

# Artifacts of Instructional Practices (AIP)

## Assumptions:

- An observation evaluation process should promote growth through self-assessment, reflection, and professional conversations (with peers and evaluator). The use of the rubrics of the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching](#) supports these practices and promotes professional growth.
- Recordings of instruction will not be used for evaluation purposes.
- Teachers should have an alternative to the in-person observation due to COVID-19 closure and safety concerns.
- The Artifacts of Instructional Practices are evidence of classroom practices that can be used in the event that a formal in-person EES observation cannot otherwise be achieved. The teacher and the evaluator can collaboratively decide whether an in-person observation or an AIP works best to meet the needs of the teacher. In case of a disagreement, the evaluator will select the option.
- The artifacts themselves are not rated. It is the implementation context and quality of their use that needs to be aligned with the performance levels in the rubric.
- The Artifacts of Instructional Practices is not intended to be a working portfolio.
- Engaging in one set of AIP is equivalent to ONE observation cycle.

## The Artifacts of Instructional Practices ARE:

1. Evidence of the planning and implementation of instructional practices aligned with the five focus components of the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching](#).
2. Inclusive of teacher and student actions that are grounded in standards-based learning outcomes.
3. Collected over a collaboratively pre-determined instructional period that may extend beyond a single lesson but not a long series of lessons or the entire unit.
4. Captured as hard copies or digital snapshots of teacher and student actions.  
(See some possible [Examples of Artifacts](#))
5. Organized by each of the five focus components. A given artifact may align with more than one component. Teachers may use this [AIP Evidence Collection Form](#) for organization.

**Note:** Focus should be on the *component alignment* and the *implementation quality* of the artifacts aligned with the rubric descriptors and not the *quantity*.

## The Artifacts of Instructional Practices ARE NOT:

1. Lessons provided by scripted curricula.
2. A working portfolio to simply provide documentation.

## Process, Requirements & Best Practices for: Artifacts of Instructional Practices (AIP)

\*notates required actions

<b>Prior to the Beginning Conference</b>	The goal is to work together to establish mutually agreed upon conference dates and times, format and documentation expectations.	
	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Evaluator</b>
	Address the <a href="#">pre-observation conference questions</a> or submit relevant lesson materials to provide context for the upcoming lesson, as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.*	Clarify the AIP process and expectations with the teacher(s) and set the conference date(s).*
<b>Beginning Conference</b>	<p>The purpose of the Beginning Conference is for the teacher and evaluator to engage in a collaborative conversation to discuss the teacher's instructional plan, and set clear expectations for what types and what sources of evidence will be considered high quality and in alignment with the rubrics.</p> <p>The Beginning Conference may occur through electronic formats such as WebEx, Zoom, Google Suite apps, email etc.; in situations where the teacher and evaluator do not agree on the format, the conference will default to a face-to-face meeting pending COVID-19 circumstances.</p>	
	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Evaluator</b>
	Talks about the submitted plan or responses to the <a href="#">pre-observation conference questions</a> and identifies potential Artifacts of Instructional Practices. This may include lesson objectives and activities, along with helpful information that will assist the evaluator, such as student characteristics and specific classroom situations.* Ask the evaluator clarifying questions at this time.	<p>During the conference, the evaluator gives constructive feedback by asking questions and clarifying any questions posed by the teacher.</p> <p>Discuss expectations for acceptable types and sources of evidence that are grounded in the performance levels in the <a href="#">rubric descriptors</a>.*</p> <p>Document the scheduled date &amp; time into PDE<sup>3</sup>.*</p>

## Process, Requirements & Best Practices for: Artifacts of Instructional Practice (AIP)

\*notates required actions

<b>Implementation and Evidence Collection</b>	The purpose is to provide a collection of quality artifacts aligned with the five focus components that will be used for continual self-assessment, and for a reflective discussion and evaluation during the Ending Conference.	
	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Evaluator</b>
	Organize evidence generated by the implementation of the plan (See some possible <a href="#">Examples of Artifacts</a> for details).*  May use the <a href="#">AIP Evidence Collection Form</a> to document hard copy/digital evidence.	May engage in an informal check-in and provide support as needed.  Provide feedback on teacher-initiated inquiries.
<b>Ending Conference</b>	The purpose of the Ending Conference is for the teacher & evaluator to engage in a reflective discussion grounded in the rubric & in the evidence, and assign ratings.  The Ending Conference may occur through electronic formats such as WebEx, Zoom, Google Suite apps, email etc.; in situations where the teacher and evaluator do not agree on the format, the conference will default to a face-to-face meeting pending COVID-19 circumstances.  The Ending Conference concludes with the teacher’s reflection (as applicable to the evaluator’s expectations), and with the evaluator finalizing the documentation within PDE <sup>3</sup> . The Ending Conference reflection or its alternate is optional unless the evaluator requires this practice at the school or office.	
	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Evaluator</b>
	Participate in a collective analysis of how the evidence corresponds to component rubrics.*  Submit additional artifacts to the evaluator as evidence.  Identify strengths and areas of growth as a reflective teacher practice.  Document any concerns or additional information in PDE <sup>3</sup> .	Facilitate an evidence-based reflection discussion rooted in aligning evidence to the <a href="#">Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching</a> .*  Discuss strengths and areas of growth for the five focus components.  Review, if any, reflections that the teacher submits and add in any additional comments as applicable.  Document date & component ratings in PDE <sup>3</sup> .*