
EXAMINING DOMAIN, STANDARDS-BASED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION METHODS AND USING CTPBEF FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF KUWAIT: A QUALITATIVE GROUNDED THEORY STUDY

Zaid Al-Shammari, Ph.D.* Thomas D. Yawkey, Ph.D.**

* Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction-Special Education
Coordinator of Education - Gulf University for Science and Technology

** Professor Emeritus of Curriculum and Instruction
The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT. This qualitative grounded theory research study examined domain, and standards-based performance evaluation methods for using CTPBEF for public education schools in Kuwait. Researchers used several sections of research methodology as selected some points as the significance of the study; definitions such as: (1) evaluation form, (2) framework, and (3) grounded theory were defined as used in this research. In addition, selected procedures were detailed for developing this research instrument for teacher classroom assessment including: (1) evaluation form development, (2) data collection with participants, and (3) verification methods. Finally, the results of the study and selected discussion indicated significant findings highly appropriate for evaluating the teacher's performance in Kuwaiti Public Schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

The world is in change fanned by information technologies, globalization and increasing national economies of nations. Along with these fast paced changes are transformations in assessment and evaluation of performance and achievement in classroom and workplace settings.

Within university and school classroom settings, evaluation methods and criteria have changed from grade 1 through grade 12 public schools and university classrooms. These changing parts of evaluation can be seen in several ways (Al-Shammari & Yawkey, 2007, in press; Gonzalez, Brusca-Vega & Yawkey, 1997; Stiggins & Bradford, 1985).

First, evaluation as competency based of the past two or more decades has given way to the current perspective of evaluation as standards-based. The increasing demands felt by governments, their agencies and schools across the world are attempting to meet these emergent economic demands and heavy competition in technologies and industries. Yet, student learning and achievement has not kept pace with these increasing demands (Wilkerson & Lang, 2004). Perceived failures of policies and practices in federal and state/province levels and in university programs for preparing students to achieve and compete have not kept pace with these changes and transformations. Thus, in changing from competency-based evaluation where assessment was aimed at underlying knowledge of facts and events to domain or standard-based evaluation where criteria of acceptable performance are pre-set has arrived. The push for high standards in classroom places and work places are becoming more and more useful in attempting to meet these emerging demands.

Second, this change to domains and standards-based evaluation is impacting all areas of performance including university classrooms and teachers' behaviors as measured outcomes and their impacts on students learning (Nolan, Rowand & Farris, 1994). The intent of this qualitative study is on developing and testing out domains and standard-based criteria for evaluating teacher's performances in university classroom settings. Research studies (e.g., Kyriadikes, Demetriou, & Charalambous, 2006; Teachers' Section, Personnel Department, Zheijiang University, 2005) show conclusively the needs for: (1) reliable and valid assessment form for evaluating teaching personnel, and (2) selection of criteria to develop assessment form based on realistic teacher education research that captures the numerous roles that teachers do in fact play in their classrooms.

Third, teachers (see Kyriadikes, et al.) have the capacities, abilities and interests to determine multiple roles for teacher evaluation within their classrooms and the abilities to distinguish classroom situations of using discrete point testing (e.g., items that are scored correct or incorrect for further details, see Gonzales, Bruska-Vega & Yawkey, 1997).

Fourth, teaching behaviors must be examined within individual classroom settings to give impacts of particular teaching behaviors within specific classroom settings. In this sense, teachers' evaluations become as important as the teacher's education (Roth & Tobin, 2001). The Kyriadikes, et al. study conducted in Greek Cyprus clearly demonstrates this particular point. Critical factors for Research Significance follow.

2. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY: SOME SELECTED POINTS

The research results of Kyriadikes, et al. show that teachers were able to assess the areas they felt important in their evaluation of their own performance as well as their students' performance learning and mastery of content. This is a critical step as well in developing teacher support for the Ministry's direction with teacher (and student). In addition, this professional endeavor gets teachers and (indirectly students) involved and supportive of evaluative efforts. Therefore, it is necessary to embed in classroom teacher performance evaluation forms critical teaching domains, areas and criteria that are required by and needed in the Kuwaiti Public Schools and to ensure teaching competence, and determine teaching promotions. This evaluation form will help improve the teachers' and students' performances in the Kuwaiti Public Schools, and motivate by engaging all teachers in these efforts to do their best in teaching and learning instruction.

