Teacher Evaluation Instruments and Processes:

A Special Education Perspective

By

Hyuk Hong

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Educational and Leadership and Policy Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

_____

Chair: Dr. Thomas DeLuca

_____

Dr. Susan Twombly

_____

Dr. Argun Saatcioglu

_____

Dr. Deborah Perbeck

_____

Dr. Joseph O'Brien

Date Defended: April 26, 2018

The Dissertation Committee for Hyuk Hong

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Teacher evaluation instruments and processes: A special education perspective

_____

Chair: Thomas A. DeLuca

Date approved: _____

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptual differences between general education teachers and special education teachers on teacher evaluation, and among special education teachers evaluated according to three different teacher evaluation systems (CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model) adapted by the districts in Washington State. The study also examined factors that may improve the special education teacher evaluation.

A total of 234 certified teachers, including 37 special education teachers, in Washington State participated in the study. An online survey form of the modified Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire was utilized to collect the perceptions of certified teachers on the teacher evaluation process.

Significant response differences were found to exist between the perceptions of special education and general education teachers, particularly elementary school teachers, on their evaluators. The perceptions of special education teachers evaluated based on three different teacher evaluation systems were included in this study for descriptive purposes only due to about 76 percent of special education teachers participated in the study were evaluated based on Danielson, which implemented an alternative approach to evaluate the performance of special education teachers. Special education teachers perceived that the evaluation standards and the purpose of the evaluation were relatively clear to them, and the evaluation process promoted accountability and teacher growth. Recommendations for future studies are to examine the effect of the professional relations between special education teachers and their evaluators on the quality of the special education teacher evaluation, and the perceptions of special education teachers on teacher evaluation systems with different approaches to evaluate special education teachers.

Dedication

This study is dedicated first to my father, UnSeok Hong, who has suffered for many years due to the injuries he sustained during the May 18 Democratic Uprising Movement in Kwangju, South Korea, in 1980. He often quoted a line from his favorite poem, “For the high ground is right there, we cannot, we must not stop here.” This became my motto in life.

To my mother, HyunSeo, Im, who raised and supported her four children. Because of you, we were able to survive and thrive. As your oldest son, I am forever grateful for your sacrifice.

To my wife, SoYang, my eternal companion, love of my life, best friend, and my suffer buddy. I was able to come this far because of your support and encouragement. Thank you for always being there for me.

To my children, Sheen, Soul, Seung, and Sun, who try to convince me every year that I should not ask them for peace and quiet for my birthday present. Thank you for your unwavering support and encouragement. You made me realize that our home is truly a heaven on earth. I love you with all my heart.

Acknowledgements

Writing and completing this dissertation would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of my dissertation committee members. To Dr. Thomas DeLuca, my dissertation chair and advisor, thank you for all your wisdom and guidance, and many hours you spent to support me. You are so kind and generous, and knowledgeable and experienced in the field. You went many extra miles to find ways to help me. I was able to complete this study because of you. To Dr. Susan Twombly, I am grateful for your insights and kind encouragement throughout the process. I still remember the qualitative study class that you taught. From you, I learned to love and understand stories that qualitative studies tell. To Dr. Deborah Perbeck, I am especially thankful for you not giving up on me. Thank you for reaching out, and encouraging me to get back and finish the study. I am also very grateful for your suggestions to improve my dissertation when I was struggling to finish it. I admire your practical knowledge and experience of supporting K-12 schools, staff, and programs. To Dr. Argun Saatcioglu and Dr. Joseph O'Brien, thank you for your valuable suggestions to improve the dissertation greatly. I am grateful that I had an opportunity to be surrounded and guided by such talented, knowledgeable, and caring professors like you. Thank you.

I also would like to thank staff and professors at the Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies and School of Education in University of Kansas for their constant effort to improve education and student learning. To Denise Brubaker, thank you for your unceasing support. You are the greatest asset the department has.

To Dr. Thomas Skrtic from Department of Special Education at University of Kansas, thank you for leading me to come to University of Kansas. You inspired me to continue to stay in K-12 and support students with disabilities.

To Dr. Eugene Edgar from Special Education Program at University of Washington, thank you for your kindness and interests in my progress over the years. I am grateful for the stories that you shared. You inspired me to become more observant, thoughtful, and considerate.

I also want to share my appreciation to educators who participated in the study. Thank you for taking time out of your extremely busy work and responding to the survey. I am also grateful for the district leaders of nine districts who allowed their teachers to participate in the study.

I acknowledge my friends and colleagues for their continued support and encouragement. To Dr. Grace KyungSook Kang, I am especially grateful for your friendship and guidance over the years. Thank you for inspiring me to start this journey. To staff from National Institute of Special Education and special education teachers and administrators from South Korea, thank you for your kindness and encouragement over the years.

I want to thank my family. To my brother and sisters back in South Korea, I am glad that we all turned out well despite all the hardships that we had to go through when we were young. I am also glad that we can create a better future for our children. Thank you for all your thoughts and prayers. To mom, I just can't say enough. Thank you, mom, for everything that you did for us. You made all these possible. I look forward to spending more time with you. To Sheen, Soul, Seung, and Sun, thank you for your daily prayers asking Heavenly Father to bless dad to have strength to finish the study. I look forward to attending your athletic events, band, choir, and orchestra performances, and doing stuff with you like singing, watching movies, riding bicycles, walking trails, and many more to come, alongside your mom. SoYang, my wife, thank you for being there for me. Wherever you are, there is Heaven.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. Introduction

In the era of standards-based teacher evaluation systems, the special education teacher evaluation presents unique challenges due to the complexity of special education teachers' roles and responsibilities (Vannest & Hagan-Burk, 2009). According to a survey in 2010, about one-half of the participants, including 1,100 state and district special education directors and related administrators, supported the idea of having a separate teacher evaluation system for special education teachers (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2010).

Despite the needs for a teacher evaluation system that addresses the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers, most of the districts and states implemented a *one-size-fits-all* approach of teacher evaluation systems (Attinello, Lare, & Source, 2006; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Hill & Grossman, 2013; Popham, 2013; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002; Starratt, 2005), and the same teacher evaluation standards were applied to evaluate both general education and special education teachers (Holdheide, Goe, Croft, & Reschly, 2010; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2012).

The purpose of this study was to identify any perceptual differences between general education teachers and special education teachers on the teacher evaluation, and among special education teachers evaluated according to three different teacher evaluation systems (CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model) implemented in Washington State. Based on the findings from this study and the literature review, this study examined the options to improve the special education teacher evaluation, including modifying evaluation criteria of the standards-based teacher evaluation systems to measure unique roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and developing separate or alternative teacher evaluation systems designed specifically to evaluate

multiple roles of special education teachers. This study also reviewed factors that may need to be considered to improve the special education teacher evaluation.

Background of the Study

Teacher evaluation reform efforts. Teacher effectiveness became a popular term in the education field. An effective teacher is the single most important school-related factor in improving student achievement (Hattie, 2009; Jordan, Mendro, & Weerasinghe, 1997; Mendro, 1998; Sanders, Ashton, & Wrights, 2005). The general consensus among scholars seems to tie teacher effectiveness to student test scores. Thus, teacher effectiveness can be defined as a teacher's contribution to students' test scores (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008; Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014).

In an effort to improve and strengthen teacher effectiveness, a nationwide focus on accountability and testing emerged with the enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002. NCLB is the federal funding initiative that promised to provide much needed educational and financial support to states. In order to be eligible for the funding, the states were required to provide multiple standardized assessments for students and report student performance based on subgroups towards meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (United States Department of Education, 2002).

In addition, the Obama administration enacted and implemented the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) in 2009 providing approximately $100 billion to improve American education system. As a part of the ARRA effort, The U.S. Department of Education created an incentive program for the states, *Race to the Top*, allocating $4.35 billion to improve the quality of education and student achievement. *Race to the Top* required States to move forward with the reforms around four specific and closely tied areas:

1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace, and compete in the global economy;
2) building data systems that store and measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed the most; and
4) turning around the lowest-achieving schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

The one factor that *Race to the Top* identified as having the most impact on these four focus areas was the teacher evaluation system. Traditionally, teacher evaluation has utilized a two-point scale rating such as 'satisfactory' and 'unsatisfactory.' Studies reported that up to 99 percent of teachers in many districts received a 'satisfactory' rating (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhem, & Keeling, 2009). Despite so many teachers receiving 'satisfactory' ratings for their teacher evaluation, student achievement remained stagnant for many years. Under the traditional teacher evaluation system, teachers reported that they did not receive the necessary support during the evaluation process, and the results of the evaluation did not help them to improve and become more effective teachers (Duffett, Farkas, Rotherham, & Silva, 2008).

Race to the Top stressed the need for new approaches to evaluating the teacher performance and effectiveness. The requirements for these new teacher evaluation systems, which are referred to as a standards-based teacher evaluation system, demanded the teacher evaluation to be much more complex than the traditional teacher evaluation approach, and promoted the development of new teacher evaluation systems that incorporated multiple measures of data collection including, but not limited to, surveys, multiple classroom observations, and teacher's impact on student achievement or a value-added growth model. In

addition, new teacher evaluation systems were required to offer opportunities for teachers to improve their effectiveness and participate in the professional development activities (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Since the enactment of *Race to the Top* in 2009, most states either modified their existing teacher evaluation systems, completely overhauled, or replaced them with new teacher evaluation systems that utilized multiple standards-based data collection methods including student outcomes, student surveys, and classroom observations (McGuinn, 2012).

Washington State teacher evaluation reform effort. Out of 41 states that applied for the *Race to the Top* funding, eleven states and the District of Columbia, secured the funding from *Race to the Top*. Washington State was one of the states that competed but did not win the funding. Despite the lack of funding, Washington State moved on to improve their teacher evaluation systems. In 2010, Washington State passed the Senate Bill 6696. The bill stressed the importance of the following eight criteria related to teacher improvement and evaluation:

1) Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement.
2) Demonstrating effective teaching practices.
3) Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs.
4) Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.
5) Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment.
6) Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning.
7) Communicating and collaborating with parents and the school community
8) Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning (RCW 28A.405.100 (2)(b)).

Washington State decided to move away from the traditional teacher evaluation method and embrace the standards-based teacher evaluation systems. By June 2010, the Teacher-Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Steering Committee of Washington state selected eight pilot districts and a consortium to develop new teacher and principal evaluation models. In July 2011, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), which oversees the educational system in Washington State, released a report to the legislature, recommending the selection of three research-based instructional frameworks as statewide teacher evaluation models. Based on the recommendation from OSPI, Senate bill 5895 of 2012, which amended 6696, directed OSPI to pick three preferred teacher evaluation systems and required all districts in Washington States to adopt one of the three teacher evaluation systems. In September 2012, OSPI reported the selection of three evaluation systems including CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model. The 2012 – 2013 school year was a pilot year. Local districts were allowed to choose one of the three evaluation systems, and perform a trial run. The statewide implementation of the new teacher evaluation systems began in 2013 – 2014 school year. During 2014 – 2015, school districts, if they chose to, were permitted to either evaluate a selected number of certified teachers or evaluate all certified teachers based on the new evaluation systems. By the 2015 – 2016 school year, every district in Washington State selected one of three teacher evaluation systems, and every teacher in Washington State were being evaluated using the new teacher evaluation systems (Teacher Principal Evaluation Project, 2015).

CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric. About 99 districts chose CEL 5D+. CEL stands for Center for Educational Leadership at the University of Washington. 5D represents five dimensions of teaching and learning including Purpose, Student Engagement, Curriculum &

Pedagogy, Assessment for Student Learning, and Classroom Environment & Culture. The '+' sign next to 5D represents student growth goals that Washington State mandated the evaluation systems to incorporate. CEL 5D+ was developed to assess the teacher performance and provide feedback for the professional development of the teacher. CEL 5D+ uses four rating scales:

- Unsatisfactory (the teacher demonstrates an unacceptable or poor level of instructional practice resulting in delayed or little learning for some students.),
- Basic (the teacher demonstrates an essential foundation for instructional practice, using research-based strategies and tools to create learning for all students.),
- Proficient (the teacher demonstrates competent and skilled instructional practice, using research-based strategies and tools to create solid learning for all students), and
- Distinguished (the teacher demonstrates exemplary instructional practice, using research-based strategies and tools to create optimal learning for all students).

Beginning with the 2017 – 2018 school year, CEL 5D+ provided *guiding questions* to consider when evaluating special education teachers who work with profoundly involved students on an individual learning plan, referring to students with disabilities. The *guiding questions* were not officially applied when evaluating special education teachers at the time of this study (Center for Educational Leadership, 2017).

Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. Around 105 school districts selected Danielson teacher evaluation system. The Framework for Teaching is represented by a research-based set of a component of instruction. Instructional responsibilities of teachers are grouped into four domains including; Domain 1: planning and preparation; Domain 2: classroom environment; Domain 3: instruction; and Domain 4: professional responsibilities. Danielson

model incorporates four levels of performance: Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished.

One unique and distinctive feature of Danielson model is its support for special education teacher evaluation. The Danielson group developed examples or scenarios of special education practices across the four levels of performance as references to be used when evaluating special education teachers. The Danielson model acknowledged that it does not address the broad and diverse world of special education. Following are the main points embedded in the examples:

1) Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles with the goal of providing multiple means of representation, engagement, and action and expression in order to support learning and the inclusion of students with disabilities (SWDs) in the Least Restrictive Environment. A crosswalk between UDL and the Framework is available for free download from our Framework page.
2) Data-driven instructional practices and behavior management strategies.
3) Student self-management, choice-making and independence.
4) Collaborative observation cycles in which the teacher plays an important role in sharing specialized information around assistive and adaptive technology, strategies and techniques, and code-related requirements.
5) Active engagement of the entire educational community including co-teachers, therapists, counselors and child study team members.
6) Additional responsibilities for the teacher related to working with instructional and one-on-one assistants to ensure fidelity of instructional and behavioral practices as well as to ensure confidentiality of student and family information (Danielson group, 2017).

Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model. About 90 school districts adopted the Marzano system. Marzano model incorporates four domains and 60 elements. Marzano uses five rating scales: Innovating (4, adapts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations), Applying (3, engages students in the strategy and monitors the extent to which it produces the desired outcomes), Developing (2, engages students in the strategy with no significant errors or omissions), Beginning (1, uses the strategy incorrectly or with parts missing), and Not using (0, strategy was called for but not exhibited). Overall, Marzano model is a *one-size-fits-all* approach of teacher evaluation system geared toward evaluating all teachers including general and special education teachers. Marzano model provides some scenarios, though not extensive, for general education teachers who support SWDs in their classrooms. The scenarios are used for evaluating general education teachers preparing and supporting SWDs, but they are not applied when evaluating special education teachers. The model recognizes that almost every classrooms in America support SWDs. While it acknowledged that special education teachers provide most needed support, their support "do(es) not supplant the instructional adaptations that regular education teachers must be prepared to make" (Warrick & Livingston, 2012, p. 9).

