REFLECTION FORM 20

5 PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN 21

5.1 FLOWCHART AND PROCDURES 22

5.2 PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN FOR YEAR 4 (OR MORE) TEACHERS 23

5.3 AWARENESS PHASE PLAN FORM 25

5.4 PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PHASE FORM 26

6 TEACHER.....27

7 INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS 101

8 SCHOOL COUNSELOR 125

9 LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST.....140

10 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST 160

11 PUPIL PERSONNEL PROFESSIONALS.....175

12 SCHOOL NURSE.....200

13 RELATED SERVICES PROVIDERS 212

1 PHILOSOPHY OF USD #305'S APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Unified School District #305 believes that Salina's students deserve the highest quality of instruction. To ensure quality instruction for every student, performance appraisal of all certified personnel is essential and is one of the district's primary responsibilities to students, patrons, and staff.

- **Effective professional appraisal:**
  - ✓ Reflects research-based standards
  - ✓ Is systematic and continuous
  - ✓ Embodies standards of excellence
  - ✓ Is cooperatively developed between evaluator and evaluatee

- **Professional growth results from:**
  - ✓ Maximizing strengths and managing weaknesses
  - ✓ Setting realistic goals
  - ✓ Providing resources
  - ✓ Defining responsibilities
  - ✓ Establishing strategies for continuous improvement
  - ✓ Fostering self reflection
  - ✓ Monitoring performance

Through the commitment, beliefs, and process outlined above, the goal of providing quality instruction for every USD #305 student will be achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge our indebtedness to Charlotte Danielson for granting us permission to use *Enhancing Professional Practice – A Framework for Teaching*, and *Teacher Evaluation To Enhance Professional Practice* as the foundation of this teacher appraisal system.

The Professional Appraisal System Is A Process, Not A Product.

- Therefore, it is anticipated that, yearly, input will be requested from those currently participating in the evaluation process.

- These "suggestions for improvement" will be reviewed by a committee of teachers, administrators and a BOE member/community representative to determine what should be changed in the Appraisal System.

- It is anticipated that the recommended improvements will be approved by NEA-Salina and the BOE

****Certified staff who are governed by the Negotiated Agreement and who are NOT licensed by Kansas State Department of Education (KDSE) are NOT subject to submitting Student Performance Measures (SPM) as part of their evaluation.****

2 OVERVIEW OF THE PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Year 1: (all teachers new to USD 305)

- **NEW TO PROFESSION TEACHERS**
  - Participate in Induction Program
  - Training on pre-selected components for effective teaching
- **EXPERIENCED TEACHERS NEW TO USD 305**
  - Overview training on evaluation process procedures
- At a minimum - (1) scheduled observation with feedback and (1) unscheduled observation with feedback
- Review of Student Performance Measures (SPM)
- Summative Review

Year 2:

- Continued Training and/or Review of Components for Effective Teaching
- At a minimum - (1) scheduled observation with feedback and (1) unscheduled observation with feedback
- Review of Student Performance Measures (SPM)
- Summative Review

Year 3 and 4:

- Continued Training and/or Review of Components for Effective Teaching
- At a minimum - (1) scheduled observation with feedback
- Review of Student Performance Measures (SPM)
- Summative Review

Notes:

- Observations listed are minimum requirements.
- Additional scheduled or unscheduled observations may be initiated by the evaluator and/or teacher, and will be documented following the guidelines established.
- Starting in year 5, teachers are typically evaluated on a 3-year cycle unless extenuating circumstances occur.

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

- Based on specific need
- Directed toward improvement of Professional Competencies
- Initiated by teacher or evaluator
- Collaboratively developed & assessed

Phase 1: AWARENESS

- Short term
- Quick progress
- Concerns resolved or further action recommended

Phase 2: SUPPORT

- Specific action plan
- Timeline for progress
- Team approach
- Intensive support
- Feedback and documentation

3 FRAMEWORKS

Why was Charlotte Danielson's "Framework for Teaching" selected?

