1-1-2018

A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics

Courtney E. Hutchinson
University of Denver

A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics

Abstract

This research study compares rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) 10 Domains of Practice. Using a content analysis of state evaluation rubrics, the researcher determined the extent to which various state evaluation rubrics align with the NASP domains and selected terminology from the NASP domains. Results indicate a need for a comprehensive and NASP-endorsed rubric, to be used by certified and experienced school psychologists for evaluation purposes. This research study will inform efforts at school psychology training programs, local and state education agencies, the United States Department of Education, and the NASP.

Document Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Ph.D.

Department

Child, Family and School Psychology

First Advisor

Devadrita Talapatra, Ph.D.

Second Advisor

Tara Raines

Third Advisor

Bruce uhrmacher

Keywords

Evaluation, Evaluation rubric, NASP, NASP domains of practice, School psychology, National Association of School Psychologists

Subject Categories

Child Psychology | Psychology | School Psychology

A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Morgridge College of Education

University of Denver

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Courtney E. Hutchinson

June 2018

Advisor: Dr. Devadrita Talapatra

Author: Courtney E. Hutchinson
Title: A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics
Advisor: Dr. Devadrita Talapatra
Degree Date: June 2018

ABSTRACT

This research study compares rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) 10 Domains of Practice. Using a content analysis of state evaluation rubrics, the researcher determined the extent to which various state evaluation rubrics align with the NASP domains and selected terminology from the NASP domains. Results indicate a need for a comprehensive and NASP-endorsed rubric, to be used by certified and experienced school psychologists for evaluation purposes. This research study will inform efforts at school psychology training programs, local and state education agencies, the United States Department of Education, and the NASP.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my kind, smart, and funny advisor, Dr. Tanya Talapatra; my amazing department chair, Dr. Cynthia Hazel; the patient and enthusiastic members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Tara Raines, Dr. Krystyna Matusiak, and Dr. Bruce Uhrmacher; Dr. Carrie Germeroth for her flexibility and generosity; John Ganzar for rescuing my proposal defense; and Dr. Lisa Merrin and Dr. John Balles for putting up with me this year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract……...ii
Acknowledgements……....iii

A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice
and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics
Research Purpose……4
Research Questions and Hypotheses……...4

Literature Review
NASP Domains of Practice……9
Current Evaluation Practices of School Psychologists……..10
Common Evaluation Components……12
Classroom Observation……..13
Validity……..…….14
Student Demographics……...19
Inter-Rater Reliability……22
Content Bias……...25
Value-Added Data……27
Value-Added Data Applied to Individuals……28
School-Wide Value-Added Data……...30
Validity……..31
Significance of Study……35

Methodology
Study Design……36
Question 1: Type of Data……36
Question 2: Definition of Data……37
Question 3: Population……....37
Question 4: Context……..37
Question 5: Data Analysis……....37
Question 6: Inference Standardization……40

Results
Demographic Information……42
Predominant Themes in Rubrics……...50

Discussion……51
NASP Domain and Terminology Representation……54
Predominant Theme in Rubrics……...56
Implications for Practice……57
School Psychology Evaluation Impact……..64
Study Limitations and Future Directions……...65
Conclusion……68