Special education teacher evaluation support at the state level: OSPI prepared an *OSPI Study Group Report* for evaluators who support teachers of separate/alternative learning environments. The report was included as a part of all three teacher evaluation systems just prior to this study was conducted. It recommended the prerequisites to a successful and reliable evaluation such as, teachers and their evaluators should have extensive understanding of the standards, the academic performance of the student group that a teacher is supporting should not influence the summative evaluation rating of the teacher, and districts should decide on the teaching positions that need to be evaluated based on the recommendation on this report. The

report included the support for special education teacher evaluation. Following are the suggestions:

- Resource and inclusive learning: “The full instructional framework and rubric” is an appropriate evaluation tool for teachers who work with students on an Individual Learn Plan (IEP) in a resource or an inclusive educational setting. This includes students who receive their core instruction from a special education teacher and their elective instruction from a general education teacher.
- Multiply involved self-contained: The evidence for instructional framework and rubric indicators/components is identified based on student learning needs for classrooms where students are on an IEP and have more severe or multiple conditions. Principals and teachers collaboratively identify the questions to adapt the teacher/student evidence that pertain to the learning needs of students for each indicator/component (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2017c, p. 2).

The full instructional framework and rubric refers to the teacher evaluation standards included in the three teacher evaluation systems implemented in Washington State. There was no evidence of these suggestions being utilized in any of the evaluation systems at the time of this study.

Statement of the Problem

Special education and general education teachers share some important common contractual and legal duties and responsibilities. For example, according to the contractual agreement between the teacher union and a district located in a Midwestern state, responsibilities of teachers (addressed to all teachers including special education) were mainly working towards meeting educational needs of the classroom by managing student behaviors and academic

learning, and delivering instruction in classrooms (USD 497, 2014). Additional legal duties of all teachers include, but not limited to, reporting child abuse and neglect, and the fair use of copyrighted materials including printed material, audiovisual material, and software (Underwood & Webb, 2005; Imber & Geel, 2009).

In addition to the common and shared duties and responsibilities among all teachers, special education teachers are required to meet stricter legal duties and responsibilities mandated by the federal law such as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) enacted in 1990 and reauthorized in 1997 and 2004. IDEA defined special education as "specially designed instruction … to meet the needs of a child with disability including instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and in other settings" (U. S. Department of Education, 2004, p. 856). Therefore, the purpose of special education is to meet the specific needs of students with disabilities (SWDs) by providing individualized services and opportunities to achieve "a meaningful, purposeful, and fulfilling life" (CEC, 1997, para. 4). IDEA emphasizes six principles that the states and local education agencies must adhere: Zero Reject, Impartial Assessment, Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Due Process, and Parent and Student Participation (Turnbull & Cilley, 1999; Turnbull & Turnbull, 2000). IDEA holds the states and local educational agencies to be responsible for supporting SWDs by making sure that the six principles of IDEA are implemented and maintained. However, the actual responsibilities of providing services ultimately rest upon special education teachers.

The evaluators' knowledge and experience about special education bring up another issue. Many special education teachers were evaluated by school administrators who have

limited expertise and understanding of special education teachers' roles and responsibilities (Billingsley, 1989).

Most of the currently available standards-based teacher evaluation systems were developed based on the performance criteria of general education teachers within the general education environment focusing on teacher effectiveness towards student achievement. The purpose of these teacher evaluation systems was to measure teacher effectiveness and provide timely and meaningful feedback towards teacher improvement (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Just as their general education counterparts, special education teachers strive to improve SWDs' academic achievement by providing individualized instructions. The Council for Exceptional Children (2012) recognized that instructional strategies developed and provided based on individual needs of students are "the heart of the special education practice" (p. 2). However, providing instruction is just one responsibility among many responsibilities of special education teachers. Special education teachers' duties and responsibilities include, but not limited to, preparing and delivering instruction, case management, progress monitoring, testing, evaluating, paperwork, meetings, and management of support staff (Washburn-Moses, 2005; CEC, 2007). In some reported cases, special education teachers are forced to allocate only 20 percent of their time to carry out instruction and spend the rest of their time to meet other obligations (Vannest & Hagan-Burk, 2009).

The standards-based teacher evaluation systems mainly focus on assessing teacher activities related to instructions that supports the academic achievement of students in the general education environment. The roles and responsibilities that special education teachers must perform, in addition to instruction-related activities, were mostly not considered for the teacher evaluation purposes. Despite the significant differences in duties and responsibilities

between general education and special education teachers, most states and districts use o*ne-size-fits-all* teacher evaluation systems to evaluate both special education and general education teachers (Johnson & Semmelroth, 2013; CEC, 2012; Semmelroth & Johnson, 2014).

Only a handful of studies on evaluating special education teachers are currently available. Two different types of approaches to support special education teacher evaluation were recommended by these studies. The first approach suggested modifying and differentiating the existing standards-based teacher evaluation systems that the states and the districts employed (CEC, 2012). One particular example is the teacher evaluation system developed by Charlotte Danielson and implemented in Washington State. The Danielson model provided a research-based teacher evaluation model for general education teachers. In addition, Danielson model included special education scenarios that can be used as benchmarks when evaluating special education teachers (The Danielson Group, 2015). The second approach supported the idea of developing a teacher evaluation system specifically addressing the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers. One example is Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) developed to measure special education teacher's effectiveness while considering the unique circumstances that special education teacher is involved in (Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014).

The timing of this study presented a unique opportunity to look into how special education teachers perceive the new standard-based teacher evaluation systems, how their perceptions measure up with the perceptions of general education teachers, and factors that may influence the quality of the special education teacher evaluation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptual differences of general education and special education teachers on teacher evaluation, and among special education teachers evaluated according to different teacher evaluation systems. This study was guided by the following questions.

1) How do teachers perceive themselves and the evaluation process in Washington State?
2) How do teacher attributes relate to their perception of the evaluation process?
3) How do special education teachers in Washington State perceive their teacher evaluations as compared to general education teachers?
4) How do special education teachers perceive the evaluation process based on the three evaluation systems: CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano?

Additionally, based on the literature reviews and the findings, this study attempted to discuss the possible options to improve the special education teacher evaluation. These options may include modifying the evaluation criteria of the *one-size-fits-all* standards-based teacher evaluation systems to allow them to measure unique roles and responsibilities of special education teachers, or developing separate or alternative teacher evaluation methods specifically for special education teachers. This study also discussed other factors that may have a potential to improve the quality of the special education teacher evaluation.

Concerning research question #4, it is important to note that a lower number of special education teachers participated from CEL 5D+ (n=7) and Marzano (n=2) school districts, compared with Danielson (n=28) school districts, severely limiting the generalizability of the

results. Thus, the survey results for RQ#4 were included only for descriptive purposes in this study.

Significance of the study

This study will contribute to the body of research on the subject of special education teacher evaluations, providing information about the perceptions of special education teachers on the teacher evaluation process, the perceptual differences between general education and special education teachers on the teacher evaluation process, the perceptual difference among special education teachers evaluated under different teacher evaluation systems, feasibility of modifying existing standards-based teacher evaluation systems to meet the needs of special education teachers or developing special education teacher specific evaluation systems, and any additional factors that may help improving the special education teacher evaluation.

This study will provide insights on the feasibility of applying *one-size-fits-all* teacher evaluation systems to evaluate special education teachers. This study will also discuss the issues of whether it is necessary to develop teacher evaluation systems specific to special education teachers or modifying existing teacher evaluation systems to address roles and responsibilities of special education teachers is sufficient.

This study may motivate school administrators who do not possess expertise in special education to gain further knowledge and experience in order to be able to provide a realistic and descriptive feedback to improve the effectiveness of special education teachers.

Special education teachers spend their days mostly isolated from general education teachers and school administrators (Bateman & Bateman, 2001, 2014; Glowacki, 2013). This study may help general education and special education teachers and administrators to fill the perception gap and improve their future collaboration.

The result of this study may help educational leaders to look into the need for modifying available teacher evaluation systems or developing a new evaluation system specific to the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers in order to provide more effective evaluation and useful feedback.

Organization of the Study

The rest of this study is organized into four chapters, a list of references, and the appendices. Chapter 2 reviewed literature related to the special education teacher evaluation. Chapter 3 provided data collection methods and the design of the study. Chapter 4 discussed the findings from the data analysis, and provided descriptive summaries of the data collected. The final chapter presented the summary of the findings, discussion, and future research recommendations. A list of references and the appendices were added at the end.

Summary

The standards-based teacher evaluation systems incorporate multiple methods of measurements to more accurately assess the teacher performance and provide practical feedback to improve teacher effectiveness. Most states and local districts adopted the new standards-based teacher evaluation systems at the time of this study. However, there is little effort to improve special education teacher evaluation. Complex roles and responsibilities of special education teachers are mandated by the federal and local law. Administrators evaluating special education teachers must have sufficient knowledge and understanding of special education teachers' roles and responsibilities to provide meaningful evaluation and effective feedback. This study may provide information needed to improve the special education teacher evaluation.

Chapter 2. Review of the Literature

The goal of this chapter is to capture the essence of the current and past research on the special education teacher evaluation, and as a result, establish the context for the purpose of this study of identifying the perceptual differences between general education and special education teachers on the teacher evaluation processes and the perceptual differences among special education teachers evaluated according to different teacher evaluation systems.

Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation can be defined as an effort to collect and use relevant information to make decisions on teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). Teacher evaluation also includes processes implemented to oversee quality of the teacher performance, and to develop and improve capacities of teachers (Barrett, 1986; Danielson, 2008; Mack, 2013).

The beginning of teacher evaluation and supervision can be traced back to colonial times (Cremin, 1976). Public education in different parts of the country during the late 1600s-1700s varied based on the needs and the wishes of local communities (Lucio & McNeil, 1968). The supervisory committees authorized by local communities managed teachers and school operations (Marks, Stoops, & King-Stoops, 1985; Tracy, 1995) by visiting classrooms and monitoring teacher performance and student progress (Lucio & McNeil, 1968; Marks et al., 1985). Due to the expansion of public schools during the early to mid-1800s, new professions related to education began to appear in large communities (Rury, 1991). These new positions included head teachers, principals, and superintendents. Professional trainings for teachers began in the late 1820s, requiring aspiring teachers to attend two-year schools for teacher certification (Spring, 2010). Because of the added complexity to public education including new instructional

pedagogies and subject area knowledge during this period, the supervisory committees were no longer equipped to carry out their responsibilities (Lucio & McNeil, 1968). They needed professional educators with knowledge and experience in new subject areas and instructional skills (Tracy, 1995). Towards the late 1800s, the responsibilities of building principals began to include supervising teachers (Marks et al., 1985). Burke and Krey (1975) pointed out that during the colonial times and until the late 1800s, teachers were judged mostly on personal characteristics and appearances rather than their instructional techniques.

During the early 1900s to 1930s, the public education system began to adopt the scientific management principles based on Frederick Taylor's principles which measured factory workers' behaviors to improve productivity (Burke & Krey, 2005; Wiles & Bondi, 1980). The scientific management principles brought the industrial management principles such as accountability and efficiency to teacher evaluation (Tanner & Tanner, 1987). The purpose of applying scientific management principles when evaluating teachers was to support administrators identifying effective educational practices in order to train teachers to improve their instructional skills (Tanner & Tanner, 1987). During this period, the evaluation standards began to shift towards focusing on pedagogical skills, classroom management, and student performance (Burke & Krey, 2005; Marks et. al, 1985).

During 1930s and 1940s, teacher evaluation moved away from the scientific methodology of the early 1900s towards a more humanistic approach (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995), treating teachers and students as individuals instead of raw materials (Ayer, 1954). Administrators were encouraged to become resources for teachers (Marks et al., 1985), and teachers were invited to participate in decision-making process on curriculum and instruction (Ayer, 1954). Due to the increased emphasis on social and emotional needs of teachers, many

administrators implemented hands-off approaches when working with teachers, resulting teachers not receiving necessary supports from administrators to improve their practices (Lucio & McNeil, 1968).

During 1950s, teacher evaluation incorporated formative evaluation approaches shifting towards focusing more on teacher competencies and their instructional qualities ((Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Shrinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Wiles, 1967).

By the 1960s and 1970s, the educational field embraced the clinical supervision model (Cogan, 1972), applying the holistic approach to teaching (Shrinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Teacher evaluation during this time focused on a collegial relationship between administrators and teachers (Tanner & Tanner, 1987), encouraging them to build trust (Cogan, 1972). Marzano et al. (2011) argued that the clinical supervision model of the evaluation never reached its full potential due to other educational focuses during the next few decades.

The structure of clinical supervision still remained through the 1980s and 1990s, but new trends began to emerge (Klein, 2015). *A Nation at Risk*, published in 1983, brought a sense of urgency to the public education in the nation. The report asserted that schools needed to provide longer school days, increase academic rigor, and improve teacher quality (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). NCEE (1983) stressed that aspiring teachers must meet high educational standards, exhibit proficiency in teaching, and demonstrate appropriate expertise in subject areas. Darling-Hammond (1998) pointed out that this was the beginning of teacher evaluation that incorporated the growth model. Wise et al. (1985) noted that major focuses of the education reform effort after *A Nation at Risk* was published were removing ineffective teachers and attracting talented aspiring teachers.

Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, teacher evaluation continued to evolve, shifting its focuses towards accountability and the professional development (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). Towards the end of 1990s, standards-based teacher evaluation approaches began to take a shape (Danielson, 1996; Ellett, 1997). With Race to the Top of 2009, teacher evaluation began to incorporate multiple means to evaluate teachers. During this period, standards-based teacher evaluation models and value-added model became popular (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Since then, there has been numerous studies on the relationships between teacher quality to student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2013).

Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

Both the traditional style of teacher evaluation systems that used two point scales of 'satisfactory' and 'unsatisfactory' and the standards-based teacher evaluation systems in recent years served two main evaluative functions: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is used to support teachers to improve their practices. Summative evaluation is used to make decisions related to the personnel management (Centra, 1993; Millman, 1981; National Education Association, n.d; Popham, 1988; Scriven, 1967).

The literature suggested four basic functions of teacher evaluation: staffing decisions such as removing inefficient teachers (Beerens, 2000; Peterson, 2000; Popham, 2013; Stonge, 2006; Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE), 2009); identifying and rewarding exemplary teachers (Orphanos, 2014; Popham, 2013; Ravitch, 2010); offering professional growth opportunities (Beerens, 2000; Church. 2012; Danielson, 2011; Danielson, 2012; Doerr, 2011, Peterson, 2000; Marzano, 2012; Stonge, 2006); and improving student learning (Doerr, 2011; JCSEE, 2009).

One of the main purposes of teacher evaluation has always been dismissing poorly performing teachers. During colonial times, the supervisory committees that oversaw local education were allowed to promptly remove teachers for any ineffectiveness (Burke & Krey, 2005; Lucio & McNeil, 1968). Castetter (1976) defined teacher evaluation as a formal assessment conducted by an evaluator on teachers' instructional performance for personnel-related decisions. Gordon, Kane, & Staiger (2006) and Tucker & Stronge (2005) argued that teacher evaluation should provide information relevant to make personnel decisions such as dismissal of teachers. During 1950s, teacher evaluation incorporated formative evaluation approaches putting more emphasis on teacher competencies and instructional quality, but the information on teacher performance were also used to remove underperforming teachers (Millman & Darling-Hammond, 1990; Shrinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995; Wiles, 1967).