Professional Competency Domains

3.1 WHY CHARLOTTE DANIELSON'S FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING?

The "Framework for Teaching" was selected as the basis for USD #305's appraisal system because it is researched-based and provides a clearly defined framework to help teachers improve their instruction. More specifically, the framework:

1. Enhances professional practice by seeking to identify principles of effective practice and classroom organization. Such principles **maximize student learning and promote student engagement**.

2. **Provides a common vocabulary** for discussions regarding professional excellence in teaching.

3. **Provides clear expectations,** via the rubrics, about what constitutes mastery teaching and serves as a guide for teachers striving to attain mastery teaching status.

4. Contains within each domain the following common themes: equity, cultural sensitivity, high expectations, developmental appropriateness, accommodating students with special needs and appropriate use of technology. These **themes fit within the core values of USD #305**.

5. ***Parallels the school improvement initiatives*** *currently underway in USD #305, across the state, and throughout the nation. (i.e. National Board Certification of Teachers)*

6. The Framework for Teaching identifies those aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning. While the Framework is not the only possible description of practice, these responsibilities seek to define what teachers should know and be able to do in the exercise of their profession.

The 1996 Edition

First published by ASCD in 1996, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching was an outgrowth of the research compiled by Educational Testing Service (ETS) for the development of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, an observation-based evaluation of first-year teachers used for the purpose of licensing. The Framework extended this work by examining current research to capture the skills of teaching required not only by novice teachers but by experienced practitioners as well.

The Framework quickly found wide acceptance by teachers, administrators, policymakers, and academics as a comprehensive description of good teaching, including levels of performance—unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished—for each of its 22 components.

The 2007 Edition

The 2007 edition of the Framework, also published by ASCD as Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, incorporated several important enhancements. Most importantly, it reflected educational research that had been conducted since 1996; this was fully described in its Appendix, "The Research Foundation." Moreover, the 2007 edition included frameworks for non-classroom specialist positions, such as school librarians, nurses, and counselors. These individuals, while typically part of the teacher bargaining unit in a school district, have very different responsibilities from those of classroom teachers. Therefore, they need their own frameworks, tailored to the details of their work. These frameworks were written to reflect the recommendations of their professional organizations, such as the American Association of School Librarians, but organized according to the same structure as that of the Framework for Teaching: Planning and Preparation, The Environment, Delivery of Service (the equivalent of Instruction), and Professional Responsibilities.

The 2007 edition of the Framework for Teaching retained the architecture of the 1996 edition; in both cases, the complex work of teaching is divided into 4 domains and 22 components. Furthermore, each component is composed of several smaller elements, which serve to further define the component. A few of the components were renamed:

1c: "Selecting Instructional Goals" was changed to "Setting Instructional Outcomes."

1f: "Assessing Student Learning" was revised to "Designing Student Assessments."

3a: "Communicating Clearly and Accurately" was revised to "Communicating with Students."

3d: "Providing Feedback to Students" was altered to "Using Assessment in Instruction."

4d: "Contributing to the School and District" was changed to "Participating in a Professional Community."

Most of these revisions were simple clarifications to the language. In the case of 4d, for example, the original name implied to some people that "Contributing to the School and District" was an additional responsibility, not integral to the work of teaching; whereas the new name, "Participating in a Professional Community," suggests that it is an essential professional obligation.

However, the revisions to 1f and 3d were significant: the 2007 edition clearly assigned the design of student assessments (1f) to Domain 1: Planning and Preparation, and 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction to Domain 3: Instruction. These distinctions were not as apparent in the 1996 edition.

The 2011 Edition

In 2009, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation embarked on the large research project Measures of Effective Teaching (MET), which entailed the video capture of over 23,000 lessons, analyzed according to five observation protocols, with the results of those analyses (together with other measures) correlated to value-added measures of student learning. The aim of the study was to determine which aspects of a teacher's practice were most highly correlated with high levels of student progress.