References……..71

Appendix A: Data Collection Procedures……91
Appendix B: Sample Rubric……108

LIST OF TABLES

Research Questions and Hypotheses
Table 1……7
Table 2……8

Methodology
Table 3……39
Table 4……39

Results
Table 5……43
Table 6……47
Table 7……48
Table 8……49
Table 9……50

A Multi-State Comparison of NASP Domains of Practice

and School Psychologist Evaluation Rubrics

Annual evaluations are a regular part of a school psychology practitioner's professional life. However, evaluations used to assess school psychologists are often poorly aligned to the National Association of School Psychology (NASP) Practice Model and its domains. When considering educator evaluations, Duncan Waite noted that "evaluation done under the guise of supervision is little better than a poke in the eye with a sharp stick'' (1997, p. 57). Opinion of educator evaluation has not changed much over the past twenty years. In a 2014 survey of Chicago public school educators, 79% of educators reported that the evaluation process increased their levels of stress and anxiety, and almost 60% of educators agreed the evaluation process takes more effort than the results are worth (Jiang, Sporte, & Luppescu, 2015). Indeed, evaluations continue to be accepted in practice not because of usability and applicability, but because of precedent and a lack of alternatives (Peterson, 1988). Instead of employing a strengths-based approach to educator evaluation, which would align with principles of supervision, educator evaluations tend to use a deficit model, which focuses on weaknesses.

Further, the recent inclusion of student growth measures (e.g., testing data, student achievement data) in educator evaluations worsened the problem of educator evaluations. A vast majority of school employees, including non-teaching personnel such

as school psychologists, require an evaluation that excludes student achievement data, as they do not teach subjects that are measured with standardized tests (Goe & Holdheide, 2011; Watson, Kraemer, & Thorn, 2009; Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014).

School psychologists are not directly involved in academic instruction, which makes assigning student growth measures to their evaluations tenuous and unreliable. However, in exchange for receiving a waiver from the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2001) requirements, U.S. states had to make student growth based on state assessments a "significant factor" in educator evaluations (Delisle, 2014). Forty-three states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Education have received flexibility waivers (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). To compound the matter, the Race to the Top (RTT) federal grant competition, rolled out in 2009, offered $4.35 billion to states if they made student growth on standardized assessments a "significant part" of educator evaluations (*Race to the Top program executive summary*, 2009, p. 12). Forty-six states and the District of Columbia submitted RTT applications (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Subsequently, the majority of states use student growth measures as a key component of educator evaluations.

RTT also heralded the introduction of annual evaluation systems that were comprised of a quantitative measure (up to 50% standardized testing data when available) and qualitative measure (primarily classroom observation data), in order to comply with the RTT grant requirements. Currently, 27 states require annual evaluations for all educators (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2015). The annual evaluations are a source of concern for school psychologists for two reasons. Because annual evaluations

often include a classroom observation component, school psychologists are at a disadvantage. Much of the work done by school psychologists is confidential, on a one-on-one basis, and requires specialized skills that many educators and administrators have no knowledge of or training in (Morrison, 2013). This can result in inaccurate and/or poor evaluations, which may result in job loss and reduction in retirement pension, as educator pay is largely based on consecutive years of service in one school district. In addition, it can result in competent school psychologists being fired and a lack of supervision and professional support for early career school psychologists.

In order to ensure best application of practices and job security, it is crucial for school psychologists to receive valid, consistent, transparent, and reliable evaluations. Even though school psychologists serve a very different role in schools, they are often evaluated using rubrics designed for classroom educators, which raises questions about the validity of school psychologist evaluations. The fact that our current evaluation systems are consistently invalid and unreliable puts the future of school psychology in jeopardy. While some states provide online evaluation training tools, such as Elevate Colorado, to help principals evaluate their educators, there is no standardized method for educator evaluation. Consequently, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation spent $45 million on its *Measures of Effective Teaching Project* (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.) in an effort to create more effective evaluation systems for classroom educators. However, virtually no research has been conducted on how to evaluate school psychologists, and very little guidance and training exists in this area.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the proposed study is to compare state school psychologist evaluation rubrics to the 10 NASP Domains of Practice using a content analysis approach. Content analysis allows for the quantification of qualitative data. Evaluation of school psychologists needs attention for several reasons. First, many school districts evaluate school psychologists using a rubric created for educators so much of the criteria does not apply. Second, the role of the school psychologist varies from state to state, which affects measures of evaluation. In addition, school psychologists are often required to provide student outcome data for their evaluations, which can be difficult to collect and interpret. Lastly, school psychologists are often evaluated by school administrators who have no training or experience in school psychology and may be unclear about the domains in which school psychologists are trained.