In the research results authored by the Teachers' Section, Personnel Department, Zheijiang University (2005), show that the improving teacher education and classroom performance capacities are part of the Ministry's "engineering" of educational improvements and a major part of evaluation of teacher performances. These results show that upgrading in teacher education classroom performance must adhere to the values of particular cultures. In other words, using instruments for assessing teacher performance based on French culture may be very inappropriate for other cultures. Second, multiple levels of teacher classroom behaviors need to be included in the assessment instrument, such as actual classroom teaching, methods used in guiding students, and related non-classroom contextual variables such as mental alertness of teachers, teaching knowledge of subject matter, and mastery of current and updated teacher content understandings.

Taking the above research results into account, the resulting evaluative framework is entitled, "Classroom Teacher's Performance- Based Evaluation Form (CTPBEF)." In other words, this grounded qualitative research study developed and tested out this evaluative instrumental framework for the CTPBEF.

The CTPBEF can be used to assess the classroom teacher's performance and focuses on evaluating the teaching processes while the teacher is teaching. This research study includes several domains emphasizing sound process teaching with criteria used to evaluate the classroom teacher's performance while teaching students in the classroom. The CTPBEF helps evaluators assess and then evaluate teachers' performances in the classrooms by using these main domains as observable benchmarks used as criteria for these teaching processes that are best used with specific types or kinds of curricula. The researcher mentioned to such evaluation that is a "specialist evaluation is normally used to evaluate specific skills" (Teachers' Section, Personnel Dept., 2005, p. 58). Kyriakides et al., (2006) mentioned to the arguing of failures in teacher evaluation systems used in Cyprus. Also, Kyriakides et al., (2006) indicated that future research studies regarding the teacher evaluation could be used in the qualitative research approach, and these researchers also mentioned to criteria as really significant for the teacher evaluation. Creswell indicated that the "qualitative researchers rely on a few cases and many variables" (Creswell, 1998, p.16).

Lastly, critical significance of the CTPBEF is based on the needs of the Kuwaiti Public Schools. This evaluative framework can be used as a functional evaluation form that has been developed with data, tested out and revised to mesh with Kuwaiti Ministry of Education guidelines. Thus, the CTPBEF has a propensity for being used as the evaluation form for evaluating the teacher's performance in Kuwaiti public school classrooms.

In sum, there were several focuses of needs to generating such an evaluation form for assessing professional classroom teachers. Research shows significance of these assessment instruments for improving teacher's and student's performance. In addition, a comprehensive instrument is best for showing multifaceted aspects of teaching. A multifaceted form of this type is also of interest to teachers especially if they see themselves involved in some of these processes such as helping to develop and/or pilot such instruments. In addition, evaluation forms including criteria have to be utilized in development such instruments (Kyriadies, et al. 2006, Teachers' Section, Personnel Department, Zheijiang University, 2005). Finally, for Kuwait this type of assessment is very critical in as much as there is no accepted evaluation form used in evaluating teachers in public schools and in the higher education institutions.

3. DEFINITIONS USED IN THE STUDY

This research study includes three important specific terms that are used in this study: (1) evaluation form, (2) framework, and (3) grounded theory. Each of these three terms is defined below.

Evaluation Form

The evaluation form is a tool used by the head teachers and supervisors who are charged to evaluate teachers by the Ministry of Education. This evaluation form as an outcome of this study is used in the Kuwaiti Public Schools for educational promotion and/or assessing teaching performances in the classroom.

Framework

A "framework" is the final tested evaluation form that was developed through this research study using grounded theory format in the qualitative research method.

The framework or final tested evaluation form is entitled, "*Classroom Teacher's Performance Based Evaluation Form (CTPBEF)*".

Grounded Theory as a Qualitative Method of Research

A grounded theory research study intends to generate or discover critical elements of a phenomena toward a theory (Creswell, 1998, p.56). Thus, the CTPBEF as a framework is further used to generate potential studies toward theoretical structure that can be tested out in the development and improvement of teacher education at the pre-service and possible in-service levels in Kuwait. In Creswell's test, this notion or idea is referred to as generating a theoretical set of principles that can be explored as processes for theory development of teacher education.

