Chapter 1 : Educational Organization | www.nxgvision.com

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORKS FOR IMPROVING SCHOOL OUTCOMES COMMON POLICY CHALLENGES SUMMARY Performance in schools is increasingly judged on the basis of effective learning outcomes.

Just a month earlier, he and his colleague administrators had taken part in a professional development program that provided in-depth information and simulation activities in a process called Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation PBSE. Gary had arranged for his teachers to have their own training in the process during the two professional development days in August. After the workshop, she had found Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation even more appealing. To Marcia, the model made sense, connected with many of the best-practice recommendations she continued to hear and read about, and seemed realistic about the challenges of the classroom. But as much as the PBSE model appealed to her, Marcia was unsure about how to begin using it herself. She had thought about the model as she considered potential areas for professional growth, but the annual plan she was about to propose to her principal was more a reflection of her old habits than the new approach. In light of current events, this certainly seemed to be an authentic and appropriate consideration for social studies. It was part of the 8th grade curriculum and a topic that she found personally interesting. Economic globalization seemed to fit the bill. Marcia arrived at her meeting with the principal with a proposed professional objective in hand. When Marcia had finished explaining her idea, Gary smiled and took a breath. It was fully in line with the type of supervisory process he had used with staff members for many years. But it was not in line with the plan to implement Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation. To bring Marcia on board, he would need to help her bridge the divide between past practices and the new approach: The State of Supervision and Evaluation Teacher supervision and evaluation is an important focus for principals and other administrators. Since the s, our body of professional knowledge on this topic has grown, supported by the work of Acheson and Gall , Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krawjewski , McGreal , Manatt and Manatt , Peterson , Stanley and Popham , Hunter , Eisner , Scriven , Stufflebeam , and other pioneers. We have come to understand more clearly the nature and importance of specific aspects of quality teaching, such as building on prior learning, effective questioning techniques, productive and intellectually challenging activities, and reinforcement of lesson objectives Marzano, We can identify student engagement, self- and peer assessment, and the opportunity for children to work collaboratively as important components of effective classrooms. Most classroom teachers believe that both children and adults need to take an active role in their own learning. This focus is evident in the typical pattern of supervision and evaluation: This traditional process is not without merit. One-on-one goal discussions with a supervisor help teachers understand what school leaders believe to be important for professional growth. The traditional process also provides performance feedback and underscores that teachers are accountable for the work they do with students. The Call for an Alternative Model So why revisit supervisory practices? Why do we need a different paradigm for teacher evaluation? Here are some reasons to consider. The focus in education has shifted from the centrality of teaching to the importance of student learning. Over the past 10 years, this idea has been embraced not only by educators, but also by parents, communities, and legislators. The now-widespread use of content standards as benchmarks for student learning is a prime indicator. National professional organizations, state departments of education, and many local school districts have identified and publicized what students should know and be able to do at each grade and within grade clusters for many of the content areas. We live in an age of ever-greater accountability. There is near-ubiquitous sentiment that educators need to demonstrate through performance that their efforts are resulting in student learning. Educators are expected to be able to prove that students are learning what they need to know at challenging levels of understanding and as a result of what and how teachers are teaching. Education literature and