Research results from this study will inform school psychology training programs, school districts, state departments of education, and NASP. Recommendations for further research and implications for school psychologist evaluation will be discussed, as well. This research proposal addresses the *Professional Competency* area of the NASP Strategic Plan, and targets national recognition of the NASP Practice Model.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

To address the neglected issue of school psychology evaluations, this study proposes three overarching questions to assess the appropriateness of current evaluations to school psychology practice. The questions are as follows:

1. What is the representation of the 10 NASP Domains across state rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists for formative and summative evaluation purposes?
    a. To what extent are specific NASP Domains represented, and
    b. To what extent is NASP Domains of Practice terminology represented?
2. What are the predominant themes represented in state evaluation rubrics of school psychologists?
    a. What regional differences exist in the evaluation of school psychologists?
3. To what extent is there agreement between the predominant themes identified in the evaluation rubrics and the predominant NASP domains?

It is hypothesized that for the Question 1, a minority of evaluation rubrics for school psychologists will represent all 10 NASP Domains of Practice. It is predicted that NASP Domain 1 (Data) will be represented in most states' evaluation rubrics for school psychologists, while NASP Domains 3 (Academics) and 4 (Social-Emotional) will be represented in at least half of states' evaluation rubrics for school psychologists. In addition, it is predicted that Domains 5 (School-Wide) and 9 (Research) will be represented in a minority of state rubrics. Finally, it is predicted that the terms "assessment," "data," "collaboration," "communication," "diversity," "technology," and "professional development" will be represented in the majority of state rubrics, and "ecological" "treatment fidelity," "consultation," "continuum," "decision-making,"

"advocacy," and "social justice" will be represented in a minority of state rubrics. Tables 1 and 2 provide keywords for easy reference.

Table 1

Domains of Practice

Domain	Title	Brief Definition
1 (Data)	Data-based decision-making and accountability	Using assessment data to implement and evaluate interventions and programs/use assessment, data collection, and technology resources, and apply results to interventions, services, and programs
2 (Collaborate)	Consultation and collaboration	Effectively communicating, consulting, and collaborating with families, educators, and community providers
3 (Academics)	Interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills	Implementing instructional strategies/ use assessment and data collection to implement and evaluate services that support cognitive and academic skills
4 (Social-Emotional)	Interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills	Individual and group counseling/ use data collection and assessment skills to implement and evaluate services that support socialization, learning, mental health, and behavioral health
5 (School-Wide)	School-wide practices to promote learning	Universal screening to identify students in need of support/ Develop and implement ways to create and maintain effective learning environments for children
6 (Preventive)	Preventive and responsive services	Participating in school crisis teams/ Promote services that improve learning, mental and behavioral health, safety, and physical well-being
7 (Families)	Family-school collaboration services	Engaging parents in decision-making about their children/ Design, implement, and evaluate services that promote partnerships between families, schools, and community agencies to improve outcomes for children
8 (Diversity)	Diversity in development and learning	Addressing the needs of English Language Learners/ Promote effective functioning for students, families, and schools with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds
9 (Research)	Research and program evaluation	Helping educators collect student data/ Evaluate and apply research as the foundation for service delivery and use data to support effective practices

10 (Ethical/Legal)	Legal, ethical, and professional practice	Using supervision and mentoring to advance the profession using best practices/Align service delivery with professional, ethical, and legal standards

Table 2

Specified Terminology

Terminology	Acronym Used in Study
assessment	ASM
advocacy	ADV
collaboration	CLB
communication	COM
consultation	CNS
continuum	CNT
data	DAT
decision-making	DMK
diversity	DIV
ecological	ECL
professional development	PDV
social justice	SJT
technology	TCH
treatment fidelity	TFD

For the second question it is hypothesized that significant regional differences will become apparent in Domains 4 (Social-Emotional) and 8 (Diversity), with regard to states' evaluation rubrics for school psychologists. Lastly, the hypothesis for the third and final question is that there will not be agreement between the predominant themes identified in evaluation rubrics and the predominant NASP domains, in a majority of the evaluation rubrics.