The Framework for Teaching was one of the models selected for this large-scale study, which involved the (online) training and certification of hundreds of observers for the purpose of rating the quality of teaching in the lessons. In order to fulfill this obligation, it became necessary to supply additional tools to aid in the training of observers, so that they could make accurate and consistent judgments about teaching practice as demonstrated in the large numbers of videotaped lessons. The following additional tools included:

- Rubric language tighter even than that of the 2007 edition of the Framework for Teaching. Furthermore, the levels of performance in the 2011 revision are written at the component, rather than the element, level. While providing less detail, the component-level rubrics capture all the essential information from those at the element level and are far easier to use in evaluation than are those at the element level.

- "Critical attributes" for each level of performance for each component. These critical attributes provide essential guidance for observers in distinguishing between practice at adjacent levels of performance. They are of enormous value in training and in the actual work of observation and evaluation.

- Possible examples for each level of performance for each component. These examples serve to illustrate the meanings of the rubric language. However, they should be regarded for what they are: possible examples. They are not intended to describe all the possible ways in which a certain level of performance might be demonstrated in the classroom; those are, of necessity, particular to each grade and subject. The possible examples simply serve to illustrate what practice might look like in a range of settings.

These enhancements to the Framework for Teaching, while created in response to the demands of the MET study, turned out to be valuable additions to the instrument in all its applications.

Practitioners found that the enhancements not only made it easier to determine the level of performance reflected in a classroom for each component of the Framework, but also contributed to judgments that are more accurate and more worthy of confidence. As the stakes in teacher evaluation become higher, this increased accuracy is absolutely essential.

As with the 2007 edition, there were absolutely no changes to the architecture of the 2011 edition. Therefore, those educators who invested resources in learning the language of the 2007 edition simply gained additional tools to help them in the challenging work of applying the Framework to actual classroom teaching.

The 2013 Edition

The principal reason for releasing the 2013 edition of the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument was to respond to the instructional implications of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Since the CCSS have been adopted in the vast majority of states, it seemed to make sense to explore what these would mean in the classroom.

The CCSS, when fully implemented, will have a profound effect on education in America. They envision, for literacy and mathematics initially, deep engagement by students with important concepts, skills, and perspectives. They emphasize active, rather than passive, learning by students. In all areas, they place a premium on deep conceptual understanding, thinking and reasoning, and the skill of argumentation (students taking a position and supporting it with logic and evidence).

In particular, the CCSS advocate specific recommendations in different curricular areas:

- In ELA and literacy in all fields, a close reading of text and a greater emphasis on nonfiction works in addition to fiction
- In mathematics, a focus on the principal topics in each grade level, with growing fluency and skill in the application of mathematical concepts

To the extent that the CCSS deal with what students should learn in school so they will be prepared for college and careers, the biggest implications are in the areas of curriculum and assessment. Educators and policymakers must revise their curricula and their classroom and district assessments, and must locate instructional materials to support the new learning.

But teachers will also have to acquire new instructional skills in order to bring the CCSS to life for their students. Teaching for deep conceptual understanding, for argumentation, and for logical reasoning have not, after all, been high priorities in most school districts or preparation programs. In most classrooms, students don't take an active

role in their own learning, nor do they (respectfully) challenge the thinking of their classmates. All of this will represent a major departure, and therefore a major challenge, for many teachers.

But educators who are familiar with the Framework for Teaching will recognize much in the philosophy of the CCSS that is similar to the underlying concepts of the Framework. After all, the centerpiece of the Framework is student engagement, which is defined not as "busy" or "on task," but as "intellectually active." Learning activities for students may be "hands-on," but they should always be "minds-on."

Furthermore, the hallmark of distinguished-level practice in the Framework is that teachers have been able to create a community of learners, in which students assume a large part of the responsibility for the success of a lesson; they make suggestions, initiate improvements, monitor their own learning against clear standards, and serve as resources to one another.

However, despite a deep shared philosophy of teaching and learning between the CCSS and the Framework, there are some specific additions that can be made to the rubric language to bring it into complete alignment; those have been added, particularly in the following domains:

- Domain 1—1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes, 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction, and 1f: Designing Student Assessments
- Domain 3—3a: Communicating with Students, 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, 3c: Engaging Students in Learning, and 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

But because the Framework is a generic instrument, applying to all disciplines, and the CCSS are discipline specific, many of the enhancements to the Framework are located in the possible examples, rather than in the rubric language or critical attributes for each level of performance.