professional development initiatives are increasingly focused on data-based decision making. For the classroom teacher, data-based decision making means looking at student work carefully and analytically and using the findings to inform instructional planning. Yet, many teachers have not received the training they need to confidently examine student work from an analytical perspective. During traditional classroom observations, supervisors are the persons collecting data: Outside of any pre- and post-observation conferencing, teachers rarely participate in analyzing and drawing conclusions from these data or, more importantly, from student performance data. Once classroom teachers become familiar with and even expert in effective teaching strategies, they usually maintain their proficiency but are less likely to continue refining their practices and striving for further improvement. Traditional teacher supervision and evaluation may not explicitly link instruction and student learning or provide for differentiated instructional contexts. However, to make a real difference in student learning, supervisors and teachers must follow a more strategic and contextualized process. Traditional methods of teacher evaluation rarely help teachers make a direct link between their professional growth and what the standardized test results and school improvement plan indicate are the real student learning needs. Will it benefit them when they encounter standards-based assessments? Will it help the school achieve its overall improvement goals? Linking the work of many faculty members through the focused goals of the school improvement plan helps create a sense of professional community in which members from diverse curriculum areas can contribute to the growth of all students. An Overview of Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation The process of supervision for learning described in this book offers both teachers and their supervisors the opportunity to work together to improve student learning. It draws on assessment research Darling-Hammond, ; Iwanicki, ; Peterson, ; Stiggins, and extends best practices in teacher supervision and evaluation in the following ways: It focuses more on instructional results than instructional processes. It emphasizes setting meaningful and achievable professional goals, measured in terms of improved student performance. It asks educators to individually and collectively analyze student work, and use these data to address learning needs in areas of essential knowledge and skill throughout the curriculum. It asks teachers to design focused interventions to strengthen and enhance student learning in the target area. It asks teachers to develop a plan for continuing professional growth that is related to the focus for improved student performance and that further establishes them as role models of lifelong learning. It requires teachers to use evidence of student performance to demonstrate that learning has taken place. It asks them to make different decisions and use different procedures; to focus narrowly and deeply on content related to essential learning; and to commit to improving their diagnostic and problem-solving skills along with their instructional skills. They are organized into six phases, or distinct components, of a full cycle of teacher growth. This is the process by which the teacher begins to collect information about student learning needs and to develop an emerging idea for a clear, narrow, and standards-based area of essential learning as an appropriate focus for an improvement objective. The teacher and supervisor analyze student data more deeply and finalize the focus and details of the improvement objective and the professional development plan. The teacher begins to participate in professional development and to implement strategies that support student learning, making necessary adjustments as the process unfolds. At mid-year, or another appropriate midpoint, the teacher and supervisor review progress to date, examining artifacts related to teacher initiatives and, if possible, student work, and modifying the plan as needed. The teacher continues to carry out the professional development plan and deepens learning related to student needs by using more refined assessment methods to inform instructional decisions. At the end of each cycle, the teacher and supervisor review evidence linking teaching strategies to student learning outcomes, and develop written reflections that detail teacher growth and suggest ideas for further development in the next cycle. At first glance, the Criteria of Excellence resemble a traditional cycle of teacher supervision and evaluation: That said, they are distinguished by two important purposes: The Criteria of Excellence establish a clear process for supervision and evaluation, offering a

generally sequential roadmap for the teacher and supervisor to follow throughout their work together. The chapters that follow offer a more detailed portrait of how the Criteria of Excellence work in practice, with special emphasis on the Teacher Preparation, Initial Collaboration, and Summative Review Phases. The Initial Monitoring Phase, Mid-Cycle Review Phase, and Secondary Monitoring Phase, while less fully detailed in this text, contribute to the cycle of professional growth by providing an opportunity for the teacher to acquire and apply new learning, collect and analyze student performance data, and receive formative feedback from the supervisor and perhaps other resource personnel as well. They are a clear guide for the work of the teacher and supervisor, but they are not prescriptive. While working within any phase of the Criteria, the teacher and supervisor may decide that the teacher needs additional professional learning to achieve full competence for any specific indicator. However, it may not be necessary for the teacher to be fully competent with every indicator in sequence before she participates in other activities outlined in the Criteria of Excellence. For example, although a teacher may be working on the preliminary skills of identifying essential areas of learning and analyzing student performance data associated with indicators in the Teacher Preparation Phase , she will still create a plan for professional development associated with indicators in the Initial Collaboration Phase and go on to review new learning and accomplishments with her supervisor at mid-cycle and end-of-cycle conferences associated, respectively, with indicators in the Mid-Cycle and Summative Review Phases. KEYSTONE Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation gives teachers a higher degree of control over the evaluation process as they work on a self-selected improvement objective aimed at bringing their students to higher levels of knowledge and understanding. In doing so, they determine not only what teaching and learning data will be the focus of their professional reflections, but also the agenda for supervisory discussions. As you will see, all three educators work most directly with their primary supervisor, the building principal. Proximity suggests that this administrator will be in a strong position to communicate easily with the teacher, observe her work firsthand, and offer appropriate guidance. In these cases, a district administrator with expertise in the targeted content area may well serve as the primary supervisor. Some districts implement these plans to the letter; others treat them more as loose guidelines. They become an opportunity for the supervisor to collect related data, to observe for specific elements of effective teaching, and to offer focused feedback. The model supports collaboration and collegial discourse about student learning and is directly linked to the school improvement process. PBSE is appropriate for use with teachers and administrators at all stages of their careers; specific growth targets and interventions can be differentiated according to individual learning, group, or team needs. Make no mistake about it: For this process of supervision and evaluation to be successful, both teachers and administrators need to study the process, work through the phases, and support each other in the effort to improve student learning. Nonetheless, the potential rewards are great: Our students deserve nothing less. No part of this publicationâ€"including the drawings, graphs, illustrations, or chapters, except for brief quotations in critical reviews or articlesâ€"may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from ASCD. Requesting Permission For photocopy, electronic and online access, and republication requests, go to the Copyright Clearance Center. Enter the book title within the "Get Permission" search field. To translate this book, contact permissions ascd. Learn more about our permissions policy and submit your request online.