Bridges (1979) and Ellett & Teddle (2003) suggested a teacher evaluation model that would support ineffective teachers to improve, and they would be dismissed if their performance did not improve. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) suggested a teacher evaluation model that incorporated a peer review in addition to an evaluation by principal to provide additional support for ineffective teachers, and if needed, recommend the removal of a teacher.

Race to the Top of 2009 stressed the importance of developing teacher evaluation systems that are capable of identifying highly effective teachers based on the student growth (Ravitch, 2010). Value-added models (VAM) measures teacher effectiveness based on student achievement, and reward teachers based on their performance (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012). Teacher rewards may include differential pay (Gordon, Kane, & Staiger, 2006; Tucker & Stronge, 2005).

Danielson (2012) argued that one of the main reasons for teacher evaluation is to promote their professional growth. Still others stated that standards-based teacher evaluation utilizes multiple approaches to evaluate teachers' instructional skills, and are designed to support professional growth (Borman & Kimball, 2005; Henemen, Milanowski, Kimball, & Odden, 2006; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). Taylor and Tyler (2012) reported that teachers became more effective and student improved academic performance, when teachers were being evaluated and provided opportunities to participate in professional developments.

Teachers can develop the growth mindset when administrators work collaboratively with teachers (Danielson, 2007). Teachers want high quality feedback, and opportunities to improve their practices (Ball, 2016). Teachers' instructional skills improve if they receive meaningful and constructive feedback (Aseltine, Faryniarz, & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2006). Teacher evaluation and effective feedback can result in positive outcome, improving teachers' classroom practices and student achievement (Marshall, 2009). Hallinger, Heck and Murphy (2013) stressed that supervising instruction must become a coaching with growth mindset, and should assist teachers to build their capacity.

When properly implemented, teacher evaluation has potential to positively influence student learning and outcomes (Hallinger, et, al., 2013). Marzano (2011) argued that the purpose of supervision is to improve student performance. Sanders and Rivers (1996) found that students instructed by highly effective teachers performed significantly better than students instructed by ineffective teachers. Gallagher (2004) reported that there were statistically significant relationships between the teacher evaluation scores and student achievement in the areas of reading and math. Rockoff and Speroni (2010) found that students assigned to teachers who received better evaluation ratings tended to perform better academically. In addition, researchers

found that quality feedback from administrators results an improved student performance (Weisberg et al., 2009; Sawchuk, 2015).

Special Education Teacher Evaluation

The focus of teacher evaluation constantly shifted since the colonial era to reflect the needs of the time, ranging from moral and ethical standings of teachers in the early years, performance and behavior focuses during 1980s and 1990s, and teacher accountability and academic achievement of students in the present time (Cuban, 1990; Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Ravitch, 2010). This section discusses the special education teacher evaluation and its development during the past 50 years or so.

Special education teacher evaluation has never been a hot topic of discussion among educators and educational researchers. Research articles on the subject of special education teacher evaluation began to appear in the 1970s, during the time when the public education system in America experienced a significant increase in the number of students with disabilities (SWDs) in their midst. Despite the fact that it has been over 40 years since, only a small number of studies, between 50 – 60 articles in total, on the subject of the special education teacher evaluation were published. Though small in numbers, these articles provided valuable insights into the history and development of the special education teacher evaluation.

Special education and general education teachers share some common contractual and legal duties and responsibilities. Contractually, both groups are required work towards supporting students' learning needs, managing student behaviors and learning, and instructing in classrooms (USD 497, 2014). They also share some legal duties including reporting child abuse and neglect (Holdheide et al., 2010; Imber & Geel, 2009; Underwood & Webb, 2005). In addition to the shared duties, Special education teachers are required to fulfill additional legal

duties and responsibilities mandated by the federal laws such as IDEA. While the most important duty of all teachers is indeed instructing students, special education teachers are required to carry out additional duties and responsibilities. These include, but are not limited to, case management, progress monitoring, testing, evaluating, paperwork, managing meetings with parents and other stakeholders, and management of support staff to meet the legal requirements (CEC, 2007, 2012; Washburn-Moses, 2005;).

Most of the currently available teacher evaluation systems mainly focus on teacher activities related to classroom instructions that support improving academic achievement of students. These evaluation systems are not equipped to measure additional duties and responsibilities that special education teachers must perform, though many special education teachers spend significant amount of time on these additional duties on a daily basis (Vannest & Hagan-Burk, 2009). Most states use *one-size-fits-all* types of teacher evaluation systems to evaluate both special and general education teachers (CEC, 2012; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2013; Semmelroth & Johnson, 2014).

Exactly when or where the subject of the special education teacher evaluation, differentiated from *one-size-fits-all* approaches of teacher evaluation, originated from is not clear. However, it seems that the need for evaluating special education teachers began to be apparent as the number of students with disabilities (SWDs) attending public schools increased and as public schools hired more special education teachers to provide instructions and services to these students. Thus, it could be assumed that the beginning and development of the special education teacher evaluation were closely related to the times when laws and court decisions supported the education of SWDs in public schools, and the development and improvement of teacher evaluation systems in general.

Public schools have been serving SWDs based on the student needs. Some schools served small number of students with specific disabilities including deaf, blind, and mental retardation since the 1950s. Classes for students with learning disabilities began to appear in the 1960s. Students were placed either in self-contained classrooms for all day, or in regular classrooms to be pulled out for additional instructional supports (Mitchell, 1976).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA; P.L. 89.10) and the State Schools Act (P.L. 313) of 1965 provided direct grants to states to support the education of SWDs, giving an additional boost to increase the number of SWDs attending public schools. As a result, the number of teachers working with and supporting SWDs in public schools increased considerably. By 1968, some 30,000 special education teachers and related specialists in the country participated in trainings funded by the federal government (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

Court cases such as the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens v. Commonwealth in 1971 and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia in 1972 established that it was the responsibility of the states and local governments to educate SWDs. The courts determined that educational rights of SWDs were supported by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

By the 1960s and throughout 1970s, the education field adopted and used the clinical supervision model to supervise and evaluate teachers (Cogan, 1972).

Studies mentioning and discussing the special education teacher evaluation began to appear in the 1970s to address the need for the discussion on the subject. In the early 1970s, the states and districts around the country began to implement goals and objective-oriented, and as well as performance-based teacher evaluation systems. For example, California passed the Stull

Bill legislation in 1971, requiring principals and teachers to get together and develop goals and objectives related to student progress, instructional skills, use of research-based strategies and materials, and classroom management for the purpose of the teacher evaluation (Price, 1973). However, teacher evaluation for special education teachers was inadequately provided (Kauffman et al., 1973).

With the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1975, public schools experienced a flow of even more SWDs seeking public education. P.L. 94-142 mandated a free appropriate public education for SWDs, emphasized special education and related services designed to meet unique needs of SWDs, and required the accountability of states on learning and growth of SWDs. The states began developing plans to support SWDs in public schools based on the requirements of P.L. 94-142. For example, California began to implement a plan in 1976 to open up their public schools and provide public education to all SWDs as mandated by P.L. 94-142 (Moya, 1980; Moya & Gay, 1982).

With the passage of PL 94-142, school administrators were required to evaluate special education teachers (Winborne, 1981). There were some efforts to provide evaluation modifications specific for special education teachers. For example, Brown (1976) introduced several checklists that were developed for the purpose of evaluating teachers assigned to instruct students with learning disabilities. Miller (1980) introduced the Competency Development Scales (CDS) for evaluating teachers of exceptional children. According to a survey performed in 1979, fifteen out of 146 school districts in California responded to the survey had guidelines for evaluating special education teachers (Moya, 1980; Moya & Gay, 1982). In Missouri during 1984, thirteen percent of 219 Missouri school districts used different criteria when evaluating

special education teachers compared to criteria used to evaluate regular teachers (Valentine & Harting, 1988).

Several researchers emphasized concerns in the evaluation of special education teachers. In part, this was due to principals not having an understanding of the unique responsibilities of special education teachers. These researchers emphasized that evaluators most likely have limited, or in some cases no experience working with special education teachers or SWDs. They suggested training in the special education teacher evaluation process in order to provide effective evaluation; give accurate feedback for instructional improvement; reflect Federal and State legal requirements; as well as understand and follow the IEP process (Holley & Hickman, 1981; Lazzari & Bruder, 1988; Moya, 1980; Moya & Gay, 1982; Rosell, 1990; Sweeney & Twedt, 1993; Twedt, 1991; Winborne, 1981). Evaluators must understand that the teacher evaluation is a tool to help special education teachers to improve their instructional performance (Nissen, 1984). Special education teachers, in turn, must understand that they "will have to stand up under the same professional examination as for their peers in regular education" (Furdden, 1984, p. 45)

There was a question about whether a teacher evaluation system that was developed to evaluate all teachers can objectively and fairly measure the performance of teachers with unique assignments, including special education teachers (Clements, 1988; Katims & Henderson, 1990; Rose & Huynh, 1984; vonEschenbach, 1988; Warger & Aldinger 1987; Zadnik, 1992). In order to develop a teacher evaluation system that can address and support individual differences of different teaching assignments such as special education, a significant amount of data must be collected (Furdden, 1984; Kauffman et al., 1973). Developing the special education teacher evaluation systems must be a group effort and process involving all stakeholders (Furdden,

1984). When developing evaluation systems for special education teachers, states and districts must consider special education teachers' knowledge of instructional techniques and materials, classroom control, classroom management, classroom organization, relations with students, relations with staff, and relations with parents (Moya, 1980; Moya & Gay, 1982), accurate and effective communication with students about content areas to improve student learning and understanding, use of teaching methods and resources, use of encouragement to entice student participation, classroom management and use of instructional time, and creating learning environment where students can learn self-discipline and the self-concepts (Nissen, 1984). Warger & Aldinger (1987) added additional areas to be considered including "pupil progress, teacher performance, and the teacher characteristics" (p. 54). Furdden (1984) stressed the use of formal data collection methods including reviewing lesson plans, pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, and the post-observation conferences, and informal data collection methods including "contacts with the teacher, walk-through observations, conduct in placement and referral meetings, participation in professional activities, phone calls and letters, and comments received from students, parents, or other professionals" (p. 45). Warger & Aldinger (1987) emphasized that the extraneous variables such as "the severity and the mix of handicapping conditions (of SWDs), the compensatory demands from a regular education, and the effects of medication, absences, and home circumstances (of SWDs)" (p. 61) that have potential to influence special education teachers' performance should be considered when evaluating special education teachers.

The structure of clinical supervision still remained through the 1980s and 1990s (Klein, 2015), while the focuses of teacher evaluation were slowly shifting towards accountability and student achievements (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Wise et al., 1985). Efforts to develop and

implement an effective teacher evaluation system continued. Some states and districts allowed flexibility in their evaluation guidelines to include the evaluation standards and criteria specific to teachers with unique responsibilities and assignments such as special education teachers. Others did not include any flexibility and had all teachers to be evaluated under the same teacher evaluation guidelines. A major shift in teacher evaluation systems occurred as a result of Race to the Top, initiated by President Barack Obama in 2009. One of the focuses of Race to the Top was improving the teacher evaluation. Race to the Top required states to incorporate evidence-based components including professional teaching standards, professional growth of teachers, and multiple observations when developing teacher evaluation instruments (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Because Race to the Top required states to develop teacher evaluation systems that focused on measuring teacher effectiveness towards the growth of students, many states developed teacher evaluation systems with the embedded performance measures. Performance-based models relies on standards-based data collection methods to appropriately and fairly evaluate teachers. Standards in teacher evaluation refer to the specific knowledge and skills that teachers should possess and demonstrate for the purpose of evaluation (Shakman, Riordan, Sanchez, Cook, Fournier, & Brett, 2012). Researchers suggested the application of the performance-based model when developing teacher evaluation tools specific for special education teachers as early as 1970s, recognizing the need for more data collection strategies (Furdden, 1984; Katims & Henderson, 1990; Kauffman et al, 1973; Myers, 1983).

Due to the lack of progress on the special education teacher evaluation, concerns on using one-size-fits-all types of teacher evaluation systems to evaluate special education teachers persisted to the present time. Difficulties were expected when evaluating special education teachers due to multiple roles and responsibilities of special education teachers (Billingsley,

1989; CEC, 2012; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2013; Semmelroth & Johnson, 2014; Sledge & Pazey, 2016; Vannest & Hagan-Burk, 2009). Differentiation of evaluation criteria could be the key to provide an effective evaluation for special education teachers and meet their unique needs (Harris, 2016; Holdheide et al., 2010; Mrla, 2016; Sledge & Pazey, 2016; Woolf, 2015). According to a survey, which more than 1,100 state and district directors of special education in U.S. participated, while most of the participants reported that their districts were not allowed to modify the evaluation process for special education teachers, about half of the survey participants agreed that special education teachers should not be evaluated based on the same evaluation system as that of general education teachers (Holdheide et al., 2010). Another survey involving 1551 principals in Illinois reported that when asked about how districts can improve their evaluation process to address the unique roles and responsibilities of special education teachers, principals suggested improving the evaluation process and instrument to meet the evaluation needs of special education teachers (Glowacki, 2013). The effectiveness of the teacher evaluation tools increased if the evaluation tools were modified to address specific roles and responsibilities of special education teachers (Guiney, 2015). The evaluation indicators specific to special education can provide more accurate evaluation feedback for special education teachers towards improving their instructional practices (Mrla, 2016).

Concerns about administrators' knowledge and experience in regards to special education continued. Administrators needed more professional development and more resources to provide an effective and a fair evaluation for special education teachers (Mimms, 2011; Mrla, 2016; Sledge & Pazey, 2016; Widener, 2011).

Value-added models (VAM) were embedded in teacher evaluation systems developed and adopted by a number of states. VAM incorporated statistical techniques that managed

variables such as a variety of groups of student, attributes of educational environment, student achievement from the past. Through the statistical techniques, the average effect of a given teacher can be measured on the growth of students that the teacher instructs (Burdette, 2011b; Lawson, 2014). Validity and accuracy of VAM in measuring the effectiveness of special education teachers towards the growth of SWDs were discussed in a number of research articles. Studies found that VAM and other types of performance measures may not accurately evaluate the effectiveness of special education teachers due to the facts that special education teachers were generally required to fulfil multiple roles and responsibilities (Burdette, 2011b; Buzick & Jones, 2015; CEC, 2012; Holdheide et.al., 2010; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2012; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014a; Jones & Brownell, 2014; Mccaffrey & Buzick, 2014; Lawson, 2014; Semmelroth, Johnson, & Allred, 2013; Steinbrecher et.al. 2014). Challenges of applying VAM to evaluate special education teachers included: accurately measuring growth of SWDs; modifying VAMs to include teachers with unique roles and responsibilities; accurately measuring instructional practices of special education teachers; providing training on observation-based evaluation systems; incorporating co-teaching and evaluate accordingly; and managing SWDs moving in and out of special education services (CEC, 2012). Additional concerns of applying VAM to the special education teacher evaluation included: "the changing content from one grade to the next; the possibility that grade level assessments may be misaligned with student abilities; and the appropriate implementation of accommodations during standardized assessments" (Steinbrecher et al., 2014, p. 325). Teacher accountability may not be clear when states choose to exclude the assessment results of SWDs from VAM or other measures of student achievement causing general education teachers to show less willingness to include SWDs in their classes (Holdheide, Browder, Warren, Buzick & Jones, 2012; Holdheide. Buzick, & Warburton, 2012).