Attentive readers who are deeply familiar with the Framework may notice some slight modifications to the language of the rubrics themselves; this has been done, as in previous revisions, in the interest of clarity. Teaching is highly complex work, and describing it is also challenging; as we receive feedback on confusing words and phrases, we try to improve the wording to minimize ambiguity. But educators who have become familiar with the 2011 version of the Framework, who "speak that language" and may have completed the online training and assessment program produced by Teachscape, should know that none of the revisions would alter the assessments of teaching represented in the videotaped lessons.

The 2022 Edition

In the 2022 update of the Danielson framework, there is a specific shift from what may have felt like passive language to active, accountable language that elevates and holds accountable practice. Over the last decade, research has taught us more about how effective teaching can transform student learning, especially in a rapidly changing world. The updated FFT incorporates this new research, as well as feedback from educators and our own experience in the field, placing increased emphasis on the lives and needs of students, equitable learning environments, social-emotional development, the use of high-quality curricula, and autonomy for educators to meet the needs of all students.

The FFT provides the necessary foundation for educators to deepen their impact on students and is most effective when used as a frame that is adapted to meet the unique needs of different school communities and educators. Rather than a prescriptive set of requirements, the FFT helps educators teach authentically and strategically.

Learning improves when educators have the flexibility to analyze teaching and learning through the lens of local context and identify aligned strategies that will lead to greater success.

Specifically, the FFT provides new guidance on planning and preparation, learning environments, learning experiences, and principled teaching. It addresses topics like knowing and valuing students, responding flexibly to student needs, and engaging families and communities. By focusing on specific areas within the Framework, a teacher can begin improving learning environments for students — a continual journey that will change from year-to-year. The new framework no longer feels like the teacher has all of the control but, there is a transfer of ownership to students in a respectful classroom and, in co-created classrooms, students have autonomy and voice. The updated Framework highlights strategies that increase students' focus, motivate them to practice critical thinking skills, and ultimately promote meaningful learning experiences.

3.2 PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY DOMAINS

Each of the four domains refers to a distinct aspect of teaching.

DOMAIN 1: Planning and Preparation

1a. Applying Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
1b. Knowing and Valuing Students
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes
1d. Using Resources Effectively
1e. Planning Coherent Instruction
1f. Designing and Analyzing Assessments

DOMAIN 2: Learning Environments

2a. Cultivating Respectful and Affirming Environments
2b. Fostering a Culture for Learning
2c. Maintaining Purposeful Environments
2d. Supporting Positive Student Behavior
2e. Organizing Spaces for Learning

DOMAIN 3: Learning Experiences

3a. Communicating About Purpose and Content
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
3c. Engaging Students in Learning
3d. Using Assessment for Learning
3e. Responding Flexibly to Student Needs

DOMAIN 4: Principled Teaching

4a. Engaging in Reflective Practice
4b. Documenting Student Progress
4c. Engaging Families and Communities
4d. Contributing to School Community and Culture
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally
4f. Acting in Service of Students

Rubrics exist for each component within the four domains, and each of the rubrics are rated as Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished. Examples include:

- **Unsatisfactory** – "Learning experiences do not require active intellectual engagement by students."
- **Basic** – "Learning experiences partially engage students intellectually; the activities require students to do some thinking"
- **Proficient-** "Learning experiences support curiosity and exploration and encourage higher-order thinking; students engage in multiple ways and represent their ideas and responses through multiple means."
- **Distinguished**- "Students take initiative to increase the challenge or complexity of learning experiences; and make suggestions for modifications that increase meaning and relevance."

4 APPRAISAL PLAN

Statement of Purpose

Mentoring For Beginning Teachers

Timeline and Procedures:
Year 1
Year 2
Year 3 and after

4.1 APPRAISAL PLAN

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purposes of these plans include:

1. Improving the quality of instruction and performance of staff and enhancing student learning as defined in the professional competencies.
2. Providing systematic training and support for staff new to teaching or new to Salina.
3. Creating positive attitudes toward the purposes and values of appraisal and professional development.
4. Collecting reliable and varied data for making employment decisions.