Chapter 2 : Educational evaluation - Wikipedia

Article shared by. Importance of Organizational Climate are given below. The fact that most of the initial instruments measuring OC were named as tests implied that a climate study is an evaluation of a school/college; and more particularly, of teachers and principal in it.

What makes a good evaluation? A well-planned and carefully executed evaluation will reap more benefits for all stakeholders than an evaluation that is thrown together hastily and retrospectively. Though you may feel that you lack the time, resources, and expertise to carry out an evaluation, learning about evaluation early-on and planning carefully will help you navigate the process. MEERA provides suggestions for all phases of an evaluation. But before you start, it will help to review the following characteristics of a good evaluation list adapted from resource formerly available through the University of Sussex, Teaching and Learning Development Unit Evaluation Guidelines and John W. Good evaluation is tailored to your program and builds on existing evaluation knowledge and resources. Your evaluation should be crafted to address the specific goals and objectives of your EE program. However, it is likely that other environmental educators have created and field-tested similar evaluation designs and instruments. Rather than starting from scratch, looking at what others have done can help you conduct a better evaluation. Good evaluation is inclusive. It ensures that diverse viewpoints are taken into account and that results are as complete and unbiased as possible. Input should be sought from all of those involved and affected by the evaluation such as students, parents, teachers, program staff, or community members. One way to ensure your evaluation is inclusive is by following the practice of participatory evaluation. Good evaluation is honest. Evaluation results are likely to suggest that your program has strengths as well as limitations. Your evaluation should not be a simple declaration of program success or failure. Evidence that your EE program is not achieving all of its ambitious objectives can be hard to swallow, but it can also help you learn where to best put your limited resources. Good evaluation is replicable and its methods are as rigorous as circumstances allow. A good evaluation is one that is likely to be replicable, meaning that someone else should be able to conduct the same evaluation and get the same results. The higher the quality of your evaluation design, its data collection methods and its data analysis, the more accurate its conclusions and the more confident others will be in its findings. How do I make evaluation an integral part of my program? Making evaluation an integral part of your program means evaluation is a part of everything you do. You design your program with evaluation in mind, collect data on an on-going basis, and use these data to continuously improve your program. Developing and implementing such an evaluation system has many benefits including helping you to: Couple evaluation with strategic planning. As you set goals, objectives, and a desired vision of the future for your program, identify ways to measure these goals and objectives and how you might collect, analyze, and use this information. This process will help ensure that your objectives are measurable and that you are collecting information that you will use. Strategic planning is also a good time to create a list of questions you would like your evaluation to answer. Revisit and update your evaluation plan and logic model See Step 2 to make sure you are on track. Update these documents on a regular basis, adding new strategies, changing unsuccessful strategies, revising relationships in the model, and adding unforeseen impacts of an activity EMI, Build an evaluation culture by rewarding participation in evaluation, offering evaluation capacity building opportunities, providing funding for evaluation, communicating a convincing and unified purpose for evaluation, and celebrating evaluation successes.

Chapter 3 : Special Education in the Schools

In education there are at least three relevant levels of evaluation: the (central) government (output control), assessment coming from external support and internal evaluation.