Burdette (2011b) argued that "teachers of students with disabilities and others who work with the neediest students, are unfairly disadvantaged by VAM because these methods are not able to fully account for the differences in characteristics of these students and school supports given them" (p. 2).

Some researchers argued that VAM can be an effective evaluation tool for special education teachers with some modifications (Burdette, 2011a, 2011b; Buzick & Jones, 2015; CEC, 2012; Lawson, 2014; Mccaffrey & Buzick, 2014; Steinbrecher et al., 2014). In order to successfully apply VAM methods to evaluate special education teachers, states should consider "the range of student ability and academic attainment assigned to one teacher during one class," accuracy of achievement of SWDs, and "linking student achievement to teachers" (Burdette, 2011a, p. 2). States should also consider student learning trajectory, students' access with accommodations, small student samples commonly associated with the special education caseloads, student mobility, testing scaling, use of multiple measures to improve and sustain the validity and accuracy of value-added scores, providing accessible and accurate measurements, developing a management system for testing accommodations, and adopting a roster validation system to give full credit to all teachers participating in co-teaching (Holdheide, Browder, Warren, Buzick & Jones, 2012; Holdheide. Buzick, & Warburton, 2012).

Some researchers suggested alternative special education teacher evaluation methods including, use of video recording for special education teachers assigned to self-contained classes (Myers, 1983), use of portfolio (Bull, 1994), use of an improved observation method with clear expectations and performance criteria (Sledge & Pazey, 2013), Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Observation Tool (Johnson, 2015; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014b; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2015), an observation system based on Charlotte Danielson's

Framework for Teaching (Jones & Brownell, 2014), and e-portfolios utilizing internet (Elliott, Roach, & Kurz, 2014).

Teacher Evaluation Systems Implemented in Washington State

In September 2012, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), which oversees the educational system in Washington State, selected three teacher evaluation systems including CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model, to be used in Washington State. By the 2015 – 2016 school year, every district in Washington State selected one of the three teacher evaluation systems, and all certified teachers in Washington State were being evaluated based on an evaluation system that their district selected (Teacher Principal Evaluation Project, 2015).

CEL 5D+. CEL 5D+ was developed by the Center for Educational Leadership at the University of Washington (UWCEL). CEL is an acronym for Center for Educational Leadership. 5D represents five dimensions of teaching and learning including purpose, student engagement, curriculum & pedagogy, assessment for student learning, and classroom environment & culture. The '+' sign next to 5D indicates the inclusion of the student growth goals that Washington State mandated the evaluation systems to incorporate. UWCEL has been working with school districts across the U.S. since 2001 to improve students learning and teacher instruction (Center for Educational Leadership, n.d.; Fink, 2012). CEL 5D+ was developed in 2007 based on the results of a number of research conducted by UWCEL. There are limited studies available on CEL 5D+ model. UWCEL faculty continues to evaluate CEL 5D+ to make sure that it supports the needs of teachers, administrators, and districts to improve student learning (Center for Educational Leadership, n.d.; Fink, 2012).

Danielson Framework for Teaching. Danielson model represents a research-based set of instructional components that are linked to ten principles of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (Danielson, 2010). Danielson initially introduced this model in 1996 while developing the Praxis III program. Danielson recognized that there is a need for a comprehensive teaching framework that provides opportunities for teachers to reflect and improve (Danielson, 2007). Danielson pointed out that her evaluation framework does not endorse any specific instructional strategies because there is no instructional strategy that can work in every situation. Instead, the framework support teachers to select an appropriate strategy for a given instructional environment to achieve the best outcome (Danielson, 1996, 2007). Danielson (2007) stressed the importance of teachers openly discussing whether their choice of instructional strategy is appropriate for a given situation. Danielson's framework is adopted by schools around the world (Danielson, 2007), and recognized as the most detailed and comprehensive teacher evaluation (Marzano et al., 2011). Among the three teacher evaluation systems implemented in Washington State, Danielson model is the only one that incorporated modified scenarios for the special education teacher evaluation.

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. Based on his book, *The Art and Science of Teaching*, Robert Marzano (2007) developed the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Framework (MTEF) as a teacher evaluation model. MTEF was based on over 300 experiments and studies involving 14,000 students, 300 teachers, and 38 schools across 14 school districts (Marzano, 2007). There are built-in flexibilities in the Marzano model where teachers could make decisions on their instructional practices towards improving student learning (Marzano, 2007). Marzano recognized the importance of quality feedback so that teachers can make informed decisions about their instructional practices (Marzano, 2010, 2011).

Summary

The main focus of this chapter was to provide a comprehensive literature review on available research articles on special education teacher evaluation. The following areas were discussed in these articles:

1) Studies on special education teacher evaluation,
2) Unique and different roles and responsibilities of special education teachers,
3) Developing teacher evaluation systems specific for special education teachers.
4) Use of the Value-Added Model to measure the effectiveness of special education teachers, problems and issues of applying such performance-based measures to evaluate special education teachers, and suggested solutions to improve the evaluation measures, and
5) Whether the use of one-size-fits-all teacher evaluation tools when evaluating special education teachers is adequate, or there is a need for a separate evaluation system for special education teachers.

There is no consensus among educators and educational researchers on the best methods of evaluating special education teachers. The main reasons are because of 1) unique and multiple roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and 2) lack of evaluation tools capable of measuring multiple variables embedded in special education teacher's job that directly impact student growth. This chapter of the literature review pointed out that providing effective, accurate, and valid special education teacher evaluation is critical because of its impact on improving special education teacher effectiveness towards student growth.

Chapter 3. Research Methodology

This chapter discusses the research methods and procedures utilized to describe the perceptions of special education teachers and general education teachers on the teacher evaluation process. Research questions, research instrument and design, study sample, data collection procedures, data analysis, and limitations and delimitations are discussed in order.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perceptions of general education and special education teachers on teacher evaluation, and the perceptions of special education teachers evaluated based on different teacher evaluation systems. This study was guided by the following questions:

1) How do teachers perceive themselves and the evaluation process in Washington State?
2) How do teacher attributes relate to their perception of the evaluation process?
3) How do special education teachers in Washington State perceive their teacher evaluations as compared to general education teachers?
4) How do special education teachers perceive the evaluation process based on the three evaluation systems: CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano?

Research Instrument and Design

This study utilized a survey research design. Survey research focuses on overall tendencies of participants and varying tendencies among them. Surveying is an effective way to collect data including trends, attitudes and opinions of participants. The results from a sample typically can be generalized to a larger group (Creswell, 2003 & 2007).

Online survey method is an effective strategy that enables researchers to implement and collect data in a timely manner. It also offers anonymity and confidentiality of participants (Leedy & Ormrod, 2009), accessibility to a larger population (Creswell, 2012; Neuman, 2009; Yost, 2010), and options to overcome distance and geographical barriers (Dillman, 2000).

This quantitative study utilized the Teacher Evaluation Profile (TEP) questionnaire, an instrument designed to collect and measure teacher perceptions on the most recent teacher evaluation experience. The TEP questionnaire was originally developed by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NREL). The researchers at NREL studied various successful teacher evaluations and interviewed those who were involved in the teacher evaluation process. Through these processes, they identified a number of key attributes of the teacher evaluation that fostered the professional growth of teachers. Attributes were grouped as five subscales according to the characteristics of questions: attributes of self as a teacher, attributes of perceptions of the evaluator, attributes of the evaluation process, attributes of feedback, and attributes of the evaluation context. In addition to these five subscales, the survey asked teachers to rate their perceptions on the overall qualities of the evaluation (Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

TEP is known for its high reliability when measuring teachers' perceptions of the most recent teacher evaluation. Stiggins and Nickel (1988) conducted a factor analysis on the TEP subscales using varimax rotation. The analysis indicated that the Teacher Evaluation Profile Instrument is an effective and reliable tool that can assist school districts in developing a teacher evaluation process that promotes teacher growth and improvement in instructions. Coefficient alpha showed that there were high reliabilities and moderate intercorrelations based on estimates of the internal consistency of the all five subscales and estimates of the intercorrelations among the scales. They pointed out that among five subscales, "Teacher Attributes" came out to be

"slightly less reliable and clearly statistically independent of the other scales" (p. 157). TEP instrument as a whole showed the internal consistency reliability of .93. TEP has been utilized in multiple studies to collect data similar to this study.

Appendix A of this study includes the TEP questionnaire used for this study. TEP questionnaire was presented to participants in the form of an online survey. Data collection was performed using an online survey tool, SurveyMonkey.com, LLC, a third party website that provides a secure platform for researchers to operate surveys. There were 48 total questions included in the survey. Participants were expected to take 15 uninterrupted minutes to complete the questionnaire. 39 questions asked about the attributes of TEP, while the last four questions focused on the overall quality of the evaluation. One question was asked about whether the evaluation process has improved since the last school year. This particular question was included to assist the participating districts to gain perspectives on whether their evaluation process has improved from the previous year. Additional four questions were asked to find out demographic information.

The questions were divided into three sections for the online survey purpose. Section 1 asked about participant's perception on the attributes that influenced teacher evaluation. Section 1 contained five subscales including rate yourself as a teacher, *rate your evaluator*, *rate the evaluation process*, *rate the feedback you received*, and *rate the evaluation context*. Section 2 asked about the overall quality of the evaluation process during 2016 – 2017 school year. Section 3 asked about the demographic information including, years taught, highest degree earned, assigned grade level, and teaching assignment during 2016 – 2017 school year (Appendix A).

Study Sample

The quantitative data were from the convenience sample. Participants volunteered to join the survey (Creswell, 2003 & 2007). The invitations were sent to 2240 certified teachers in nine school districts in Washington state. A total of 397 respondents participated in the survey achieving 18 percent response rate. The 397 cases were further reduced to 234 based on the reasons depicted in Table 4.1 included in Chapter 4 of this study.

The participants were from nine school districts located in a northwestern state where the author worked. The sample consisted of certificated teachers who taught elementary education in elementary schools, English, math, science, and special education. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, a state agency that oversees public education in Washington State, recognizes English Language Art, Mathematics, Science, and History/Social Studies as Core Content Areas (OSPI, 2017a). The responses from history and social studies teachers were omitted from this study because history and social studies teachers from Marzano districts did not participate in the survey, preventing an opportunity to compare the results from other teacher evaluation system districts (Table 4.1).

As demonstrated in the literature review, teachers assigned to teach the core content areas carry out duties, responsibilities, and instructions typical of general education teachers, and they are different and distinguishable from that of special education teachers.

Elementary education teachers taught in elementary schools. English, math, and science teachers taught in secondary schools. Special education teachers taught in either elementary or secondary school. Elementary education, English, math, and science teachers represented general education teacher population in this study. All participants were evaluated according to one the three teacher evaluation system (CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, Charlotte Danielson's

Framework for Teaching, and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model) during 2016 – 2017 school year.

Data Collection Procedures

Contact information including email addresses and phone numbers of the districts in Washington State were obtained by visiting the websites of individual districts and the state department of education (OSPI). Upon receiving the IRB approval from University of Kansas on March 1, 2017, the researcher sent out individualized emails to leaders of around 300 districts in Washington State. These leaders included superintendents, assistant superintendents, director in charge of research and curriculum, and directors of human resource. In many cases, phone calls were made to find out the person in charge. The email invitation contained the purpose of the research and the survey, the website address of the survey, and a message seeking permission to allow their teachers to participate in the survey. Nine district leaders responded with the permission to allow their teachers to participate in the survey.

The survey was performed towards the end of the 2016 – 2017 school year. Participating teachers either already had received the final teacher evaluation results or were in the process of getting one. After receiving the permission from the district leaders, a formal email invitation was sent out to teachers. In most districts, the district leaders relayed the email invitation to their teachers. For others, the author was allowed to email individual teachers. The email invitation included the website address of the survey, the purpose of the survey, the assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, and the contact information if they have any questions (Appendix B). The survey was left open for two weeks. A reminder email was sent out towards the end of the two-week period. The districts that requested access to the data were allowed to access the results for their districts to improve their teacher evaluation process.

Steps were taken to assure the anonymity and confidentially of the participating teachers. Only the researcher of this study had access to data. Information that may lead to identifying an individual participant were disaggregated in the final report so that no individual participant would be identified in the written data analysis. Data files were stored in a data storage device which were locked in a secure cabinet when not in use. A single computer was used to review and analyze data. The computer and data files related to this study were password protected. The data files stored in the survey site was removed in March 2018. Data files and the related files stored in the researcher's data storage device were deleted when this study was finalized and submitted. There were no printed data files.

Data Analysis

For the statistical analysis, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized. SPSS assisted in managing and analyzing the survey data and producing derived results.

The demographic information was summarized using the frequency distribution. Use of the descriptive statistics enabled data analysis to be more meaningful.

In addition to the descriptive statistics, inferential statistics including One-way ANOVA, Bonferroni Post hoc test, and the Independent Samples t-test were utilized to determine the perceptual differences of participating teachers in regards to teacher evaluation.

Limitations and Delimitations

The study involved teachers from districts in a northwestern state. Thus, the findings from this study were limited to information, knowledge, and participation provided by the participants from the state. This area was selected because the author's job is located in the Washington State. The teacher evaluation systems discussed in this study may not be used in other states. As a result, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to the population of

different sizes and from different locations. Some of the information and knowledge from this study may only apply to districts the participants work, and may not transfer to other districts. Some concepts and knowledge can be useful in other contexts as long as these delimitations are considered.

The participants of this study do not necessarily represent the entire population of teachers in participating districts and in the state. Because of the voluntary nature of the survey participants, not every school, grade level, and districts may have been equally represented. The data collected were not reported according to individual districts. Instead, they were disaggregated by other relevant variables. The study was limited to the data collection methodology. The online data collection method was used to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of participants, and overcome distance. There may have been personal and professional biases of the participants based on their educational and cultural background. Because this study focused on teacher evaluation, and general education and special education teachers were the participants of the study, the participants may not have been completely honest in their responses or may not have been willing to provide information that might affect their future career and professional relationships in the district. The participants may have experienced fear that their identities and opinions might be known to others in their districts despite the assurance of anonymity and confidentiality. The results of this study may only provide a snapshot of participants' opinions affected by many unknown factors including, but not limited to, organizational climate, education, training, and personal and professional dilemma. Finally, some differences were not testable, due to not enough responses from some of the teaching assignments and from different evaluation models.

CHAPTER 4. Findings and Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived differences of teacher evaluation process between general and special education teachers, and among special education teachers evaluated according to different teacher evaluation systems.