Literature Review

NASP Domains of Practice

The NASP Domains of Practice represent the knowledge and skills school psychologists are trained to provide, in order to serve students, families, and schools. The Domains of Practice are elements of the NASP Practice Model. The NASP Practice Model is comprised of two parts: Professional Practices and Organizational Principles. Professional Practices, which encompasses the 10 Domains of Practice (see Table 1), is divided into three sections:

1. Practices that apply to all aspects of service delivery – domains 1 (Data), 2 (Collaborate)
2. Direct and indirect services for children, families, and schools
    a. Student-level – domains 3 (Academics), 4 (Social-Emotional)
    b. Systems-level – domains 5 (School-Wide), 6 (Preventive), 7 (Families)
3. Foundations of service delivery – domains 8 (Diversity), 9 (Research), 10 (Ethical-Legal)

This paper specifically looks at the 10 Domains of Practice in an effort to gauge to extent to which the evaluations of school psychologists are based on professional practices specific to school psychology.

School psychologists should be evaluated according to the NASP Domains of Practice because of their specialized training that vastly differs from that of classroom teachers and administrators. Indeed, there are no other school employees trained in this unique skill set, and school psychologists fill a very specialized role in the school community. School psychologists are prepared to connect various levels of the school staff, students, and the community in ways that other school employees are not. In addition, school psychologists provide a broad continuum of services that address both the social-emotional and the academic needs of students, in a comprehensive approach to promoting success. It is vital that school administrators are aware of all the services school psychologists can provide, and that they are evaluated accordingly.

Current Evaluation Practices of School Psychologists

Unfortunately, there is a shortage of literature that describes evaluation of school psychologists, but Morrison (2013) states that performance appraisal rubrics, which are adapted from rubrics used to evaluate educators or administrators, are usually the sole evaluation measure of a school psychologist. In addition, the evaluator is usually a principal or district administrator, and not someone with knowledge and background in school psychology. The fact that a single evaluator usually completes the evaluation decreases the evaluation's reliability and validity. Other factors that hinder a school psychologist's evaluation include confidentiality issues, the impact of an evaluator on a client, and the infrequent opportunities to display the wide range of skills required of school psychologists (Morrison, 2013). In short, while principals and special education directors are able to offer feedback, they are not trained in the nuances of the practice of

school psychology, and therefore are not equipped to accurately evaluate school psychologists. For example, school psychologists' services are compromised when their ratio exceeds 1: 500-700 general education students, so their evaluation should take into account the school psychologist's working conditions (NASP, 2012). However, school administrators may not be aware of the obstacles to service provision that result from high ratios.

There are a few school-psychology specific evaluation criteria that evaluators can turn to when assessing the work of school psychologists. Morrison (2013) specified four key principles in evaluation of school psychologists: (1) multiple measures, including student outcome data; (2) reliability and validity, with validity anchored to the NASP Practice Model; (3) ability to distinguish different levels of proficiency; and (4) and linkage to professional growth. Similarly, the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (2014) recommends four elements in evaluations of Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP): (1) statutory and regulatory requirements; (2) differentiation of measures; (3) evaluator training; and (4) professional learning. Finally, NASP developed a framework for the evaluation of school psychologists in 2012, which includes four principles of evaluating school psychologists: (1) use the NASP Practice Model as the framework; (2) include school psychologists when creating their evaluation system; (3) use valid, reliable, and meaningful measurements; and (4) provide ongoing, meaningful feedback, including supervision and mentoring from school psychologists. Further, NASP (2012) recommends that school psychologists only be evaluated by professionals credentialed in school psychology with at least three years of experience. Only

credentialed professional school psychologists are able to accurately differentiate between levels of performance when school psychologists demonstrate technical and professional skills (NASP, 2012).