Education is the more encompassing concept, referring to the general process by which a social groupâ€"whether an entire society, a family, or a corporationâ€"transmits attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and skills to its members. Within these broad boundaries, we can distinguish three general types of educationâ€"informal, nonformal, and formalâ€"according to the location of instruction, the characteristics of the teachers, the methods of instruction, and what is learned. Informal education takes place in the context of everyday life, and the educators include family members, peers, workmates, and the mass media. Finally, nonformal educationâ€"which takes such forms as on-the-job training, agricultural extension programs, and family-planning outreach programsâ€"is more organized than informal education but has aims that are more specific and short term than those of formal education. Virtually all societies utilize all three forms of education, but they differ in the relative predominance of these forms. In nonindustrialized societies, informal education dominates, with formal and nonformal education only marginally present. However, this is not to say that such agencies of informal education as the mass media do not have very profound effects. The ubiquity of the modern mass media and the fact that they are now held in relatively few hands allow them to widely and deeply shape many of our beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors Bagdikian ; Herman and Chomsky Yet school systems still differ considerably, even among countries comparable in economic development. One key axis of variation is relative size. Nations greatly differ in the proportion of their total population, especially the young, enrolled in school. For example, in the proportion of youth of secondary school age enrolled in school averaged 94 percent across twenty-one advanced industrial societies sixteen European countries, the United States , Canada, Japan, Korea, and Australia. But the average percentage was 55 percent for eighteen less developed Asian countries excluding Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong , and Singapore and 32 percent for fifteen African countries U. National Center for Education Statistics Clearly, differences in wealth and degree of industrialization explain a major part of this variation. But even when we control for these factors, we still find enormous differences among societies in the structure of their school systems. Nations differ greatly in how much control the national government exercises over how schools are financed and operated. There are several countries that lodge governance primarily at the subnational or provincial level, such as the United States, Canada, and Germany. But most advanced societies vest control in a national central educational authority, usually a national Ministry of Education. For example, the Japanese Ministry of Education provides most of the funding for schooling, determines national curriculum requirements the subjects to be taught and the depth in which they are to be covered , selects lists of acceptable text books, sets standards for teacher training and certification, and administers the or so public universities. To be sure, local prefectural boards establish or close schools, hire and supervise teachers, and plan the curriculum. But they do all this within parameters set by the national ministry, which can veto their decisions Kanaya Nations with strongly centralized school governance leave much less room for local control and therefore for local variation in the content and structure of schooling. But the flip side of the coin is that such nations also suffer from much less inequality in school spending across localities andâ€"because of class and racial segregation in housingâ€"across social classes and races. The United States and Germany are nearly polar opposite on virtually all these dimensions. The United States puts off occupational selection until very late. The main branching point comes after high school, when a student decides whether to go to college, which college to enter, and later what field to major in. As a result, U. Because of this, many current educational reformsâ€"such as school-to-work partnerships between schools and employersâ€"are directed toward