4. SELECTED PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING A RESEARCH INSTRUMENT FOR TEACHER CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT

There were a number of steps used in setting up this research study. This section describes the process of validating a list of criteria that might be included in teacher performance and matched with required criteria in the Kuwaiti Schools and curricula (Roth & Tobin, 2001). First, the researchers gathered existing materials that identified the Ministry of Education's criteria for curricula and teacher performance used currently in use in the Kuwaiti Schools. Second, the researchers reviewed the most current evaluation forms related to the evaluation of teacher's performance in the classroom settings. The sources of these evaluation forms included those form institutions of higher education such as The Pennsylvania State University, University Park; The University of Texas, Victoria; and The Gulf University of Science and Technology. In addition, materials from professional organizations and institutions criteria were used as part of this foundation of content. In addition, Henninger's (2004) idea was used that views the teaching process involving many people with interests in education. Here, views of Kuwaiti teachers, administrators, students and other professionals were listed and examined. The researchers wanted to insure that assessment of teacher performance was evaluated in many ways including perspectives from varied groups such as researchers, teachers, school administrators, Council for Exceptional Children in the United States and of course those of the Kuwait Ministry of Education. Third, these materials were studied and those teaching curricula, domains, and professional teaching behaviors and responsibilities deemed compatible with and/or extensions of existing Ministry of Education's criteria for teacher performance and criteria were identified. These items became the bases for the framework and instrument, "Classroom Teacher's Performance Based Evaluation Form (CTPBEF)". Essentially, these three steps provided the framework for the CTBPBEF as the evaluation form.

The next section describes: (1) Evaluation Form Development, (2) Data Collection with Participants, and (3) Verification Methods. Each section is explained as follows.

Evaluation Form Development

The CTPBEF development is important as a first step in the process to make an evaluation form (i.e., a framework) for evaluating the teacher's performance in classroom. There were four processes used when designing and selecting domains and their criteria. These four processes are described in the following paragraphs.

First, designing the evaluation scales in the evaluation form (CTPBEF) was based on the needs and criteria that are used in the public schools in State of Kuwait. The researchers listed clear percentage guidelines, and evaluation scales in the evaluation contains the percentage and points. These scales are described below in Table (1).

Table (1): The CTPBEF Scales, Percentages and Points

Scales		Percentages			Points
		Between			
Scale 1	Excellent	90	To	100	5
Scale 2	Very Good	80		90	4
Scale 3	Good	70		80	3
Scale 4	Acceptable	60		70	2
Scale 5	Weak	Below 60			1

*Permission granted for use of Table 1: by Dr. Phillip Feldman, Editor-in-Chief, Education and Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari and Dr. Thomas D. Yawkey (co-authors), Classroom Teacher's Performance-Based Education Form (CTPBEF) for public education in the State of Kuwait: A Framework. Published in **Education (2007, in press)**, 124(4).*

Second, five domains were identified as core part of the instrument. The procedures for developing these five domains are described above in the section entitled, "Selected Procedures for Developing a Research Instrument for Teacher Classroom Assessment." These five domains and their titles, respectively appear below in Table (2). The scoring criteria are also listed in Table (2).

Table (2): The CTPBEF Domains and Number of Criteria

Domains	Titles	Including
First Domain	Planning and Preparing Lessons	4 Criteria
Second Domain	Teaching Methods	4 Criteria
Third Domain	Educational Materials	4 Criteria
Fourth Domain	Classroom Management	4 Criteria
Fifth Domain	Cooperation	4 Criteria

*Permission granted for use of Table 2: by Dr. Phillip Feldman, Editor-in-Chief, Education and Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari and Dr. Thomas D. Yawkey (co-authors), Classroom Teacher's Performance-Based Education Form (CTPBEF) for public education in the State of Kuwait: A Framework. Published in **Education (2007, in press)**, 124(4).*

Third, the researchers selected appropriate criteria from different evaluation forms and other criteria that are used in other universities and institutions (as described previously see "Selected Procedures for Developing a Research Instrument for Teacher Classroom Assessment"). Three examples of these criteria include: (1) showing knowledge and maintaining proper grip on the subject, (2) using most attractive methods to encourage all students participate in the classroom, and (3) explaining main rules that are to be implemented in the classroom.