This chapter reports the results of the survey and addresses the following research questions:

1. How do teachers perceive themselves and the evaluation process in Washington State?
2. How do teacher attributes relate to their perception of the evaluation process?
3. How do special education teachers in Washington State perceive their teacher evaluations as compared to general education teachers?
4. How do special education teachers perceive the evaluation process based on the three evaluation systems: CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano?

Participants Information

Invitations were sent to 2240 certified teachers in nine Washington school districts. A total of 397 respondents participated in the survey achieving 18 percent response rate. The 397 cases were further reduced to 234 based on the reasons depicted in Table 4.1.

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction of Washington State recognizes English Language Art, Mathematics, Science, and History/Social Studies as Core Content Areas (OSPI, 2017a). The responses from the teachers teaching core content areas with elementary teachers were used for this study, in conjunction with the responses from the special education teachers. The core content area teachers carry out duties, responsibilities, and instructions typical

of general education teachers, but they are different and distinguishable from that of special education teachers.

Table 4.1. Case Removal Steps

Case Removal Steps	Remaining Cases
Removal of cases with missing responses/incomplete survey	348
Removal of cases who were assigned to non-teaching positions such as librarian, instructional coach, therapist, etc.	331
Removal of cases who failed to answer their teaching assignments	311
Removal of cases with teaching assignments that are not reported by other teacher evaluation district groups, preventing the option of comparing responses between the teacher evaluation systems.	255
Removal of cases with teaching assignments other than the core content areas recognized by Washington State for the purpose of teacher evaluation, except special education (OSPI, 2017a)	234

The responses from history and social studies teachers were omitted from this study because history and social studies teachers from Marzano districts did not participate in the survey, preventing an opportunity to compare the results from other teacher evaluation system districts.

Elementary classroom teachers provide instructions on English and math on a daily basis, and science on a regular basis (OSPI, 2017b). In this study, the term *elementary education* is used to describe elementary content areas (i.e., English, math, and science) taught in a typical elementary classroom and taught by typical elementary classroom teachers.

Table 4.2 shows the demographic information of the participants. About half of the teachers have 13 or more years of experience (45.3 percent) and over three-quarters have a master's degree (76 percent). This may indicate that more experienced and educated teachers were more comfortable to share their experiences about teacher evaluation than teachers with

less experience and education. In Washington State, around 67 percent of certified teachers have at least a master's degree (OSPI, 2017b).

Table 4.2. Demographic information of all participants

	Frequency	Percent
Years of Teaching		
1-2 years	20	8.5
3-7 years	54	23.1
8-12 years	52	22.2
13 or more years	106	45.3
Missing	2	.9
Total	234	100.0
Highest Degree Earned		
Bachelor Degree	52	22.2
Master Degree	180	76.9
Doctorate Degree	1	.4
Missing	1	.4
Total	234	100.0
Teaching Assignments		
Elementary	80	34.2
English (ELA)	44	18.8
Math	43	18.4
Science	30	12.8
Special Education	37	15.8
Total	234	100.0

A total of 197 general education teachers and 37 special education teachers participated in the survey. Special education teachers' participation rate was nineteen percent.

The survey invitation for this study was sent to 2240 certified teachers in nine school districts in Washington state. The exact number of special education teachers from these districts were not readily available. From the state-wide report, a little over 6800 special education teachers (about 11 percent of a total number of classroom teachers) in Washington State were serving the needs of SWDs as of 2016 (OSPI, 2017d). The total number of classroom teachers in

Washington State was around 63,500 during 2016 – 2017 school year (OSPI, 2017b). In 2016, there were about 440,000 special education teachers, close to 14 percent of full-time teachers, in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). During 2014 – 2015, these special education teachers served around 6.6 million SWDs (13 percent of all public school students) in this country (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017).

Teachers who participated in this survey were either in the process of receiving the teacher evaluation results or already have received the evaluation results for the 2016 – 2017 school year at the time of this survey.

Table 4.3. Number of teachers by teaching assignments and by teacher evaluation systems

		CEL 5D+ (*n=2)	Charlotte Danielson (*n=5)	Marzano (*n=2)	Total
Valid	Elementary	2	67	11	80
	English (ELA)	6	32	6	44
	Math	11	26	6	43
	Science	5	20	5	30
	Special Education	7	28	2	37
	Total	31	173	30	234

* Number of districts

Table 4.3 shows the breakdown of the teachers by teaching assignments and by the teacher evaluation systems they were evaluated under during 2016 – 2017 school year. Compared to the districts that implemented Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (n=173), the number of participants from the districts that implemented CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric (n=31) and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model (n=30) was significantly lower.

Table 4.4 presents the further breakdown of special education teachers by grade levels and teacher evaluation systems. The majority of special education teachers participated in the

survey were from five districts that implemented Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (n=28).

Table 4.4. Demographic information of special education teachers by teacher evaluation systems

	CEL 5D+ (*n=2)	Charlotte Danielson (*n=5)	Marzano (*n=2)	Total
Years of Teaching				
1-2 years	0	3	0	3
3-7 years	2	9	1	12
8-12 years	3	5	1	9
13 or more years	2	11	0	13
Total	7	28	2	37
Highest Degree Earned				
Bachelor Degree	2	3	1	6
Master Degree	5	25	1	31
Total	7	28	2	37
Teaching Assignments				
Elementary	1	9	2	12
Middle School	1	6	0	7
High School	5	13	0	18
Total	7	28	2	37

* Number of districts

CEL 5D+ and Charlotte Danielson districts had special education teachers from all school levels participating. Marzano districts had two special education teachers teaching at elementary schools participating in the survey. Given the low number of participants using the CEL 5D+ and Marzano evaluation systems, no generalizable results can be reported. These data are reported for information purposes only.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: How do teachers perceive themselves and the evaluation process in Washington State?

Table 4.5. Mean scores of teacher perceptions

TEP attributes		Mean Response
Attributes of self as a teacher	1. The strength of your professional expectations of yourself as a teacher	4.65
	2. Orientation to risk-taking	3.87
	3. Orientation to change	4.25
	4. Willingness to experiment in the classroom	2.99
	5. Openness to criticism	4.04
	6. Knowledge of instructional methods and strategies	4.13
	7. Knowledge of curriculum content you teach	4.43
Attributes of perceptions of evaluator	8. Credibility as a source of feedback	4.00
	9. Working relationship with you	4.13
	10. Level of trust	4.12
	11. Interpersonal manner	4.08
	12. Temperament of the evaluator	4.21
	13. Flexibility of the evaluator	4.03
	14. Knowledge of the instructional methods and strategies	3.89
	15. Capacity to demonstrate/model improvements	3.51
	16. Familiarity with your classroom	3.73
	17. Usefulness of suggestions for improvement	3.60
	18. Persuasiveness of rationale for changes	3.57
Attributes of evaluation processes	19. The evaluation standards were communicated	4.09
	20. The evaluation standards were clear	3.94
	21. The evaluation standards were appropriate for your teaching assignment	3.79
	22. The evaluation standards same/tailored	2.93
	23. Observation of classroom performance	3.97
	24. Examination of artifacts	3.23
	25. Examination of student achievement	3.65

TEP attributes		Mean Response
Attributes of the feedback	26. Amount of information received	3.39
	27. Depth of information provided	3.33
	28. Frequency of Observation	4.13
	29. Frequency of feedback	3.97
	30. Quality of ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback	3.49
	31. Specificity of information provided	3.46
	32. Nature of information provided	3.83
	33. Timing of feedback	3.85
	34. Feedback focused on standards	3.96
Attributes of the evaluation context	35. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process	3.77
	36.Time allocated during the school year for professional development	2.78
	37. Availability of training programs and models of good practices	2.97
	38. Clarity of district policy statements regarding the purpose for evaluation	3.34
	39. Intended role of evaluation	3.32
overall quality of evaluation	40. Rate the overall quality of the evaluation process	3.15
	41. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your attitudes about teaching	2.99
	42. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your teaching behaviors and strategies	2.97
	43. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your understanding of the teaching/learning process	2.80

Table 4.5 displays the mean scores of all teacher responses for each survey question. The Likert scale was utilized for the purpose of this survey, 1 being the lowest, 3 being the middle, and 5 being the highest rating.

According to the survey results, teachers perceived themselves to be knowledgeable and experienced, while showing moderate willingness to take risks. Teachers reported that their evaluators were moderately helpful, trustworthy, and patient. They perceived that the teacher

evaluation processes were moderately acceptable. They felt that the evaluation feedback was mostly acceptable, timely and meaningful. Teachers showed marginal willingness to experiment in the classroom. They perceived that the evaluation standards were not tailored enough for all teachers. Overall, teachers reported that the quality of evaluation process and the impact of the evaluation process on their teaching practice were marginal (Table 4.5.). Table 4.5 includes the mean Likert responses to each TEP attribute, aggregated by the scales in the left column.

Research Question 2: How do teacher attributes related to their perception of the evaluation process?

For RQ#2, each subscale of TEP was analyzed with factors including *Years of Teaching*, *Highest Degree Earned*, and *Teaching Assignments*, using One-way ANOVA. To estimate the statistical significance of relationships between the dependent variables and each pair of sub-categories within the Factor list, the Bonferroni post hoc test was used as a part of the One-way ANOVA test.

Years of teaching. One-way ANOVA test results showed that there were statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of self as a teacher*, with F (3, 228) = 3.723, p=.012 (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6. Analysis of Variance, *Years of teaching*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.610	3	.537	3.723	.012
Within Groups	32.872	228	.144		
Total	34.482	231			

p<.05; Dependent variable: Attributes of self as a teacher

Further analysis using the Bonferroni Post hoc test revealed statistically significant response differences between teachers with 1-2 years of experience and those with 13+ years of

experience (p=.04). Within the limits of the scale, beginning teachers reported significantly lower self-awareness than veteran teachers (p=.040). One possible explanation for the differences is that beginning teachers most likely have limited professional experiences in the classroom. All other subscales reported that the differences between the means were not statistically significant (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Bonferroni post hoc test, *Years of Teaching*

Years teaching	1-2 years	3-7 years	8-12 years	13 or more
1-2 years				
3-7 years	.094			
8-12 years	.175	.081		
13 or more years	.253*	.159	.078	

*p<.05; Dependent variable: Attributes of self as a teacher

Highest degree earned. One-way ANOVA test results showed that there is no statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level among all subscales.

Teaching assignments. One-way ANOVA test results showed that there were statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator* with F (4, 229) = 2.629, p=.035 (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8. Analysis of Variance, *Teaching assignments*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.743	4	2.186	2.692	.035
Within Groups	190.343	229	.831		
Total	199.106	233			

p<.05; Dependent variable: *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator*

Further analysis using the Bonferroni Post hoc test revealed statistically significant response differences between elementary teachers and special education teachers (p=.018) (Table 4.9). Within the limits of the scale, special education teachers reported significantly lower scores for their evaluators than elementary teachers. The differences may be due to the nature of their

working environment and the frequency of their contact with evaluators. Elementary school principals/evaluators tend to work more closely and frequently with teachers (Louis et al., 2010).

Table 4.9. Bonferroni post hoc test, *Teaching assignments*

Teaching Assignments	Elementary	English	Math	Science	Special Education
Elementary					
English	-.272				
Math	-.272	.0003			
Science	-.235	.038	.037		
Special Education	-.574*	-.302	-.302	-.339	

*p<.05; Dependent variable: *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator*

In addition to *Attributes of perceptions of the evaluator*, there were statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of the evaluation context*, with F (4, 229) = 2.707, p=.031 (Table 4.10). Further analysis using the Bonferroni Post hoc test revealed statistically significant response differences between elementary teachers and math teachers (p=.023) (Table 4.11).

Table 4.10. Analysis of Variance, *Teaching assignments*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.144	4	1.786	2.707	.031
Within Groups	151.064	229	.660		
Total	158.208	233			

p<.05; Dependent variable: *Attributes of the evaluation context*

Table 4.11. Bonferroni post hoc test, *Teaching assignments*

Teaching Assignments	Elementary	English	Math	Science	Special Education
Elementary					
English	-.296				
Math	-.474*	-.178			
Science	-.306	-.010	.168		
Special Education	-.192	.104	-.282	.114	

*p<.05; Dependent variable: *Attributes of the evaluation context*

The remaining subscales reported that the differences between the means were not statistically significant.

Research Question 3: How do special education teachers in Washington State perceive their teacher evaluation as compared to general education teachers?

An Independent Samples t-test was utilized to compare the mean scores of general education and special education teachers. The result showed that there were statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator* with a p-value of .011 (Table 4.12).

The significant response differences between general education and special education teachers about their evaluators may be due to special education teachers perceiving that they were isolated from the general population of the school including their evaluators/administrators (Bateman & Bateman, 2001, 2014).

Table 4.12. T-test: general education vs. special education teachers

Variable	Gen Ed	Spec Ed	t-value
Attributes of self as a teacher	4.0661	3.9916	1.074
	(.3816)	(.41529)	
Attributes of perceptions of evaluator	3.9665	3.5486	2.553*
	(.86322)	(1.1501)	
Attributes of evaluation processes	3.6925	3.5019	1.424
	(.73430)	(.81415)	
Attributes of the feedback	3.7370	3.4835	1.557
	(.90947)	(.90439)	
Attributes of evaluation context	3.2299	3.2541	-.163
	(.82088)	(.85174)	
Overall quality of evaluation	3.0317	2.7027	1.712
	(1.07527)	(1.05876)	
Number of participants	197	37	

*p<.05; Value in parenthesis is the standard deviation.

All other subscales reported that the differences between the means were not statistically significant.

Research Question 4: How do special education teachers perceive the evaluation process based on the three evaluation systems: CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano?

Research question 4 focused solely on the responses of special education teachers. It should be noted that due to the low participation rate of special education teachers from CEL 5D+ school districts (n=7) and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model districts (n=2), special education teachers' responses were not generalizable and included only for descriptive purposes in this study.

A total of 37 special education teachers participated in the study including seven special education teachers from two CEL 5D+ school districts, 28 special education teachers from five Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching districts, and two special education teachers from two Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model districts.

All special education teachers perceived themselves to be relatively flexible when confronting changes. They reported that the evaluation processes included clear standards and were communicated to teachers. They perceived that the purpose of the evaluation was moderately clear and promoted accountability and teacher growth.

More studies are needed with larger samples and additional teacher evaluation systems to generalize the findings.

Summary

The findings suggest there is a significant response differences between beginning teacher and veteran teachers on how they perceive themselves as a teacher, possibly due to the limited professional experiences of the beginning teachers in the classroom. There is also a

significant difference among teachers with different educational levels on how they view themselves as a teacher, suggesting that teachers with more education may perceived themselves to be more proficient.

Significant response differences were found to exist between the perceptions of special education and general education teachers, particularly elementary school teachers, on their evaluators. The perceptions of special education teachers evaluated based on three different teacher evaluation systems were included in this study for descriptive purposes only due to about 76 percent of special education teachers participated in the study were evaluated based on Danielson, which implemented an alternative approach to evaluate the performance of special education teachers. Special education teachers perceived that the evaluation standards and the purpose of the evaluation were relatively clear to them, and the evaluation process promoted accountability and teacher growth.