enhancing the connection between secondary school curricula and labor market opportunities. Meanwhile, the proportion of students entering and graduating from higher education is huge. In , 65 percent of high school graduates or about 58 percent of all college-age youth, given a dropout rate of about 11 percent entered higher education. According to the High School and Beyond Survey, about one-quarter of college entrants eventually receive a baccalaureate degree or higher and another one-fifth receive a one- or two- year certificate or degree. These figures for college entrance and graduation are about double those for Germany Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development ; U. Because so many U. Germany, meanwhile, has a very different school system. Student selection occurs at age ten, when students are divided between academic high school Gymnasium and two types of vocational secondary schooling Realschule and Hauptschule. At age fifteen students graduate from the vocational high schools into either more advanced vocational schools or apprenticeship programs combining on-the-job and classroom training. Both are strongly connected to specific employment. Meanwhile, graduates of the Gymnasium go on to take the Abitur exam, which determines if they will be allowed into university. All told, only onequarter of German students enter the university and only 15 percent get university degrees Brint ; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development These differences in student careers fundamentally shape educational outcomes. A tightly coupled school career system, in which test results largely determine admission to the best schools and graduation from them in turn strongly shapes job placement, will tend to produce students who work hard at their schooling and their exam performance, as is the case in Japan Brint ; Rohlen But the effects of school structure reach further. School systems that have small, highly selective higher educational sectors with little or no distinctions made among universities, as in the case of Germany, will tend to generate greater class consciousness and solidarity. In contrast, schools systems with large, internally heterogeneous higher education sectors, such as in the United States, foster weaker class consciousness Brint Economically Less Developed Countries. Economically less developed countries LDCs vary greatly as well in the size and structure of their school systems. For example, in Africa, the ratio of secondary school students to the secondary-age population ranges from 7 percent in Mozambique to 77 percent in Egypt U. In addition, LDCs vary greatly in how socially exclusive their higher education systems are; for example, in the proportion of postsecondary students who are female ranged from 24 percent in sub-Saharan Africa to 52 percent in the Caribbean Ramirez and Riddle A major source of this diversity in size and structure is, of course, differences in degree and form of economic development even among less developed societies. But other factors also play an important role in causing this variation. Though most LDCs were at some point colonies or protectorates of one of the European powers or the United States, this colonial inheritance was not homogeneous. For example, the British and French colonial heritages were quite different, rooted in the different educational and political systems of those two countries. Furthermore, the nature of the political elitesâ€"whether enthusiastic modernizers as in Turkey or Iraq or conservatives as in Saudi Arabia â€"has made a difference in how much emphasis they put on expanding the school system Brint Despite these variations, educational systems in economically less developed countries LDCs do exhibit considerable homogeneity in structure. A lack of resources has tended generally to force a lower level of educational provision Brint In addition, many LDCs share a common colonial inheritance; for example, across the former British colonies in Africa and the Caribbean, secondary education remains dominated by the British "O-level" and "A-level" examinations Brint Moreover, modernizing movements of quite various ideological stripes have seen education as a way of creating loyalty to and solidarity with their new ideas Brint ; Meyer, et al. Finally, the World Bank has been playing a homogenizing role by strongly urging particular reforms such as emphasizing primary over tertiary education and deemphasizing vocational education on nations applying for loans Brint The United States is virtually unique among advanced societies in that education is not mentioned in the national constitution and educational governance is not lodged with the national government Ramirez and Boli-Bennett Instead, schooling in the United States is a state and local

responsibility. Consequently, the United States has more than fifty separate sovereign educational authorities. The United States has no national universities except for the military academies and a few other specialized institutions. There is no required national exam for university entrance. The connection between educational credentials and workplace opportunities is comparatively weak in the United States Collins Of course, for some occupations, the connection is quite strong, with a standardized curriculum preparing graduates for licensing examinations. But for most college graduates, the connection between their college major and their work careers is tenuous at best. Significant labor-market advantages go to those who attend and graduate from college, but the school system has relatively weak connections to most occupational sectors. Recent reforms, such as the federal School-to-Work Act, aim to tighten the links between secondary and postsecondary training and the labor market Van Horn But it will take many years of such efforts before the United States even approximates Germany or Japan in the closeness of linkage between school and work. These structural features have created an educational system in the United States that is wide open and characterized by very high enrollments and great student and institutional diversity. We make available a seat in some college somewhere for virtually everyone who wants to attend. Consequently, our secondary education system is less decisive than in most other countries, as "second-chance" opportunities abound. Secondary school students do not have to make hard decisions about their educational futures until quite late, often in college. In order to better understand these unusual features of the American system, let us examine the structure of U. Elementary and Secondary Education. All elementary and secondary Kâ€"12 school districts operate within the confines of the relevant state education law, which specifies requirements for graduation, certification of teachers, and so forth. State governments also provide on average about 47 percent of public school funding, with most of the rest coming from local taxes U. Private schools, too, must conform to state education law, but they are less restricted than are public schools. For example, in most states, the regulations governing teacher certification are less strict if one teaches in a private school than a public school. It is almost entirely up to the private school and its sponsors to generate financial support. No tax-derived funds may be used to support private Kâ€"12 schooling unless special conditions are met for example, private schools may receive public aid if they enroll handicapped students. Interestingly, public aid flows much more easily to private colleges. They can receive student financial aid, grants to build academic facilities, and grants and contracts to conduct research and run academic programs. The operation of public education at the elementary and secondary levels largely rests with the local school district. In â€" there were about 16, separate school districts in the nation, each with its own school board, superintendent, and schools U. Although smaller school districts have often been consolidated into larger ones, many states still have hundreds of separate districts. School district boundaries are usually coterminous with local political boundaries, but elected school boards are rarely identified with a political party. Localities provide about 46 percent of public school funding U. This reliance on local revenues derived from property taxes generates great disparities in per-pupil spending across property-rich and property-poor districts. Though states have increased their share of educational expenses, largely due to legal challenges to relying on local property taxes for funding, spending disparities have decreased only a little. The poorest districts do have more money to spend, but rich districts have increased their tax levels in order to maintain their spending lead Ballantine An important consequence of the U. Citizens elect local school boards and frequently vote on budgets, property tax rates, and bond issues. Moreover, parents exercise considerable informal political power through parentâ€"teacher associations, informal conferences with school teachers and administrators, and decisions about whether to send their children to a particular school or not. See the section below on modes of influence over schools. Despite the absence of strong national control, U. One reason is that the federal government does exercise a homogenizing influence through its policy recommendations and funding for particular programs. In addition, national professional associations of educators and regional nongovernmental accrediting agencies provide common