Salina USD 305 is committed to excellence in education. This commitment is evidenced by the ongoing process of professional appraisal for all teachers

4.2 INDUCTION PROGRAM

MENTOR TEACHERS PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

Each beginning teacher participates in the Salina Public Schools Induction Program. The induction program is based upon Charlotte Danielson's *A Framework for Teaching.* At the onset of the school year, the beginning teacher is matched with a mentor. Mentors are experienced teachers who were recommended by a building administrator. As part of the mentor selection process, veteran teachers who wish to serve as mentors competed a written application. All mentors participate in a three-day summer mentor training.

The mentor provides ongoing support for the beginning teacher as the pair works on the Components of the Framework for Teaching. The beginning teacher and mentor engage in several structured activities throughout the year to support the beginning teacher as he/she hones skills in planning and preparation, classroom environment and instruction.

The induction program follows a developmental cycle of teach, plan, reflect, and apply. Through this process the beginning teacher is able to work with a mentor and identify areas of strength as well as areas of growth based on the components of professional practice. The induction activities allow the beginning teacher the opportunity to analyze his/her professional practice and communicate with other beginning teachers so that he/she can grow as a professional.

4.3 COMPREHENSIVE PAS TIMELINE

Comprehensive PAS Timeline				**PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SYSTEM**	
Timeline		**What is due for Evaluators & Teachers**	Check off		
ON OR BEFORE THIS DATE		**EXPLANATION**		**Yrs. 1 & 2** [2 observations on summative]	**YEAR 3 & ON** [1 observation on summative]
May 1 each year		Notify in writing all teachers who will be evaluated next year.		X	X
New Staff Orientation		Beginning teachers are assigned mentors and participate in the induction program.		X	
		All teachers new to 305 receive district level training on the Introduction to Framework for Teaching.			
September 1		Evaluators meet with all staff for orientation on evaluation procedures.		X	X
1st week of November		First evaluations completed (observation, conference, SPM, and summative) **60th School Day of 1st Semester**		X	
February 15		Evaluations complete, including personnel conferences, SPM, and summative evaluations. [THIRD YEAR AND AFTER ONLY]			X
1st week of April		Second evaluation complete, including personnel conference, SPM, & final summative evaluation. [ALL FIRST AND SECOND YEAR TEACHERS] **60th School Day of 2nd Semester**		X	
May 1		Notify in writing all teachers who will be evaluated next year.		X	X

4.4 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 1

For Beginning Teacher and Experienced Teacher <u>NEW</u> to USD 305		
Step	**Activity**	**Timeline**
1.	All teachers new to 305 receive district level training on the Introduction to Framework for Teaching.	*New Staff Orientation*
2.	**Beginning teachers** are assigned mentors and participate in the Induction program	*New Staff Orientation*, throughout year
3.	Evaluators meet with all their new staff for orientation on evaluation procedures; complete Pre-Assessment. Teacher and evaluator meet to discuss evaluation process and schedule first observation.	By September 1
4.	<u>FIRST SEMESTER</u>: Evaluator conducts at least 1 scheduled **classroom observation(s)**–	
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in a **pre-observation conference** to discuss completed forms.	Prior to scheduled observation
	▸ Teacher completes **self-reflection form** after each observation	Prior to post-observation conference
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **post-observation conference** and discuss self-reflection form after each observation	Within 5 days after observation
	▸ Teacher presents Student Performance Measure(s)	Before summative meeting
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **summative evaluation meeting**	Deadline 60 school days into 1st semester
5.	<u>SECOND SEMESTER</u>: Evaluator conducts at least 1 unscheduled **classroom observation(s)**	
	▸ Teacher completes **self-reflection form**	Prior to post-observation conference
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **post-observation conference** and discuss **self-reflection form**	Within 5 days after observation
	▸ Teacher presents Student Performance Measure(s)	Before summative meeting
6.	Teacher and evaluator participate in **final evaluation meeting**	Deadline 60 school days into 2nd semester
7.	Notification of staff to be evaluated the upcoming school year	By May 1

Additional and unscheduled observations will be at the discretion of the evaluator or teacher and will include a post conference with teacher.