CHAPTER 5. Discussion

This chapter is divided into the following sections: summary of the problems and the study, discussion, recommendations for future studies, and summary of the chapter.

Summary of the Problem

In the United States alone during 2016, there were about 440,000 special education teachers, around 14 percent of full-time certified teachers, serving the needs of students with disabilities in the country (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). Despite the high number of special education teachers, most of the currently available teacher evaluation systems do not include the evaluation standards specific to the role and responsibilities of special education teachers. Only a handful of standards-based teacher evaluation systems are providing alternative or modified versions of the evaluation standards to measure the performance of special education teachers. There are a couple of special education teacher specific teacher evaluation systems being developed and tested in the field.

This study was developed to add to the efforts to improve special education teacher evaluation.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived differences of teacher evaluation between general education and special education teachers, and among special education teachers evaluated according to different teacher evaluation systems.

Considering the literature reviews and the findings of this study at this time when applying *one-size-fits-all* approach of teacher evaluation systems seems to be a prevalent method of evaluating special education teachers, this study may provide additional insights on if modifying evaluation criteria of the standards-based teacher evaluation systems enabling them to

measure unique roles and responsibilities of special education teachers is sufficient, if there is a need for separate or alternative teacher evaluation methods specifically for special education teachers, and if there are factors that need to be considered to improve the special education teacher evaluation.

The study surveyed the perceptions of general education and special education teachers in Washington State. Based on the survey results, the perceptual differences of general education and special education teachers on their teacher evaluation experiences were compared. In addition, the perceptions of special education teachers were analyzed.

Summary of the Findings

Participants: 2240 certified teachers from nine school districts in Washington State were invited, and 397 teachers responded to the survey (18 percent response rate). 163 responses among 397 responses were removed due to the reasons listed in Table 4.1. As a result, this study focused on the survey responses from 234 certified teachers who taught in Washington State public schools during the 2016-2017 school year.

Forty-five percent of 234 participants reported to have 13 or more years of teaching experiences, and 76 percent of them had a master's degree. 18.8 percent of the participants were special education teachers (n=37). Teachers from Charlotte Danielson's Framework districts had the highest participation (n=173). CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric districts had 31 teachers participating, and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model districts had 30 teachers participating. Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching districts also reported the highest number of special education teacher participation (n=28).

Research Question 1: How do teachers perceive themselves and the evaluation process in Washington State?

Based on the survey responses, teachers perceived themselves to be effective when carrying out their duties as teachers, but showed marginal willingness to experiment in their classes. The evaluators were viewed as moderately helpful, trustworthy, and patient. The evaluation feedback that teachers received seemed to be mostly acceptable, timely and meaningful. They perceived that the evaluation standards were tailored marginally when evaluating teachers with different teaching assignments. Overall, teachers reported that the quality of evaluation process and the impact of the evaluation process on their teaching practice were marginal at best.

Research Question 2: How do teacher attributes related to their perception of the evaluation process?

Years of Teaching. One-way ANOVA test on the subscales of TEP with a factor *Years of Teaching* revealed that there are statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of self as a teacher*. According to the Bonferroni Post hoc test, there were statistically significant response differences between the beginning teachers and experienced teachers. The differences might be due to the beginning teachers' limited experiences in the field. Veenman (1984) pointed out that, according to his literature reviews of 83 international empirical studies, the beginning teachers faced serious problems when teaching students, working with parents, learning about organization, and dealing with materials and supplies. In addition, they experienced difficulties with lesson preparation, relations with other teachers, utilizing various teaching strategies, knowledge of school policies, measuring the performance level of students, subject matter knowledge, additional clerical work, and working with their principals. Another comprehensive literature review found that the beginning teachers had limited knowledge of the procedures to manage classroom effectively, causing them to spend too much time on trying out

various workarounds, rather than focusing on instructions to improve student learning (Kagan, 1992). Melnick & Meister (2008) reported that, when beginning and experienced teachers were compared, there were significant differences in the areas of classroom management and interacting with parents, while there were no statistically significant differences on preparing lessons and managing time.

Highest Degree Earned. One-way ANOVA test results showed that there is no statistically significant difference at the $p<.05$ level among all subscales. Teachers with different degree levels seemed to show statistically significant differences when measured for *teacher efficacy* (Alrefaei, 2015) and *teacher leadership* (Angelle & DeHart, 2011). Further study is needed to verify the factors that might be causing the differences.

Teaching Assignments. One-way ANOVA test on the subscales of TEP with a factor *Teaching Assignments* revealed that there are statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator*. According to the Bonferroni Post hoc test, there are statistically significant response differences between the elementary teachers and special education teachers. The differences may be due to the differences in their working environment and the frequency and quality of collaboration with other team members including principals. The relationship between principal leadership and teacher satisfaction on the evaluation were well documented. Results from multiple studies showed that there were correlations between principal leadership and teacher satisfaction on the evaluation process (Drago-Severson, 2012; Grissom, 2011; Lacireno-Paquet, Bocala & Bailey, 2016; Sartain, Stoelinga & Brown, 2011). Elementary school principals, when compared with their secondary school counterparts, tended to spend more time working directly with teachers, staff, parents, and students to improve teacher effectiveness (Louis et al., 2010). Angelle and DeHart (2011) found that, compared to

other grade level teachers, elementary school teachers collaborated at a higher rate with their teams. On the other hand, special education teachers tended to perceive themselves as being isolated from the general population of the school due to their roles and responsibilities (Bateman & Bateman, 2001, 2014; Glowacki, 2013).

Research Question 3: How do special education teachers in Washington State perceive their teacher evaluation as compared to general education teachers?

The Independent Samples t-test result showed that there are statistically significant differences among the mean scores of *Attributes of perceptions of evaluator* when the perceptions of general education and special education teachers were compared. Just as the case with elementary teachers and special education teachers described in the *Teaching Assignments* section above, the differences may be due to the special education teachers' perceptions of being isolated from the rest of the school (Bateman & Bateman, 2001; Klein, 2015; Glowacki, 2013).

Research Question 4: How do special education teachers perceive the evaluation process based on the three evaluation systems: CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano?

RQ#4 focused on the responses of special education teachers from CEL 5D+, Danielson, and Marzano districts. Due to limited responses from some districts and teacher evaluation systems, the results were not generalizable and included here for descriptive purposes only. All special education teachers perceived that they are relatively flexible with changes. They all reported that the evaluation processes included clear standards. They also perceived that the purpose of the evaluation was moderately clear, and promoted accountability and teacher growth. Since Race to the Top was initiated, most states revamped their teacher evaluation systems to address the accountability and the professional growth of teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2009 &

McGuinn, 2012). As a part of the effort, some states developed and provided information to consider when evaluating special education teachers (CEC, 2012).

Discussion

Traditional style of teacher evaluation systems that utilized two-point scales of 'satisfactory' and 'unsatisfactory' (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhem, & Keeling, 2009) have evolved to standards-based teacher evaluation systems that incorporated multiple 'teacher performance data' collection methods to provide meaningful evaluation towards improving teacher performance and effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2009; McGuinn, 2012).

To assist the special education teacher evaluation process, a few available teacher evaluation systems implemented alternative evaluation standards and evaluation scenarios specific to the special education classrooms. In addition, some states, including Washington State, developed and provided information to consider when evaluating teachers with unique teaching assignments, such as special education teachers. Currently, only a couple of teacher evaluation systems specific to the special education teacher evaluation are being developed and tested in the field. There is no known finalized teacher evaluation system specific to the special education teacher evaluation available in the field.

Despite these efforts to improve the special education teacher evaluation for more than 40 years, no known studies have been conducted on how special education teachers perceived their evaluation process, and how the perceptions of special education teachers and general education teachers differ on their teacher evaluation process. This study was designed to gather perceptual data of special and general education teachers concerning three standards-based teacher evaluation systems implemented in Washington State. This study identified the perceptions of both general and special education teachers on the attributes of the teacher evaluation process.

According to the results of the study, special education teachers rated attributes of their evaluators significantly lower than general education teachers. The differences of special education teachers' perceptions about the evaluators were most apparent when compared with the perceptions of elementary school teachers. These findings suggested that the perceptions of special education teachers on their evaluators may have some bearing on their perceptions on the overall quality of the evaluation. According to Twedt (1991) and Sweeney & Twedt (1993), many teachers, including special education teachers, reported that the evaluators did not provide useful feedback to improve professional skills despite having positive working relationships with their evaluators. To improve the special education teacher evaluation and the professional relations between special education teachers and their evaluators/administrators, there must be a support system to improve special education teacher participation in general activities of the school and to remove their feelings of isolation (Bateman & Bateman, 2001, 2014; Glowacki, 2013), and professional development opportunities for evaluators to improve their special education related knowledge and experiences (Glowacki, 2013; Winborne, 1981).

Another finding of this study revealed that special education teachers felt that the evaluation standards and the purpose of the evaluation were relatively clear to them. They also perceived that the teacher evaluation process promoted accountability and teacher growth. These results were reported from the group of 37 special education teachers including 28 teachers from the Danielson districts. It is important to note that Danielson is the only teacher evaluation system among three evaluation systems in this study that offered modified evaluation scenarios for the special education teacher evaluation. Therefore, reports from Danielson teachers, who were supposedly evaluated based on the alternative evaluation scenarios specific to special education classrooms, may have significantly influenced the results.

Recommendations for Future Research

Multiple studies reported that many administrators possessed limited understanding about special education and the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers (Lazzari & Bruder, 1988; Glowacki, 2013; Moya, 1980; Moya & Gay, 1982). As a result, they did not provide useful suggestions for improvement (Twedt, 1991). It is suggested that when developing and implementing teacher evaluation systems for special education teachers, districts and local educational agencies must include both special education teachers and administrators (CEC, 2012; Glowacki, 2013; Nissen, 1984; Sledge & Pazey, 2013). In relation with special education teachers and administrators on the teacher evaluation, Rosell (1990) surveyed the perceptions of regular and special education teachers and administrators on the teacher evaluation process, and Twedt (1991) and Sweeney & Twedt (1993) studied the perceptions of special education teachers and regular education teachers on teacher evaluation. However, they did not provide detailed information on the professional relations between teachers and administrators. Further study is recommended to find out the effect of the professional relations between special education teachers and their evaluators on the quality of the special education teacher evaluation. Additional testing would be recommended to identify effective strategies to improve the professional relations between special education teachers and their evaluators.

The articles that solely focused on the subject of the special education teacher evaluation tended to agree that there needs to be different ways to evaluate special education teachers, apart from the *one-size-fits-all* evaluation that tends to focus on general education teachers. Majority of these studies supported the idea of utilizing the available teacher evaluation systems with some form of modifications and accommodations to address the unique needs of special education teachers. Some of the suggested modifications and accommodations included

incorporating observation (Moya, 1980), video recording (Myers, 1983), proficiency in additional roles and responsibilities (Furdden, 1984; Sledge & Pazey, 2013), consideration of "the extraneous variables" (Warger & Aldinger, 1987, p. 61), performance based evaluation such as VAM (CEC, 2012; Holdheide, Buzick, & Warburton, 2012; Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014a; Semmelroth, Johnson, & Allred, 2013), and multiple measures including student growth (Holdheide, Buzick, & Warburton, 2012). Among the three teacher evaluation systems that Washington State implemented in 2012, Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching offered modified scenarios to be used when evaluating special education teachers. CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric and Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model did not include any modifications or accommodations for the special education teacher evaluation at the time of this study. One of the purposes of this study was to compare the perceptions of special education teachers evaluated based on these three teacher evaluation systems. Due to the limited participation from CEL 5D+ and Marzano districts, the results were not generalizable. It would be of interest to conduct further studies to compare the perceptions of special education teachers from districts that implemented teacher evaluation systems with modifications for special education teachers and from the districts that implemented *one-size-fits-all* teacher evaluation systems. A similar study can be replicated expanding to other states involving additional standards-based teacher evaluation systems. A study can be conducted to find out the fidelity of the implementation and application of teacher evaluation systems when evaluating special education teachers.

A similar study could be done for teachers with teaching assignments that *one-size-fits-all* approach of teacher evaluation systems may not be able to provide a meaningful evaluation. Examples of such teaching assignments include but not limited to, ELL, physical education, and music.

Summary

Teacher evaluation is one of the most important tools that has a potential to assist teachers to improve their effectiveness. Special education teachers need the same opportunity as their general education counterparts and receive meaningful evaluation and useful feedback to improve their teaching practice. The focus of this chapter was to discuss the findings and implications of this study. The findings in this study suggested that the professional relationships between evaluators and special education teachers and perceptions of special education teachers on their evaluation may influence the outcome of the special education evaluation. The significance of the findings in this study is supported by the data collected from certified teachers participated in the study. The states and local educational agencies may need to look into providing additional supports and professional developments, so that evaluators and special education teachers share "a deep level of understanding" (OSPI, 2017c, p. 1) of what is needed to improve student learning and special education teacher effectiveness.

References

Alrefaei, N. (2015). *Teachers' sense of efficacy: Examining the relationship of teacher efficacy and student achievement.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 2015). Order No. 3704548. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1690497495).

Angelle, P. S., DeHart, C.A. (2011). Teacher perceptions of teacher leadership: examining differences by experience, degree and position. *Nass Bulletin,* 95(2), 141-160.

Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2006). *Supervision for learning: A performance-based approach to teacher development and school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Attinello, J. R., Lare, D. W., & Source, F. (2006). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and growth. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2), 132–152.

Ayer, F. C. (1954). *Fundamentals of instructional supervision*. New York, NY: Harper.

Baker, E., Barton, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., & Linn, R. (2010). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers.* Briefing Paper No. 278. Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute.

Barrett, J. (1986). *The Evaluation of Teachers.* (ERIC Digest No. 12). Retrieved from ERIC

Bateman, D. and Bateman, C. F. (2001). *A principal's guide to special education,* Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Bateman, D. and Bateman, C. F. (2014). *A principal's guide to special education* (3rd ed.). Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Beerens, D. R. (2000). *Evaluating teachers for professional growth: Creating a culture of motivation and learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Billingsley, B. S. (1989). Evaluating special educators: Context and considerations for evaluation design. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *2*(3), 229-238.

Blanton, L. P., Sindelar, P. T., & Correa, V. I. (2006). Models and measures of beginning teacher quality. *The Journal of Special Education, 40*, 115-127.

Blumberg, A. (1985). *The school superintendent : Living with conflict*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Borman, G. D., & Kimball, S. M. (2005, September). Teacher quality and educational equality: Do teachers with higher standards-based evaluation ratings close student achievement gaps? *Elementary School Journal, 106*(1), 3. doi:10.1086/496904

Brown, V. (1976). Programs, materials and techniques: Teacher evaluation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 9. 267-275.

Bull, K. (March, 1994). *Portfolio assessment in teacher evaluation: A comparison of the perspectives of general and special education administrators and teachers.* Austin, TX: Proceedings of the Annual National Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education.