definitions across states and localities of what constitutes good educational practice.

Chapter 4 : Reconceptualizing Supervision and Evaluation

documents stress the need for evaluation of schools amid calls for greater accountability, organizational efficiency, quality development, quality control, quality assurance, quality monitoring.

In any school system, special education is a means of enlarging the capacity of the system to serve the educational needs of all children. The particular function of special education within the schools and the education departments of other institutions is to identify children with unusual needs and to aid in the effective fulfillment of those needs. Both regular and special school programs play a role in meeting the educational needs of children with exceptionalities. A primary goal of educators should be to help build accommodative learning opportunities for children with exceptionalities in regular educational programs. In the implementation of this goal, special education can serve as a support system, and special educators can assist regular school personnel in managing the education of children with exceptionalities. When the special placement of a child is required, the aim of the placement should be to maximize the development and freedom of the child rather than to accommodate the regular classroom. Special education should function within and as a part of the regular, public school framework. Within this framework, the function of special education should be to participate in the creation and maintenance of a total educational environment suitable for all children. From their base in the regular school system, special educators can foster the development of specialized resources by coordinating their specialized contributions with the contributions of the regular school system. One of the primary goals of special educators should be the enhancement of regular school programs as a resource for all children. Special education must provide an administrative organization to facilitate achievement for children with exceptionalities of the same educational goals as those pursued by other children. This purpose can be achieved through structures that are sufficiently compatible with those employed by regular education to ensure easy, unbroken passage of children across regular-special education administrative lines for whatever periods of time may be necessary, as well as by structures that are sufficiently flexible to adjust quickly to changing task demands and child growth needs. The major purpose of the special education administrative organization is to provide and maintain those environmental conditions in schools that are most conducive to the growth and learning of children with special needs. Under suitable conditions, education within the regular school environment can provide the optimal opportunity for most children with exceptionalities. Consequently, the system for the delivery of special education must enable the incorporation of special help and opportunities in regular educational settings. Children should spend only as much time outside regular class settings as is necessary to control learning variables that are critical to the achievement of specified learning goals. Special education is a cross-disciplinary, problem-oriented field of services which is directed toward mobilizing and improving a variety of resources to meet the educational needs of children and youth with exceptionalities. Indeed, special education developed as a highly specialized area of education in order to provide children with exceptionalities with the same opportunities as other children for a meaningful, purposeful, and fulfilling life. Perhaps the most important concept that has been developed in special education as the result of experiences with children with exceptionalities is that of the fundamental individualism of every child. The aspiration of special educators is to see every child as a unique composite of potentials, abilities, and learning needs for whom an educational program must be designed to meet his or her particular needs. From its beginnings, special education had championed the cause of children with learning problems. It is as the advocates of such children and of the concept of individualization that special education can come to play a major creative role in the mainstream of education. The special competencies of special educators are more than a collection of techniques and skills. They comprise a body of knowledge, methods, and philosophical tenets that are the hallmark of the profession. As professionals,