4.5 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 2

Step	Activity	Timeline
1.	Teacher and evaluator meet to discuss evaluation process and schedule first observation, complete Pre-Assessment.	By September 1
2.	FIRST SEMESTER: Evaluator conducts at least 1 scheduled **classroom observation**(s)	
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in a **pre-observation conference** to discuss completed **pre-observation form**	Prior to first observation
	▸ Teacher completes **self-reflection form** after each observation	Prior to post observation conference
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **post-observation conference** and discuss self-reflection form after each observation	Within 5 days after observation
	▸ Teacher presents **Student Performance Measure**(s)	Before summative meeting
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **summative evaluation meeting**	Deadline 60 school days into 1st semester
3.	SECOND SEMESTER: Evaluator conducts at least 1 unscheduled **classroom observation(s)**	
	▸ Teacher completes **self-reflection form**	Prior to post-observation conference
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in post-observation conference and discuss self-reflection form	Within 5 days after observation
	▸ Teacher presents **Student Performance Measure(s)**	Before summative meeting
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **summative evaluation meeting**	Deadline 60 school days into 2nd semester
4.	Notification of staff to be evaluated the upcoming school year	By May 1

Additional and unscheduled observations will be at the discretion of the evaluator or teacher and will include a post conference with teacher.

4.6 APPRAISAL PLAN YEAR 3, 4, 7 and every 3rd year

Step	Activity	Timeline
1.	Teacher and evaluator meet to discuss evaluation process and schedule first observation, complete Pre-Assessment.	By September 1
2.	Evaluator conducts at least **1 scheduled classroom observation(s)**	
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in a **pre-observation conference** to discuss completed **pre-observation form**	Prior to first observation
	▸ Teacher completes **self-reflection form** after each observation	Prior to post observation conference
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **post-observation conference** and discuss **self-reflection form** after each observation	Within 5 days of the observation
	▸ Teacher presents **Student Performance Measure(s)**	Before summative meeting
	▸ Teacher and evaluator participate in **summative evaluation meeting**	Prior to February 15
3.	Notification of staff to be evaluated the upcoming school year	By May 1

Additional and unscheduled observations will be at the discretion of the evaluator or teacher and will include a post conference with teacher.

4.7 TEACHER PRE-OBSERVATION FORM

Required for all announced observations; Time allocation: approx. 10 min.

**NOTE: In lieu of narrative for #2, 3, 4, and 6, you may refer to your lesson plan, if attached*

1. Briefly describe the students in this class, including those with special needs. *(Component 1b)*

*How was prior knowledge assessed? *(Component 1e)*

2. *What instructional strategies do you plan to use to engage students in the content? *(Component 1e)*

3. *What instructional materials or other resources will you use? (Attach sample materials you will be using in the lesson.) *(Component 1d)*

4. What difficulties with the lesson do you anticipate the students might have? *(Component 1a)*

5. *How do you plan to assess student achievement of the goals? (Attach any tests or performance tasks, with rubrics or scoring guides.) *(Component 1f)*

6. How will you use the results of the assessment? *(Component 1f)*

7. Please list any other information you feel pertinent.

4.8 TEACHER REFLECTION FORM

1. As I reflect on the lesson, to what extent were students productively engaged? *(Components 4a, 1e, 3c)*

2. Did the students learn what I intended? Were my instructional goals met? How do I know? *(Components 1f and 4a)*

3. Did I alter my goals or instructional plan as I taught the lesson? If so, why? *(Components 1e and 3e)*

4. Given the opportunity to teach this lesson again to this same group of students, what would I do differently? Why? *(Component 4a)*

5. OPTIONAL: Provide several samples of student work on this assignment. This work should reflect the full range of student ability in your class and include feedback you provide to students on their papers.