Fourth, two faculty members in the English Department, Gulf University for Science and Technology (GUST) translated CTPBEF from Arabic to English. The first faculty translated the material from Arabic to English. Then, the second faculty member translated English back to Arabic Language version. There were no disagreements in translations from Arabic to English and from English to Arabic. These two steps are "back translations" and were used to make sure that the evaluation form is valid and appropriate to be used in both languages (for other translations methods, see Al-Shammari, 2005).

Data Collection with Participants

A non-random sample of 25 participants were identified and represented educational professions which included: in-service teachers, supervisors, vice principals and faculty. Participants who were interviewed in this research study all appeared to share an interest in performance evaluation in their classrooms and schools. Their motivation appeared to center on the practicality of using this evaluation form and applying it to the evaluation process. However, all participants remained anonymous. Also, the participants in this sample were selected by the researchers of this study based interview whether or not each participant had significant input for this study based on content discussion of evaluation methods in classroom settings. As a result of selecting this sample, the researchers selected 25 participants for this study. The numbers of each type of participant is described below in Table (3).

Table (3): The Numbers & Types of Participants

Types of Participants	Numbers of Participants
In-Service Teachers	18
Head teachers	4
Vice Principals	2
Faculty	1

Permission granted for use of Table 3: by Dr. Phillip Feldman, Editor-in-Chief, Education and Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari and Dr. Thomas D. Yawkey (co-authors), Classroom Teacher's Performance-Based Education Form (CTPBEF) for public education in the State of Kuwait: A Framework. Published in Education (2007, in press). 124(4).

Verification Methods

The researchers depended in this study on the verification methods that help ensure these selected domains and its criteria meet the criteria in the KMOE curricula and schools. For example, when the researchers analyzed the collected data, the researchers tried to support or refute the data by examining these domains and criteria, and relating them to the data found in this research study.

Lincoln and Guba (1985); and Creswell (1998) mentioned that the verification is to be used in demonstrating validity, which helps the researchers in investigating the truth and validity of information discussed.

Also, Al-Shammari (2005) mentioned in his study that the validity in the research study is referred to what this instrument is supposed to measure. Also, other researchers referred to validity as, “the appropriateness, correctness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect” (Fraenkel, & Wallen, 2003, p.158). Verification methods in this qualitative research study were significantly important to make needed changes and corrections while considering the participants’ comments. These changes were made in three different methods as follows:

As the first verification method, the 25 participants (as described in Table (3)) received an individual copy of the evaluation form and then made changes on it as individually distributed to each one to review and to make comments on a designed evaluation form.

Second, the researchers reviewed the changes and corrections that were made on this evaluation form based on the comments of the 25-participants. The researchers started with the participant who is a faculty member (for verification), and then moved to the comments of the other participants. The faculty member (for verification) is an Associate Professor in the Curriculum and Instructional Department, College of Education whose focus is in the area of Public Authority for Applied Education and Training (PAAET). This participant made changes and corrections in the order of criteria in two domains such as the third and fourth domains. For example, the faculty recommended placing criterion 3 to be criterion 1, criterion 1 to be criterion 2. Also, seven of eighteenth in-service teacher participants suggested adding new sentences as new criteria. However, the researchers found these suggested sentences as a subcriteria that is already mentioned in the main listed criteria. Other in-service teacher participants made several changes and corrections in the criteria within each domain. The researchers of this study applied and generalized what the participants suggested as changes and corrections to be made in this evaluation form. Also, these changes and corrections were made in the most of domains and criteria as described in Table (4) below.

Table 4: Numbers of Changes and Corrections of Criteria

No.	Domains	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
1.	First Domain		1	6	2
2.	Second Domain	4	3	3	
3.	Third Domain	3	2		2
4.	Fourth Domain	3	2	1	3
5.	Fifth Domain	2		4	2

Permission granted for use of Table 4: by Dr. Phillip Feldman, Editor-in-Chief, Education and Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari and Dr. Thomas D. Yawkey (co-authors), Classroom Teacher's Performance-Based Education Form (CTPBEF) for public education in the State of Kuwait: A Framework. Published in Education (2007, in press), 124(4).