special educators are dedicated to the optimal education of children with exceptionalities and they reject the misconception of schooling that is nothing but custodial care. The focus of all education should be the unique learning needs of the individual child as a total functioning organism. All educators should recognize and accept that special and regular education share the same fundamental goals. Special education expands the capacity of schools to respond to the educational needs of all students. As advocates of the right of all children to an appropriate education, special educators affirm their professionalism. Children with special educational needs should be served in regular classes and neighborhood schools insofar as these arrangements are conducive to good educational progress. It is sometimes necessary, however, to provide special supplementary services for children with exceptionalities or to remove them from parts or all of the regular educational program. It may even be necessary to remove some children from their homes and communities in order for them to receive education and related services in residential schools, hospitals, or training centers. The Council believes that careful study and compelling reasons are necessary to justify such removal. The Council charges each public agency to ensure that a continuum of alternative placements, ranging from regular class programs to residential settings, is available to meet the needs of children with exceptionalities. Children with exceptionalities enrolled in special school programs should be given every appropriate opportunity to participate in educational, nonacademic, and extracurricular programs and services with children who are not disabled or whose disabilities are less severe. While special schools for children with exceptionalities and other separate educational facilities may function as part of an effective special educational delivery system, it is indefensible to confine groups of exceptional pupils inappropriately in such settings as a result of the failure to develop a full continuum of less restrictive programs. The Council condemns as educationally and morally indefensible the practice of categorical isolation by exceptionality without full consideration of the unique needs of each student, and the rejection of children who are difficult to teach from regular school situations. When insufficient program options exist and when decisions are poorly made, children with exceptionalities are denied their fundamental rights to free public education. In so acting, education authorities violate the basic tenets of our democratic societies. Like all children, children with exceptionalities need environmental stability, emotional nurturance, and social acceptance. Decisions about the delivery of special education to children with exceptionalities should be made after careful consideration of their home, school, and community relationships, their personal preferences, and effects on self-concept, in addition to other sound educational considerations. To achieve such outcomes, there must exist for all children, youth, and young adults a rich variety of early intervention, educational, and vocational program options and experiences. Access to these programs and experiences should be based on individual educational need and desired outcomes. Furthermore, students and their families or guardians, as members of the planning team, may recommend the placement, curriculum option, and the exit document to be pursued. CEC believes that a continuum of services must be available for all children, youth, and young adults. CEC also believes that the concept of inclusion is a meaningful goal to be pursued in our schools and communities. In addition, CEC believes children, youth, and young adults with disabilities should be served whenever possible in general education classrooms in inclusive neighborhood schools and community settings. Such settings should be strengthened and supported by an infusion of specially trained personnel and other appropriate supportive practices according to the individual needs of the child. Policy Implications Schools In inclusive schools, the building administrator and staff with assistance from the special education administration should be primarily responsible for the education of children, youth, and young adults with disabilities. The administrator s and other school personnel must have available to them appropriate support and technical assistance to enable them to fulfill their responsibilities. In return for greater autonomy, the school administrator and staff should establish high standards for each child, youth, and young adult, and should be held accountable for his or her progress toward outcomes. Communities Inclusive schools must be located in inclusive communities;