5 PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

FLOWCHART AND PROCEDURES

5.1 FLOWCHART AND PROCDURES

Professional Assistance Plan for Year 4 (or more) Teachers		
Step	**Activity**	**Timeline**
	AWARENESS PHASE	
1	**Teacher seeks special assistance** or **primary evaluator requests that a teacher meet** to discuss a specific area of competency that needs improvement. This is done with a written notice given to the other person.	When a teacher's performance in an area needs improvement and/or additional resources or attention
2	Teacher and primary evaluator meet to clarify area(s) of concern related to the competency domains and to mutually identify and agree upon **procedures, resources, and timelines** relative to resolving the concern(s).	Within ten working days of the written notice
3	Support and resources forthcoming for teacher to assist him/her to be successful.	During the time frame mutually agreed upon
4	A **review of progress** by the evaluator will result in 1 of 3 possible recommendations: ▸ Concerns resolved ▸ Progress noted, continuation as mutually agreed upon ▸ Concerns remain unresolved, movement to Professional Support Phase, with written notification that includes the reason(s) for the meeting and a time	Short duration-generally within two months of the first meeting
	PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PHASE	
1	The teacher is **informed in writing** of the reason(s) for the meeting and the time for the meeting.	When concerns have been unresolved in the Awareness Phase or, when classroom performance warrants more intensive support than in the Awareness Phase
2	The teacher, primary evaluator and other designated team members will participate in an initial meeting **to discuss specific concerns and develop a plan of action.**	Within 10 days following the initial notification of recommendation
3	Team will **meet to review progress** and make necessary modifications to the plan	At least monthly
4	Primary evaluator conducts **formal and informal observations** and provides feedback to the teacher, and the teacher receives resources as outlined	As consistent with the plan
5	Evaluator prepares **summary report** outlining the initial reasons for the Professional Support Phase and **objectives accomplished during this phase** to share with the team	Prior to final team meeting
6	Team recommendation will result in one of the following: ▸ Concerns resolved, removal from plan ▸ Progress noted, continuation of plan ▸ Concerns unresolved, recommendation to the BOE for consideration	At the conclusion of the plan (should not exceed two semesters)
7	Evaluator completes **summative evaluation form**	Within 5 days of the final team meeting

5.2 PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN FOR YEAR 4 (OR MORE) TEACHERS

OVERVIEW

The Professional Assistance Plan section consists of an **Awareness Phase** and a **Professional Support Phase.**

1. The **Awareness Phase** enables the Year 4 (or more) teacher to become aware of or to seek assistance in any area of the Professional Competency Domains needing improvement.

2. The **Professional Support Phase** enables the team members to assist a Year 4 (or more) teacher to improve specific professional competency element.

AWARENESS PHASE (Recommended for brief duration, generally not to exceed two months.)

- Awareness Phase brings individuals together to identify and discuss areas of concern related to the Professional Competency Domains.

- The initial meeting can be requested by either the evaluator or the teacher by requesting the reasons for this phase in writing to the other party.

- Within ten working days from the notice, the evaluator and the teacher will meet to mutually agree on the procedures, resources, and timelines relative to resolving the concerns. **(See *Awareness Phase Plan Form*)**

- A review of progress by the evaluator and teacher will result in one of three recommendations:

    1. Concerns resolved, no further action necessary;
    2. Progress noted, continuation of agreed procedures and mutually agreed upon extended time line and/or;
    3. Concerns remain unresolved, movement to the Professional Support Phase.

- Meeting minutes and discussions within the Awareness Phase will remain at the building level between concerned parties unless Professional Support Phase is recommended.

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN FOR YEAR 4 (OR MORE) TEACHERS, Cont.

PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PHASE

Purpose

The purpose of the Professional Support Phase is to provide more specific guidance and assistance for the resolution of concerns identified in the Awareness Phase of the Professional Assistance Plan for Year 4 (or more) teachers or through the general evaluation process. In this phase, intensive supervisory procedures will be implemented.

A "team approach" is utilized in this phase and strategies may include classroom observations, evaluations, conferences, coaching, and provision of additional training or materials to support an environment conducive to improvement.

Plan Development

- The Professional Assistance Team will consist of the teacher, the teacher's primary evaluator, the Executive Director of Human Resources (or designee), and a representative(s) of the teacher's choice. Secondary evaluators and other resource people may be included on the team.