While these recommendations share common themes of professional development, adherence to the NASP practice model, school psychology-specific measures, multiple measures, validity, and reliability, there is scarce research on whether these guidelines have been implemented in evaluation of school psychologists in the United States. The NASP Practice Model takes the Domains of Practice, which represent the common themes as well as the skills and knowledge every school psychologist offers and applies them to a visual model that explains how comprehensive school psychological services are delivered. If the NASP Domains of Practice and the Practice Model are not utilized in evaluations, then school psychologists are not being evaluated on the services they are intended to provide.

Common Evaluation Components

There is a research gap regarding current evaluation of school psychologists. Many are evaluated with the same rubrics designed for classroom educators, sometimes with minor modifications. In other cases, school psychologists are not evaluated at all, due to school administrators' lack of knowledge and training in how to evaluate school psychologists, or a perceived lack of importance for school psychologist evaluations. However, there is a great deal of research available regarding evaluation of classroom educators and the measures used. Two predominant measures stand out: classroom observation and value added data (VAD). Classroom observation is a traditional method

of evaluation, which presumes that school administrators are able to ascertain levels of proficiency by visually observing educators in their classroom, teaching students (Danielson, 2012; Kane & Staiger, 2012; Weber, Waxman, Brown, & Kelly, 2016). VAD is a complex statistical modeling approach and attempts to isolate the effect that a school employee had on a student's academic growth, between two or more points in time (American Educational Research Association, 2015; American Statistical Association, 2014; Measuring School Effectiveness, 2014). Both are used to evaluate school psychologists, in addition to educators, and will be discussed in greater detail in the sections following.

Classroom Observation. Observation by school administrator is the one underlying measure of all educator evaluation. In this method, a school administrator brings an observation instrument, usually in the form of a checklist/rubric, into a classroom, in order to rate an educator's level of proficiency (Danielson, 2012; Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). The administrator is supposed to be an outside observer, not a participant, and the implicit assumption of this method is that an administrator can generalize their impressions from short observation periods to an entire educator's practice. The amount of time educators are observed may range from one or two 45-minute periods to five or six "walkthroughs," or 10-minute periods, per year. Some principals allow educators to choose the date and time of their observations in advance, and others prefer to surprise educators and show up unexpectedly in their classrooms. School administrators are typically given a fair amount of discretion in how to conduct these observations.

Validity. Extant research reveals that classroom observations by school principals lack validity (Mertler, 1997; Peterson, 2004). Common sense would suggest that educators with stronger evaluation scores should also have stronger student achievement gains on average (Kane and Staiger, 2012), which would validate observation scores. However, associations between classroom observational data and VAD are relatively low, in general (Bell, Gitomer, & McCaffrey, 2012; Gallagher, 2004; Grossman, Cohen, Ronfeldt, & Brown, 2014; Grossman, Loeb, Cohen, & Wyckoff, 2013; Lazarev, Newman, & Sharp, 2014; Strong, Gargani, & Hacifazlioglu, 2011). In other words, principals are generally unable to distinguish, through observation, between educators whose students experience academic growth and educators whose students do not. In fact, educators and principals see educator evaluations as having little value, which differentiates schools from non-educational fields, in which evaluations generally have much higher correlations with outcomes (Gallagher, 2004; Strong et al, 2011). In a pilot of an evaluation system in Arizona, only a few significant correlations were found between observation items and student academic progress, and only in domains observed outside the classroom (Lazarev, Newman, & Sharp, 2014). This is concerning, because educator evaluations are partly based on observations made in the classroom (Grossman et al, 2014; Strong et al, 2011).

Some explain this discrepancy with the theory that observable aspects of teaching are separate and complementary to student academic growth, and that is why the two measures do not align (Grossman et al, 2013). However, it is well documented that some observable aspects of teaching, such as signs of strong educator-student relationships,

lead to increased student academic achievement (Danielson, 2012; Klem & Connell, 2004; Roorda, 2012). Thus, it is quite possible that principals are generally unable to identify teaching activities that lead to academic growth, as well as teaching activities that indicate a supportive and positive classroom climate. It is also possible that preconceived notions of an educator's effectiveness and personal bias affect observation scores and skew evaluation results, which is discussed in more detail below.