5. SELECTED DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This qualitative research study provided significant findings that are highly appropriate for evaluating the teacher's performance in Kuwaiti Public Schools. The discussion follows:

The researchers of this research study found that the majority of the participants agreed on these domains or standards and criteria to be used in this evaluation form. These were part of the purposes of evaluating teacher's performance teaching in the classroom. Specifically, the participants had no comments on the first domain (lesson preparing and planning). They, all agreed on the criteria being used in this domain and made only a few changes in other domains, as described in Table (4). Their major agreement for revision was to reverse the domains by placing in first listing, "teaching methods" and in second placement, "planning and preparing lessons." With that switch or change, the participant and researchers felt that this change would show greater consistency between the KMOE, Kuwait Schools and university teacher training and emphases. In a sense, "teaching methods" became first in the domains which are weighted equal among these four domains.

Similar results from other research studies (e.g. Kyriadikes, et.al; Teachers' Section, Personnel Department, Zheijiang University), support this study's finding that in-service teachers demonstrated their sound understandings by recommending additions of new criteria and changes to be made in this evaluation form.

It is interesting to note that the results of the study by Nolan, Rowand and Farris (1994) showed that a great majority of teachers thought they should know how their teaching behaviors were going to be evaluated. These teachers felt that these understandings should be part of the total evaluation process. In addition, the descriptive research of O'Hanlon and Morrison (1980) and Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985) lend to this finding. And, administrators and teachers working together and become involved in the evaluation process including evaluation goals and processes were critical part of and to effective evaluation.

Stiggins and Bridgeford regard these understandings as part of the "spirit of evaluation." These procedures of knowing: (1) the classroom behaviors are evaluated and that, (2) their suggestions are used in their evaluations demonstrate to them that teacher evaluation is job-related and authentic and are a "...representation of what teachers do in the world of work (Wilkerson & Lang, 2004,p. 8). Used in this way, the "content validity" of this evaluation is markedly increased (see Wilkerson & Lang).

In addition, the results of the present study showed that teachers were supportive of both summative and formative evaluation. They appeared to understand the significance of both these types of evaluation in order to help them teach better and assist their students in learning better. The results of this study support those results of a study done by Teachers' Section, Personnel Department where Chinese teachers stated that evaluation must be present both long and short term to enhance the quality of education.

Finally, in the teachers written comments about this process, several interesting observations were made. These relevant observations become recommendations for potential study and should be included into these standards based procedures (McLoughlin & Lewis, 2008).

1. Fifty percent (50%) of the comments of the participants focused on distinctions between contemporary teaching methods and perceived "old" curriculum. Apparently, these participants were feeling that contemporary teaching procedures did not mesh well with traditional curriculum. Demonstrating a variety of teaching methods used to teach traditional curriculum might be helpful. And, the variety of methods used could rest with their students' and/or families' needs covering both internal and external forces on the classroom (Chen & Yawkey, 2007). Some of the participants' comments were connected to "old curriculum" and "old materials" used in the classrooms. Showing the participants how to design classroom materials to fit the curricula becomes critical within the standards-based criteria (Layton & Lock, 2008).

2. Forty percent (40%) of the participants' comments were grouped around the need to understand and use different teaching methods and be able to see and practice them in advance. Some participants were interested in different methods and styles of managing the classroom and student's behaviors. These concerns are regards as internal factors to classrooms and observations of differing ways of managing the classrooms are vital to understanding evaluative processes in standards-based evaluation.

Overall these results from initiation through verification to final results demonstrated the development, refinement of the CTPBEF and the actual support for this activity. In addition, and through interviewing processes welcomed the opportunities to participate in this educational endeavor for their own teaching and their students learning.

6. REFERENCES

Note 1:

Readers wishing copies of the following instruments used in this research, please write directly to the lead author, Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari, Curriculum and Instruction-Special Education, Coordinator of Education at Gulf University for Science and Technology, P.O. Box 7207, Hawally 32093, Kuwait. These instruments include: (1) CTPBEF-English Language Version, (2) Instrument Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria, and (3) Five Evaluation Domains for the CTPBEF,

Note 2:

Permission granted for use of content on **pages 4 to 13** by Dr. Phillip Feldman, Editor-in-Chief, *Education* and Dr. Zaid Al-Shammari and Dr. Thomas D. Yawkey (co-authors), Classroom teacher's performance-based education form (CTPBEF) for public education in the State of Kuwait: A Framework" published in *Education*,124(4).