- The initial team meeting of the Professional Support Phase will be held within ten working days of the final meeting of the Awareness Phase. At the initial meeting of the team:

  - ✓ The primary evaluator will review the specific areas of concern related to the Professional Competency Domains.

  - ✓ Working collaboratively, the team will address the areas of concern by developing an action plan that is Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time bound (SMART). The team will also develop strategies that include resources, both human and programmatic.

- Meeting at least monthly, the team will review progress and make any necessary modifications to the plan. Minutes of the team meetings will be sent to team members within five days following each meeting.

- Meeting documentation will be filed at both the building and district office levels. (See **Professional Support Phase Action Plan Form**).

- At their discretion, parties may include additional representation at any or all meetings.

Conclusion

A review of progress at the conclusion of the designated time period will result in one of three recommendations:

- ✓ Concerns resolved, removal from the Professional Support Phase.
- ✓ Progress noted, continuation on the Professional Support Phase.
- ✓ Concerns unresolved, recommendation to the BOE for their consideration.

5.3 AWARENESS PHASE PLAN FORM

Year 4 (or more) **TEACHER**

Building:_____ Initial Meeting Date:_____

Evaluator:_____ Teacher:_____

Evaluator Signature:_____ Teacher Signature:_____

Professional Competency Domain:

Concerns:

Action Plan Strategies:

Resources (if applicable):

Specific outcome to exit plan:

Interval Meeting Date/Times and Progress on Action Plan:

Date:		Initials:
Date:		Initials:

Final Meeting Date/Time:

Recommendation:

☐ Concerns resolved
☐ Progress noted, continuation as mutually agreed upon
☐ Concerns remain unresolved, movement to Professional Support Phase, with written notification that includes the reason(s) for the meeting and a time

Evaluator Signature_____ Date:_____

Teacher Signature_____ Date:_____

Signatures acknowledge content - they do not signify agreement.
Responses to this document may be made no later than two weeks after receipt of it.
This form is filed at building level only unless it moves to support phase.

5.4 PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PHASE FORM

Action Plan For Year 4 (or more) Teachers Form

Teacher:_____ Building:_____

Initial Meeting Date:_____

Primary Evaluator:

Additional Assistance Team Members:

Exec. Dir. of Human Resources:

***Recommend separate plans for each Professional Competency Domain(s)/components of concern are needed.*

	Comments	
Professional Competency Domain(s)/components of concern		
The Plan:	Expectations:	
	Strategies:	
	Resources:	
	Data Collection:	
	Evidence: (Level of performance according to Danielson rubric)	
The Monitoring System: Benchmarks/Indicators of Improvement (Timeline)	Date:	Initials:

Final Team Recommendation	Team Signatures:
☐ Concerns resolved, removal from plan ☐ Progress noted, continuation of plan ☐ Concerns unresolved, recommendation to the BOE	

Primary Evaluator Recommendations:

Primary Evaluator Signature_____ Date:_____

Teacher Signature_____ Date:_____

Signatures acknowledge content - they do not signify agreement.

Responses to this document may be made no later than two weeks after receipt of it

6 TEACHERS

7 INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS

INTRUCTIONAL COACHES

8 SCHOOL COUNSELORS

9 LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALISTS

10 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

11 SOCIAL WORKERS

****Certified staff who are governed by the Negotiated Agreement and who are NOT licensed by Kansas State Department of Education (KDSE) are NOT subject to submitting Student Performance Measures (SPM) as part of their evaluation.****

12 SCHOOL NURSES

****Certified staff who are governed by the Negotiated Agreement and who are NOT licensed by Kansas State Department of Education (KDSE) are NOT subject to submitting Student Performance Measures (SPM) as part of their evaluation.****

13 RELATED SERVICES PROVIDERS

AUDIOLOGIST

AUTISM

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST

PHYSICAL THERAPIST

SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST

****Certified staff who are governed by the Negotiated Agreement and who are NOT licensed by Kansas State Department of Education (KDSE) are NOT subject to submitting Student Performance Measures (SPM) as part of their evaluation.****