Burdette P. (2011a, April). Performance-based compensation: Focus on special education teachers. Retrieved from http://projectforum.org/docs/Performance-basedCompensation-FocusOnSpecialEducationTeachers-final.pdf

Burdette P. (2011b, November). Special education value-added performance evaluation systems: A state-level focus. Retrieved from http://projectforum.org/docs/StateEducatorValue-AddedPerformanceEvaluationSystems-AState-levelFocus.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017, November). Occupational outlook handbook. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/ooh/education-training-and-library/special-education-teachers.htm

Burke, P. J., & Krey, R. D. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership* (2nd Ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher Ltd.

Buzick, M., & Jones, N. D. (2015). Using test scores from students with disabilities in teacher evaluation. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice.* 34(3), 28-38.

Center for Educational Leadership (n.d.). 5D+ rater reliability training. University of Washington, Center for Educational Leadership. Retrieved from https://www.k-12leadership.org/content/service/rater-reliability-training

Center for Educational Leadership (2017). *5D+ Teacher evaluation rubric*. University of Washington, Center for Educational Leadership.

Centra, J.A. (1993). Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christner, C. A. & Others (1979). *Competency-based teacher evaluation in a school district: validation of the competencies' importance by district administrators, professionals, students, and parents*. Paper presented at the 63rd annual meeting of the American educational research Association, San Francisco. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED177213.pdf

Church, A. (2012). Making performance-based evaluation work for you: A recipe for personal learning. *Knowledge Quest, 41*(2), 38-41. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/cehs_facpubs/5

Clements, B. S. (1988). Effects of the reform movement on the evaluation of teachers: The Texas experience. *Design for Arts in Education, 89*(4), 28.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: a metaanalysis. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 113-143.

Council for Exceptional Children (1997). Special education in the school. *CEC Policy Manual* (Para. 4). Retrieved from https://www.cec.sped.org/Policy-and-Advocacy/CEC-Professional-Policies/Special-Education-in-the-Schools

Council for Exceptional Children (2007). Position on Response to Intervention (RTI): The Unique Role of Special Education and Special Educators. *Division On Developmental Disabilities, Council For Exceptional Children.* Retrieved from https://www.cec.sped.org/~/media/Files/Policy/CEC percent20Professionalpercent20Policies percent20andpercent20Positions/RTI.pdf

Council for Exceptional Children (2010). Section Three. *CEC Policy Manual* (pp. 71--92), Reston, VA. Originally adopted by the Delegate Assembly of The Council for Exceptional Children in April 1983. Retrieved from www.cec.sped.org/

Council for Exceptional Children (2012). *Position on special education teacher evaluation.* Arlington, VA. Retrieved from www.cec.sped.org/

Cremin, L. A. (1976). *Public education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(3), 3-13. doi:10.3102/0013189X019001003

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 46*(2), 12–15.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational Leadership, 68*(4), 35-39.

Danielson, C. (2012). It's your evaluation --. *NJEA.org*. Retrieved from http://www.njea.org/news-and-publications/njea-review/october-2011/its-yourevaluation

Danielson Group, (2017, October), Charlotte Danielson's framework for teaching. Retrieved from http://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: To enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Standards for assessing teaching effectiveness are key. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(5), 471-472.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Ananlysis Archives, 8*(1), 1-44.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Recognizing and enhancing teacher effectiveness. *The International Journal of Educational Psychological Assessment, 3*, 1-24.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease S. R., (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context.: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research *53*(3): 285-328.

Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Doerr, S. E. (2012). Charolotte Danielson's theory of teacher evaluations: A quantitative study of teachers' perceptions on the four domains. (Doctoral Disertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3499681)

Donaldson, M. L., & Donaldson, G. A., Jr. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(8), 78-82.

Drago-Severson, E. (2012). New opportunities for principal leadership: Shaping school climates for enhanced teacher development. *Teachers College Record, 114*(3). Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16304

Duffett, A., Farkas, S., Rotherham, A., & Silva, E. (2008). *Waiting to be won over: Teachers speak on the profession, unions, and reform* (p. 25). Washington, D.C.: Education Sector. Retrieved from http://www.educationsector.org/publications/waiting-be-won-over

Ellett, C. D. (1997). Classroom-based assessments of teaching and learning. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. 107-128.

Ellett, C. D. & Teddlie, C. (2003, March). Teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness: Perspectives from the USA. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *17*(1), 101-128.

Elliott, S.N., Roach R.T., & Kurz A. (2014). Evaluating and advancing the effective teaching of special educators with a dynamic instructional practices portfolio. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39*, 83-98.

Fink, S. (2012). Teacher Evaluation. In *Center for educational leadership.* Retrieved from http://www.k-12leadership.org/about-cel/our-history

Glowacki, H. L. (2013). *Illinois elementary principals' perceptions of the teacher evaluation process of special education teachers* (Order No. AAI3603369). Available from PsycINFO. (1611625896; 2014-99171-079). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1611625896?accountid=14556

Gordon, R. J., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. (2006). *Identifying effective teachers using performance on the job*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.

Grisson, J.A., & Youngs, P. (2015). *Improving teacher evaluation systems: Making the most of multiple measures.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Guiney, M. (2015). Evaluation of teachers of students with low incident disabilities (Master Thesis). Retrieved the from http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1762&context=theses:

Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 26*(1), 5-28.

Harris, D. N., Ingle, W. K., & Rutledge, S. A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*: 73-112.

Harris, I. K. (2016). *Performance appraisals for special education teachers: examining the need for separation and alignment*. (Doctoral dissertation, Olivet Nazarene University, 2016). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1097&context=edd_diss

Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* London: Routledge.

Heneman, H., III & Milanowski, A. T. (2003). Continuing assessment of teachers reaction to a standards-based teacher evaluation system: A pilot study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *17*(2), 173–195.

Hill, D (1982). A content analysis of special education teacher evaluation forms (Master Thesis). Retrieved from ERIC: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED223697.pdf

Hill, H., & Grossman, P. (2013), Learning from teacher observations: challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review. 83*(2), pp. 371-384.

Holdheide, L., Browder, D., Warren, S., Buzick, H., & Jones, N. (2012). *Summary of "using student growth to evaluate educators of students with disabilities: Issues, challenges, and next steps"* (pp. 1–36). Retrieved from http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/TQ_Forum_SummaryUsing_Student_Growth.pdf

Holdheide, L., Buzick, H., & Warburton, S. (2012). State considerations in designing and implementing evaluation systems that include teachers of students with disabilities. *Office of Special Education Programs Project Director's Conference*. Washington DC. Retrieved from https://www.osep-

meeting.org/2012conf/largegroup/Tues_StateConsiderationsDesigningImplantingEvaluationTeams/StateConsiderations.htm

Holdheide, L, Goe, L, Croft, A, & Reschly, D. (2010). *Challenges in evaluating special education teachers and English language learner specialists* (Research & Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from http://www.tqsourceorg/publications/July2010Brief.pdf.

Holley, F. M., & Hickman, R. C. (1981). *Research on teacher evaluation: Needs and realities.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas-Austin. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED202894.pdf

Imber, M. and Geel, T. (2009). *Education Law*. Los Angeles: Routledge.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).

Johnson, E. E. (2015). Integrating special education teachers into a statewide teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 28(2), 82-88*

Johnson, E., & Semmelroth, C. L. (2014a). Introduction to AEI's special issue on special education teacher evaluations. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39(2), 1–5.*

Johnson, E., & Semmelroth, C. L. (2014b). Special education teacher evaluation: Why it matters, what makes it challenging, and how to address these challenges. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39*(2), 71-82.

Johnson, E. S. & Semmelroth, C. L. (2015). Validating an Observation Protocol to Measure Special Education Teacher Effectiveness, *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals.*

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2009). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to assess systems for evaluating educators* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Jones N. D., Brownell M. T. (2014). Examining the use of classroom observations in the evaluation of special education teachers. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39*(2), 112-124.

Jordan, H., Mendro, R., & Weerasinghe, D. (1997, July). *Teacher effects on longitudinal student achievement*. Paper presented at the sixth National Evaluation Institute sponsored by CREATE, Indianapolis, IN.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 129-169.

Katims D. S., Henderson R. L. (1990). Teacher evaluation in special education. *NASSP Bulletin, 74*(527), 47-52.

Kauffman, J. M., Hallahan, D. P., Payne, J. S., & Ball, D. W. (1973). Teaching/learning: Quantitative and functional analysis of educational performance. *The Journal of Special Education, 7*(3), 261-268.

Kimball, S. M., & Milanowski, A. (2009, February). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(1), 34-70.

Lacireno-Paquet, N., Bocala, C., & Bailey, J. (2016). *Relationship between school professional climate and teachers' satisfaction with the evaluation process* (REL 2016–133). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational

Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565674.pdf

Lash, A., Tran, L., & Huang, M. (2016, May). *Examining the validity of ratings from classroom observation instruments for the use in a district's teacher evaluation system.* Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/

Lawson, J. (2014). Value-Added Modeling: Challenges for Measuring Special Education Teacher Quality. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 10*(1)

Lazzari, A. M., & Bruder, M. B. (1988). Teacher evaluation practices in early childhood special education. *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood*, *12*(3), 238-244.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2009). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010*). Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1968). *Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Mack, D. R. (2013). *Teacher Evaluation* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Order No. 3588128. Available from Proquest.com.

McCaffrey D. F., Buzick H. (2014). *Is value-added accurate for teachers of students with disabilities?* Carnegie Knowledge Network. Retrieved from http://www.carnegieknowledgenetwork.org/briefs/teacher_disabilities/

Marks, J. R., Stoops, E., & King-Stoops, J. (1985). *Handbook of educational supervision : A guide for the practitioner* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Marshall, K. (2009). *Rethinking teacher supervision and evaluation: How to work smart, build collaboration, and close the achievement gap*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marzano, R. J. (2010). Art & science of teaching: What teachers gain from deliberate practice. *The Effective Educator, 68*(4), 82-85.

Marzano, R. J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership 70*(3), 14-19.

Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Mathers, C., Oliva, M., & Laine, S. (2008). *Improving instruction through effective teacher evaluation: Options for states and districts.* TQ research & policy brief. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

McGuinn, P. (2012). *The state of teacher evaluation reform*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/McGuinn_TheStateofEvaluation-1.pdf

Melnick, S.A., & Meister, D.G. (2008). A comparison of beginning and experienced teachers' concerns. *Educational Research Quarterly, 31*(3), 39-56.

Mendro, R. L. (1998). Student achievement and school and teacher accountability. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 12*, 257–267, p. 262. The Dallas Public Schools program will be highlighted in more detail in Chapter 6.

Milanowski, A.T., & Heneman, H.G., III (2001). Assessment of Teacher Reactions to a Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation System: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(3), 193-212.

Miller, P. S. (1980). *Competency development scale for teachers of exceptional children*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Millman, J. (ed.), (1981), Handbook of teacher evaluation, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, Calif., 1981.

Millman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Mimms, M. (2011). *Principals' perceptions of their ability to evaluate special education teachers using the 21st century professional teaching standards* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2012). Order No. AAI3457567). Available from PsycINFO. (993099188; 2012-99030-320).

Mitchell, D. E. (1976). *A study of the role definition for the special education resource specialist.* U.C. Riverside: California State Department of Education, Grant #75-147.

Mrla, T. (2016). *Perceived relevance of special education performance indicators: Teacher excellence and support system.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 2016)

Order No. 10111609). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1794166874)

Moya, S. A. (1980). *Evaluation of special education teachers in the state of California.* (Doctoral dissertation, 1980) Order No. DP26652. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1634344172).

Moya, S. A., & Gay, G. (1982). Evaluation of special education teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 5*(1), 37-41.

Myers, A. F., Kifer, L. M., Merry, R. C., & Foley, F. (1938). *Cooperative supervision in the public schools*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Myers, C. J. (1983). *Special Educator Improvement Procedure (SEIP): An innovative approach to special education teacher evaluation for the improvement of instruction.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona). Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/187578

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Children and youth with disabilities*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgg.asp

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983, April). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2010). *Survey of special educators conducted by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality with support from the Council for Exceptional Children* (aggregated survey results). Washington, DC.

National Education Association, (n.d). Teacher assessment and evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/TeachrAssmntWhtPaperTransform10_2.pdf

Nissen, E. R. (1984). *Guidelines for administrators to use in evaluating special education teachers.* Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?q=evaluating+AND+content+AND+management+AND+system&pg=5&id=ED253984

Neuman, W. L. (2009). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2017a). *Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program*. Retrieved from http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/QandA.aspx#Implementation

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2017b). *Washington State Report Card*. Retrieved from http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/summary.aspx?groupLevel=District&schoolId=1&reportLevel=State&yrs=2016-17&year=2016-17

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2017c). *OSPI guidance for specific learning environments: Alternative learning environments.* Retrieved from http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/Frameworks/OSPI_Learning_Environments.pdf

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2017d). *State special education data collection summaries*. Retrieved from http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Childcount-Placement.aspx

Orphanos, S. (2014). What matters to principals when they evaluate teachers? evidence from Cyprus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(2), 243-258.

Papay, J. P. (2012, Spring). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purposes and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(1), 123-141.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Popham, W. J. (1988) The dysfunctional marriage of formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*(3), 269-273. National Education Association,

Popham, W. J. (2013). *Evaluating America's teacher: Mission possible?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Price, N. C. (1973). The principal and the Stull Act. *NASSP Bulletin, 57*(376), 66-72.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rockoff, J. E., & Speroni, C. (2010). Subjective and objective evaluations of teacher effectiveness. *American Economic Review, 100*(2), 261-266.

Rose, J. S., & Huynh, H. (1984). *Technical issues in adopting the APT for district-wide teacher evaluation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.

Rosell, J. E. (1990). *Perceptions of regular and special education teachers and administrators about the process of teacher evaluation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1990). *ETD collection for University of Nebraska - Lincoln*. AAI9034286

Rury, J. L. (1991). *Education and women's work: Female schooling and the division of labor in urban America, 1870-1930*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sanders, W., Ashton, J., & Wright, S. (2005). *Comparison of the effects of NBPTS-certified teachers with other teachers on the rate of student academic progress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and National Science Foundation.

Sanders, W., & Rivers, J. (1996). Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement. *Home*. Retrieved from http://heartland.org/policy-documents/cumulative-and-residual-effects-teachers-futurestudent- academic-achievement

Sartain, L., Stoelinga, S. R., & Brown, E. (2011). *Rethinking teacher evaluation in Chicago: Lessons learned from classroom observations, principal-teacher conferences, and district implementation*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Consortium for School Research. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED527619.pdf

Sawchuk, S. (2015, September 3). Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*, 35(3). Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-overview.html?print=1

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of Evaluation, in: R. Tyler, R. Gagné & M. Scriven (Eds.), Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation (AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1) (Chicago, Rand McNally) pp. 39-83

Semmelroth, C. L., & Johnson, E. (2014). Measuring rater reliability on a special education observation tool. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 39*(3), 131-145.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shakman, K., Riordan, J., Sanchez, M. T., Cook, K. D., Fournier, R., & Brett, J. (2012). *An examination of performance-based teacher evaluation systems in five states.* (Issues & Answers report, REL 2012-no.129). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education,

Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands.