therefore, CEC invites all educators, other professionals, and family members to work together to create early intervention, educational, and vocational programs and experiences that are collegial, inclusive, and responsive to the diversity of children, youth, and young adults. Further, the policy makers should fund programs in nutrition, early intervention, health care, parent education, and other social support programs that prepare all children, youth, and young adults to do well in school. There can be no meaningful school reform, nor inclusive schools, without funding of these key prerequisites. As important, there must be interagency agreements and collaboration with local governments and business to help prepare students to assume a constructive role in an inclusive community. Moreover, special educators should be trained with an emphasis on their roles in inclusive schools and community settings. They also must learn the importance of establishing ambitious goals for their students and of using appropriate means of monitoring the progress of children, youth, and young adults. Teacher training institutions are challenged to instruct all teacher candidates about current trends in the education of exceptional children. State and provincial departments of education are charged with the responsibility to promote inservice activities that will update all professional educators and provide ongoing, meaningful staff development programs. Administrators can have a significant positive influence upon the professional lives of teaching staff and, therefore, upon the educational lives of children. Administrative personnel of school districts are, therefore, charged with the responsibility to promote inservice education and interprofessional exchanges which openly confront contemporary issues in the education of all children. The Council believes that the central element for the delivery of all the services required by a person with an exceptionality must be an individually designed program. Such a program must contain the objectives to be attained, resources to be allocated, evaluation procedures and time schedule to be employed, and a termination date for ending the program and procedure for developing a new one. The process for developing an individualized program must adhere to all the procedural safeguards of due process of law and must involve the individual person and his or her family, surrogate, advocate, or legal representative. Most significant is our position that all individuals are entitled to adequate representation when such decisions are being made. We support the increasing efforts on the part of governments to officially require the assignment of a surrogate when a family member is not available for purposes of adequately representing the interests of the person with an exceptionality. It is also our position that the individual consumer must be given every opportunity to make his or her own decisions, that this is a right provided to all citizens, and that any abridgement of that individual right can only occur upon the proper exercise of law. For this reason, all programs should contain plans to evaluate their effectiveness, and the results of such evaluations should be presented for public review. The Council believes that all legislation to fund existing programs or create new programs should contain mechanisms for effective evaluation and that governmental advisory bodies should review the findings of evaluations on a regular basis. External as well as internal systems of evaluation should be developed to aid in the evaluation of programs for children and youth with exceptionalities. As the result of early attitudes and programs that stressed assistance for children with severe disabilities, the field developed a vocabulary and practices based on the labeling and categorizing of children. In recent decades, labeling and categorizing were extended to children with milder degrees of exceptionality. Unfortunately, the continued use of labels tends to rigidify the thinking of all educators concerning the significance and purpose of special education and thus to be dysfunctional and even harmful for children. These problems are magnified when the field organizes and regulates its programs on the basis of classification systems that define categories of children according to such terms. Many of these classifications are oriented to etiology, prognosis, or necessary medical treatment rather than to educational classifications. They are thus of little value to the schools. Simple psychometric thresholds, which have sometimes been allowed to become pivotal considerations in educational decision making, present another set of labeling problems. Indeed, special educators at their most creative are the advocates of children who are not well

served by schools except through special arrangements. To further the understanding of and programming for such children, special educators as well as other educational personnel should eliminate the use of simplistic categorizing. No one can deny the importance of some of the variables of traditional significance in special education such as intelligence, hearing, and vision. However, these variables in all their complex forms and degrees must be assessed in terms of educational relevance for a particular child. Turning them into typologies that may contribute to excesses in labeling and categorizing children is indefensible and should be eliminated. In the past, many legislative and regulatory systems have specified criteria for including children in an approved category as the starting point for specialized programming and funding. This practice places high incentives on the labeling of children and undoubtedly results in the erroneous placement of many children. It is desirable that financial aids be tied to educational programs rather than to children and that systems for allocating children to specialized programs be much more open than in the past. Special educators should enhance the accommodative capacity of schools and other educational agencies to serve children with special needs more effectively. In identifying such children, special educators should be concerned with the identification of their educational needs, not with generalized labeling or categorizing of children. To further discourage the labeling and categorizing of children, programs should be created on the basis of educational functions served rather than on the basis of categories of children served. Regulatory systems that enforce the rigid categorization of pupils as a way of allocating them to specialized programs are indefensible. Financial aid for special education should be tied to specialized programs rather than to finding and placing children in those categories and programs. Psychological tests of many kinds saturate our society and their use can result in the irreversible deprivation of opportunity to many children, especially those already burdened by poverty and prejudice. Most group intelligence tests are multileveled and standardized on grade samples, thus necessitating the use of interpolated and extrapolated norms and scores. Most group intelligence tests, standardized on LEAs rather than individual students, are not standardized on representative populations. In spite of the use of nonrepresentative group standardization procedures, the norms are expressed in individual scores. Most group intelligence tests, standardized on districts which volunteer, may have a bias in the standardization. Many of the more severely handicapped and those expelled or suspended have no opportunity to influence the norms. Group intelligence tests are heavily weighted with language and will often yield spurious estimates of the intelligence of non-English speaking or language different children. A group intelligence test score, although spurious, may still be a good predictor of school performance for some children. School achievement predicts future school performance as well as group intelligence tests, thus leaving little justification for relying on group intelligence tests.

Chapter 5 : Evaluation: What is it and why do it? | Meera

An open organizational system will encourage an attitude of inquiry Bureaucratic Organization and Educational Change RALPH B. KIMBROUGH.