One possible reason for the disconnect between observable measures of effective teaching and student achievement, is that the characteristics principals prefer in educators are rarely associated with any other measure of effectiveness. Principals often give higher evaluation ratings to educators who contribute to the school community (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014), work well with other school employees (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014), exhibit strong communication skills (Abernathy, Forsyth, and Mitchell, 2001; Dunton, 2001; Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014), and are enthusiastic (Dunton, 2001). In addition, principals prefer educators who have the same teaching philosophy that the principals do (Dunton, 2001; Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014), and are caring (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014). In other words, principals expect educators to display characteristics that are unrelated to teaching ability. Is it possible to be an effective math educator if one does not coach a sport after school, serve on school committees, eat lunch with co-workers, communicate with colleagues well, and display immense enthusiasm for their job? Yes; however, that educator is at risk of receiving a lower evaluation score based on the characteristics that principals prefer in their teaching staff. The practice of judging an educator by qualities unrelated to teaching skills increases the odds that

effective educators are fired, or not promoted, and ineffective educators are renewed or promoted, resulting in a less effective teaching staff and less successful students. As student success and growth is the ultimate goal of education, principal observations should not consider qualities in educators that are unrelated to student success and growth.

Most of the time, principals have difficulty identifying teaching practices that lead to academic growth. In a 2014 study of principal evaluation scores of educators and the educator's value-added data, only 30% of educators received similar ratings using both VAD and principal observation data (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014). To confound the issue for school psychologists, principals usually have experience and training in teaching, but not in school psychology. Since principals are usually unable to identify effective teaching practices, what does that say for their ability to identify effective school psychology practices?

Another possible reason for the low validity of observation scores is the predominance of the style-based approach to educator evaluation. As mentioned above, principals usually bring a rubric into the classroom when they evaluate educators, and a similar rubric is often used to evaluate school psychologists, when they are observed (Morrison, 2013). A checklist of observable actions implies that there is one right way to teach, regardless of context or individual students (Sinnema and Robinson, 2007). However, many items that supposedly indicate educator effectiveness, such as "makes contact when student not on task," have been found to negatively correlate with student achievement (Peterson, 1988). It is the appropriate use and degree of behaviors, not the

presence of the behaviors themselves, that lead to student achievement (Peterson, 2004). Thus, effective teaching cannot be inferred from educator behaviors alone; it depends on classroom circumstances and student circumstances (Peterson, 1988). Therefore, evaluation in the form of a checklist of observable behavior is not a valid method of teaching effectiveness. Instead, "each educator evaluation should be treated as a separate case study that accounts for the context in which the educator teaches" (Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013, p. 352). However, a study of an evaluation system at Vaughn Elementary in Los Angeles found that evaluators appeared to have a bias toward a particular teaching style. In this study, an educator who had a different teaching style had higher student achievement than her evaluation score would indicate (Gallagher, 2004). This suggests that educators can receive good evaluation scores if they model a desired practice, regardless of student learning (Sinnema & Robinson, 2007), just as school psychologists may receive good evaluation scores, regardless of the level of proficiency demonstrated (Morrison, 2013).

This biased preference to service is problematic as educators have an incomplete view of the role of school psychologists that have persisted for several decades. In 1980, principals indicated that assessment, screening, and consultation were helpful services, but only 55% of principals appreciated individual counseling and only 62.9% appreciated behavioral modification services (Senft & Snider, 1980). Although this research study took place 37 years ago, it highlights the persistent and enduring lack of understanding of school psychologists' comprehensive role. More recent studies also suggest principals see school psychologists as primarily in charge of testing and assessments of students

(Gilman & Gabriel, 2004; Greene, 2010; Watkins, Crosby, & Pearson, 2001), with secondary responsibilities of implementing intervention and providing consultation services (Greene, 2010; Watkins, Crosby, & Pearson, 2001). Since evaluations are subjective, a principal who prefers a certain domain of school psychology, such as assessment, may assign an evaluation score that is not indicative of demonstrated comprehensive professional competence and efficacy. For school psychologists, this might promote a reduction of the school psychologist's role and inaccurate evaluation scores, neglecting to account for the unique and broadly based knowledge and services the school psychologist provides.