- [1] Al-Shammari, Z., "Special education teachers' attitudes toward autistic students in the Autism School in the State of Kuwait: A case study." *The Journal of Instructional Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 170-178, 2005.
- [2] Al-Shammari, Z. and Yawkey, T. D., "Classroom teacher's performance-based evaluation form (CTPBEF) for public education schools in the State of Kuwait: A framework." *Education*. Vol. 128, No. 4, 2007, in press.
- [3] Chen, C.S. & Yawkey, T. D., "Socio-cultural factors in the family and school systems mediating minority children's development and academic achievement." 49-83, 2007. In Gonzalez, (V.(Ed.). *Minority and mainstream children's development and academic achievement*. New York: University Press of America.
- [4] Creswell, J. W., *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1998.
- [5] Drummond, G., "Programme feedback: It only takes a minute. *International Journal of Educational Management*." 21(7), 29-36, 2007.
- [6] Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E., *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (5th Edition), McGraw-Hill, NY, 2003.
- [7] Gonzalez, V. Brusca-Vega,R. & Yawkey,T.D., *Assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students with or at-risk of learning problems: From research to practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1997.
- [8] Gonzalez, V., Yawkey, T. D., & Minaya-Rowe, L., *English as Second Language teaching and learning: Pre-K-12 classroom perspectives for students' academic achievement and development*. New York, Pearson Education, 2006,
- [9] Henniger, M. L., *The teaching experience: An introduction to reflective practice*. New York: Pearson Merrill Prentice-Hall, 2004.
- [10] Layton, C.A. & Lock,R. H., *Assessing students with special needs to produce quality outcomes*. New York: Pearson Merrill Prentice-Hall, 2008.
- [11] Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985.
- [12] Manning, M. L. & Baruth, L. G., *Students at risk*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1995.
- [13] Penn State's Performance-Based Assessment of Student Teaching (PBAST). Penn State's Department of Curriculum and Instruction's Office of Clinical Experiences: University Park, PA, 120 pages.

- [14] Roth, W. M. & Tobin, K., "The implications of co-teaching/co-generative dialogue for teacher evaluation: Learning from multiple perspective of everyday practice." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(1), 7-99, 2001.
- [15] Kuwait Ministry Of Education's Teacher's Performance Evaluation Form.75/30/EA0068349/05/55000.
- [16] Kyriakides, L., Demetriou, D., & Charalambous, C., "Generating criteria for evaluating teachers through teacher effectiveness research." *Educational Research*, 48(1), 1-20, 2006.
- [17] McLoughlin, J.A. & Lewis, R. B., *Assessing students with special needs*, (7th Ed.), New York: Pearson Merrill Prentice-Hall, 2008.
- [18] Nolan, M. J., Rowand, C. & Farris, E., *Public elementary teachers' views on teacher performance evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1-75 (ISBN#:-0-16-043139-5), 1994.
- [19] O'Hanlon, J. & Mortensen, L., "Making teacher evaluation work." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(6), 664-672, 1980.
- [20] Stiggins, R. J. & Bridgeford, N.J., "Performance assessment for teacher Development." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(1), 85-97, 1985.
- [21] Teachers' Section, Personnel Department., "A preliminary look at systems of evaluating teachers in institutions of higher education and at evaluation methods." *Chinese Education and Society*, 38(5), 48-60, 2005.
- [22] The Council of Exceptional Children (CEC)'s Standards. Retrieved from: Council of Exceptional Children, Reston, Virginia <http://www.cec.sped.org>.
- [23] University of Houston-Victoria's Student Teacher Handbook (No Date/ND). University of Houston-Victoria's Field Experiences Office, Victoria, Texas.
- [24] Wilkerson, J. R. & Lang, S. C., "A standards-driven, task-based assessment approach for teacher credentialing with potential for college credentialing with potential for college accreditation." *Practical Assessment and Research*, 9(12), 1-33, 2004. <http://pareonline.net/getvn.as?v=9&n=12>.