Shinkfield, A. J., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sindelar, P.T., Smith, M.A., Harriman, N.E., Hale, R.L., & Wilson, R.J. (1986). Teacher effectiveness in special education programs. *The Journal of Special Education, 20*, 195—207.

Sledge A., Pazey B. L. (2013). Measuring teacher effectiveness through meaningful evaluation: Can reform models apply to general education and special education teachers? *Teacher Education and Special Education, 36,* 231–246.

Sledge, A., Pazey B. L. (2016). Teacher evaluation in the special education setting: voices from the field. *Texas Education Review, 4*(1), 17-46.

Starratt, R. (2005). Responsible leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), pp. 124-33.

Steinbrecher, T. D., Selig, J. P., Cosbey, J., & Thorstensen, B. I. (2014). Evaluating Special Educator Effectiveness: Addressing Issues Inherent to Value-Added Modeling. *Exceptional Children*, *80*(3), 323-336. doi:10.1177/0014402914522425

Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth systems--different purposes. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 70*(490), 51-58.

Stiggins, R. J., & Duke, D. (1988). The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stiggins, R., J., & Nickel, P. (1988). The teacher evaluation profile: A technical analysis. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 2:151-156.

Stronge, J. H. (2006). Teacher Evaluation and school improvement: improving the education landscape. *Evaluating Teaching: A Guide to Current Thinking and Best Practice (*2nd ed), 1-23.

Sweeney, J., & Twedt, B. (1993). *A comparison of regular and special education teachers' perceptions of the teacher evaluation process.*

Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1987). *Supervision in education: Problems and practices*. New York: Collier Macmillan.

Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *The American Economic Review,* 102(7), 3628-3651.

Teacher Principal Evaluation Project. (2015). *Timeline*. Retrieved from http://tpep-wa.org/about-tpep/timeline/

The Danielson Group (2015). *Special Education Scenarios.* https://danielsongroup.org/special-education/ Apr. 2015.

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). L*inking Teacher Evaluation and Student Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Turnbull, H. R., & Cilley, M. (1999). *Explanations and implications of the 1997 amendments to IDEA*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Turnbull, H. R. & Turnbull, A. P. (2000). *Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities* (6th ed.). Denver: Love.

Twedt, B. J. (1991). *An examination of performance evaluation of special education teachers in Iowa* (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1991). Order No. 9202400. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (303954401).

Underwood, J., & Webb, L. D. (2005). *School law for teachers.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

USD497. (2014). *Master Agreement 2014-2015*. Retrieved from www.usd497.org.

U. S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/

U. S. Department of Education (2004). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act* (IDEA). Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://idea.ed.gov/download/statute.html

U. S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the Top program: Executive summary*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executivesummary.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Thirty-five years of progress in educating children with disabilities through IDEA*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/idea35/history/idea-35-history.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*. Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn

Valentine, J. W., & Harting, R. D. (1988). *Performance-based teacher evaluation in Missouri: A three-year report.* Jefferson City, MO: Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED311588

Vannest, K. J., & Hagan-Burke, S. (2009). Teacher time use in special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 31,* 126– 142.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(2), 143-178.

vonEschenbach, J. F. (1988). Special educators' perceptions of teacher effectiveness compared to coordinators, principals, and regular class teachers. *Diagnostique, 13*(2)

Warger, C., & Aldinger, L. (1987). Teacher evaluation: The special case of the special educator. *NASSP Bulletin*, *71*(500), 54–62.

Warrick, P., & Livingston, D. (2012). *The Marzano Model for Teacher Evaluation in Washington State*. Retrieved from http://staff.camas.wednet.edu/blogs/tpep/files/2011/12/The_Marzano_Model.pdf

Washburn-Moses, L. (2005). Roles and Responsibilities of Secondary Special Education Teachers in an Age of Reform. *Remedial and Special Education, 26*(3), 151-158.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhem, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect.* Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect_2nd_ed.pdf

Widener, R. E., Jr. (2011). *Evaluating special education teachers: Do we get the job done? A regional perspective* (Doctoral Dissertation. East Tennessee State University). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (875798028).

Winborne, C. R. (1981). The evaluation dilemma: Special education and the principal. *NASSP Bulletin, 65*(442), 22-24.

Wiles, K. (1967). *Supervision for better schools* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Woolf, S. B. (2015). Special Education Professional Standards How Important Are They in the Context of Teacher Performance Evaluation? *Teacher Education and Special Education, 38*(4), 276-290.

Zadnik, D. (1992). Instructional supervision in special education: Integrating teacher effectiveness research into model supervisory practices. *CASE information dissemination packet.* CASE Research Committee.

Appendix A: TEP Questionnaire (Modified)

Teacher Evaluation Profile Questionnaire

Click "Next" to continue with the survey at any time.

The survey requires 5 -15 uninterrupted minutes. The purpose of this survey is to collect teachers' perceptions on the teacher evaluation system and the process during 2016-2017 school year.

The following statement explains your consent for this survey, and efforts to ensuring you anonymity.

The Department of Education, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

We are conducting this study to better understand perceptions of teachers on teacher evaluation. This will entail your completion of a survey. Your participation is expected to take approximately 5-15 minutes to complete. The content of the survey should cause no more discomfort than you would experience in your everyday life.

Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of perceptions of various teachers on teacher evaluation. Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary. Your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. Your identifiable information will not be shared unless (a) it is required by law or university policy, or (b) you give written permission.

To ensure anonymity and confidentiality of information, no personally identifiable information is collected. Your responses will be combined with those of others and summarized in a report to further protect your anonymity. Even in the event that you voluntarily/accidentally submit your personal or contact information in any area of the survey, it will not be shared with anyone without your written consent, and will not be included in any form of reports.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please feel free to contact us by phone or mail.

Completion of the survey indicates your willingness to take part in this study and that you are at least 18 years old. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429 or write the Human Research Protection Program (HRPP), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, email irb@ku.edu.

Sincerely,

(Young) Hyuk Hong
Principal Investigator
Department of Education
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
Joseph R. Pearson Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
253-285-0963
hyho@ku.edu
yhong@fwps.org

Susan Twombly, Ph.D.
Faculty Supervisor
Department of Education
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
Joseph R. Pearson Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
(785) 864-9721
stwombly@ku.edu

Section 1: Attributes of Evaluation

Rate Yourself As a Teacher: *Describe yourself in relation to the following attributes as a teacher.*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

1. The strength of your professional expectations of yourself as a teacher

I demand little of myself				I demand a great deal of myself
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

2. Orientation to risk taking

I avoid risks				I take risks
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

3. Orientation to change

I am relatively slow to change				I am relatively flexible
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

4. Willingness to experiment in the classroom

I don't experiment				I experiment frequently
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

5. Openness to criticism

I am relatively closed				I am relatively open
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

6. Knowledge of instructional methods and strategies

I know a little				I know a great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

7. Knowledge of curriculum content you teach

I know a little				I know a great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Rate Your Evaluator: *Describe your perceptions of the person who evaluated your performance (principal/assistant principal/evaluator) during 2016-2017.*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

8. Credibility as a source of feedback

Not credible				Very credible
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

9. Working relationship with you

Adversary				Helper
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

10. Level of trust

Not trustworthy				Trustworthy
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

11. Interpersonal manner

Threatening				Not threatening
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

12. Temperament of the evaluator

Impatient				Patient
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

13. Flexibility of the evaluator

Rigid				Flexible
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

14. Knowledge of the instructional methods and strategies

Not knowledgeable				Very knowledgeable
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

15. Capacity to demonstrate/model improvements

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

16. Familiarity with the your classroom (considering your grade level, subject area, and student population)

Unfamiliar				Very familiar
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

17. Usefulness of suggestions for improvement

Useless				Very useful
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

18. Persuasiveness of rationale for changes

Not persuasive				Very persuasive
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Rate the Evaluation Process: *Describe the attributes of the* ***evaluation processes*** *implemented during 2016-2017 school year.*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

19. The evaluation standards were communicated

Not at all				In great detail
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

20. The evaluation standards were clear

Vague				Very clear
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

21. The evaluation standards were appropriate for your teaching assignment (considering your grade level/subject area)

Not appropriate				Highly appropriate
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

22. The evaluation standards were...

The same for all teachers				Tailored for your unique teaching assignments
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

To what extent were the following sources of performance information considered as part of the evaluation:

23. Observation of classroom performance

Not considered				Used extensively
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

24. Examination of artifacts (lesson plans, materials, home/school communication)

Not considered				Used extensively
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

25. Examination of student achievement

Not considered				Used extensively
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Rate the Feedback You Received: *Describe the attributes of the **feedback** you received during 2016-2017 school year:*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

26. Amount of information received

None				Great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

27. Depth of information provided

Shallow				In-depth
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

28. Frequency of Observation (Evaluator performed none/all *required* classroom observations based on the Comprehensive/Focused Evaluation System)

None				All
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

29. Frequency of feedback (Evaluator and you had none/all *required* feedback meetings to discuss the evaluation feedback based on the Comprehensive/Focused Evaluation System)

None				All
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

30. Quality of ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

31. Specificity of information provided

General				Specific
1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

32. Nature of information provided

Judgmental				Descriptive
1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

33. Timing of feedback

Delayed				Immediate
1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

34. Feedback focused on standards

Ignored the standards				Reflected the standards
1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Rate the Evaluation Context: *Describe the attributes of the* ***evaluation context*** *during 2016-2017 school year.*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

Resources available for evaluation:

35. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of other participants (evaluator, students, etc)

None				Great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

36. Time allocated during the school year for professional development aligned with the teacher evaluation standards

None				Great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

37. Availability of training programs and models of good practices

None				Great deal
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

District values and policies reflected in evaluation:

38. Clarity of district policy statements regarding the purpose for evaluation

Vague				Very clear
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

39. Intended role of evaluation

Teacher accountability				Teacher growth
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Section 2: Overall Quality of the Evaluation Process during 2016-2017 school year

Rate Overall Quality of Evaluation: *Rate the statements based on your 2016-2017 evaluation experience.*

Ratings are ordered, ranging from least (1 on the left) to most (5 on the right). Choose the rating that represents your perception most accurately.

* 40. Rate the overall quality of the evaluation process

Very poor quality				Very high quality
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

* 41. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your attitudes about teaching.

No impact				Strong impact
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

* 42. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your teaching behaviors and strategies.

No impact				Strong impact
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

* 43. Rate the impact of the evaluation process on your understanding of the teaching/learning process.

No Impact				Strong Impact
1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

* 44. If you were evaluated at your current school district (2015-2016), rate your opinion on the teacher evaluation as a whole during this school year (**2016-2017**) compared to the last school year (**2015-2016**). Choose "N/A", if you were not evaluated at current school district during 2015-2016 school year.

No Improvement				Significant improvement	
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Please explain your rating on Question 44:

Section 3: Teacher Information

Demographic Information

To ensure anonymity and confidentiality of information, no personally identifiable information is collected. Your responses will be combined with those of others and summarized in a report to further protect your anonymity. Even in the event that you voluntarily/accidentally submit your personal or contact information in any areas of the survey, it will not be shared with anyone without your written consent, and will not be included in any form of reports.

All demographic information will be deleted once data are used to develop a finalized report form or within 90 days whichever comes first.

45. Including the current year (2016-2017), how many years have you taught?

- ◯ 1-2 years
- ◯ 3-7 years
- ◯ 8-12 years
- ◯ 13 or more years

46. What is your highest degree?

- ◯ Bachelors Degree
- ◯ Masters Degree
- ◯ Doctorate Degree

47. What is your assigned grade level during 2016-2017 school year?

- ◯ Grades PreK - 5
- ◯ Grades 6 - 8
- ◯ Grades 9 – 12
- ◯ Other (please specify)

[ ]

* 48. What is your assigned subject/specialty area? If you do not see your area, please type your response in "other" box below.

- ◯ PreK – 5
- ◯ English (ELA)
- ◯ English Language Learner
- ◯ Foreign Language
- ◯ History
- ◯ Math
- ◯ Music
- ◯ Physical Education
- ◯ Science
- ◯ Social Studies
- ◯ Special Education
- ◯ Other

Other (please specify)

Click "Done" button below, when you are finished with this survey.

Once you exit, you cannot come back and change your responses.

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix B: Email Invitation

Dear Certified Teachers,

My name is Hyuk Hong, a special education teacher at Federal Way Public Schools, WA, and a Doctoral Candidate in the areas of the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Kansas.

This survey is a part of my dissertation and is developed to provide information for your district, leadership, and teachers to improve the teacher evaluation process.

Please click https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/5NJ85TG at any time you are ready to take the survey. There are 48 rating questions. It will take approximately 5-15 minutes to complete.

This online survey is designed to collect your perceptions on the teacher evaluation process in your district during 2016-2017 school year. Because it focuses on the process of the evaluation, you do NOT need the final result of the evaluation to take this survey.

All certified teachers from all grade levels and subject areas including Special Education, PE, ELL, Music and other specialty teachers are encouraged to participate to provide a comprehensive look at the teacher evaluation process.

To ensure anonymity and confidentiality of information, no personally identifiable information is collected. Your responses will be combined with those of others and summarized in a report to further protect your anonymity. For example, if there are low numbers of participation from groups of teachers such as grade level and subject specific teachers, and Special Education, PE, ELL, Music and other specialty teachers, their data will be combined into one large group. Even in the event that you voluntarily/accidentally submit your personal or contact information in any area of the survey, it will not be shared with anyone without your written consent, and will not be included in any form of reports.

The survey will stay open for the next 2 weeks (05/03 – 05/12). The deadline may extend if needed.

If you have any questions, please contact me hyho@ku.edu. I will get back to you within 48 hours.

Appendix C: IRB Approval

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Research

APPROVAL OF PROTOCOL

March 1, 2017

Hyuk Hong
hyho@ku.edu

Dear Hyuk Hong:

On 3/1/2017, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	Perceptions of Special Education and General Education Teachers on Teacher Evaluation: A quest for special education teacher evaluation
Investigator:	Hyuk Hong
IRB ID:	STUDY00140657
Funding:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Hyuk Hong A Consent Form V01.docx, • Initial Application Hyuk Hong Perception of Teachers 02252017 V02.pdf, • Hyuk Hong SurveyMonkey 02272017 with Consent v04.pdf

The IRB approved the study on 3/1/2017.

1. Notify HSCL about any new investigators not named in original application. Note that new investigators must take the online tutorial at https://rgs.drupal.ku.edu/human_subjects_compliance_training.
2. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported immediately.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity.

Continuing review is not required for this project, however you are required to report any significant changes to the protocol prior to altering the project.

Please note university data security and handling requirements for your project:
https://documents.ku.edu/policies/IT/DataClassificationandHandlingProceduresGuide.htm

You must use the final, watermarked version of the consent form, available under the "Documents" tab in eCompliance.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Dyson Elms, MPA
IRB Administrator, KU Lawrence Campus

Human Research Protection Program
Youngberg Hall | 2385 Irving Hill Rd | Lawrence, KS 66045 | (785) 864-7429 | research.ku.edu/hrpp