In addition, an evaluator's lack of training and knowledge in the domains of school psychology could lead to inaccurate evaluation scores. Research finds that evaluators need to be trained properly in order to assess teaching, but there is little evidence of comprehensive evaluation training programs in school districts (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007). In a descriptive study of educator evaluation in the Midwest, only 8% of district policies included information about evaluator training, and only 21% of school districts identified resources that informed evaluation (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007). In addition, only 8% of school districts had any form of training requirements for evaluators (Brandt, Mathers, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007). This percentage decreases exponentially when examining training of school administrators regarding how to evaluate school psychologists. Indeed, there is no literature available on the training or ability of school principals to accurately evaluate school psychologists.

Student Demographics. Another aspect of classroom observations that are not linked to educator service delivery is student demographics. Educators who have students with higher achievement levels when the year begins receive higher observation scores, on average, than educators whose students begin the year at lower achievement levels (Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). In a form of confirmation bias, when an observer sees an educator leading a class with higher ability students, they judge the educator to be more effective than when they see the same educator leading a class of lower ability students (Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). Therefore, educator observation scores are not valid unless they are adjusted for the demographics of their students (Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). Unfortunately, it is not common practice to adjust classroom observation scores for student demographic. In the eyes of the observer, every educator should be able to teach all students effectively, but the reality is that students are not evenly distributed among educators.

Considering the demographic effect negatively affects educators of lower-achieving students, this specifically affects the evaluation of those in special education. Average scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and mathematics measures range from 61% to 72% below the basic level for fourth and eighth grade students with disabilities (Johnson & Semmelroth, 2014). Students with disabilities have often receive inadequate support and services, limiting their chances of academic growth, and validity and reliability of measures of growth for students with disabilities is difficult to establish anyway (Allbritton, Mainzer, & Ziegler, 2004).

Therefore, educators who want higher evaluation scores may avoid or limit teaching students with disabilities, in order to earn a higher evaluation score.

To confound the issue, observation protocols do not always include evidence-based instructional practices that are effective with students who have disabilities, such as direct instruction and learning strategies (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012). In addition, observation instruments often do not account for the unique responsibilities of special educators, such as social and behavioral supports (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012). Lastly, the nature of special education classroom themselves are unique. Students may enter and exit intervention groups and special education classes at various times during the school day or year, making it difficult to assess job performance as students may receive services from multiple sources or for time-limited amounts, respectively (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012). Educators can only be fairly evaluated when observation scores are comparable across different student groups (Welsh, 2011).

Similar issues plague the observations of school psychologists, who also serve students with unique social-emotional and cognitive needs who require unique interventions and support. And, although the effect of demographics has not yet been explored with respect to evaluations of school psychologists, it is expected the same student demographic bias holds true. Thus, school psychologists working with students with higher service needs and higher levels of severity regarding their disability may be scored poorly because significant gains might not be apparent. Additionally, school psychologists working in schools with less funding may have higher caseloads, hindering

effective service provision (National Association of School Psychologists, 2006) and may receive lower evaluation scores due to an inability to adequately provide services.

To make the matter even more complex, some educators are more effective with particular types of students or may be more or less effective in the classroom at different points during the year (Welsh, 2011). Observation data is situational, not universal. All educators are expected to be able to teach all students, which fails to account for each educator's unique strengths and weaknesses.

Further, it is not possible to generalize observation data from a few short time periods with one or two groups of students to the entire school year. Circumstances and context influence student behavior. For example, student behavior may vary depending on the time of day, day of the week, and start time of class, (Owens, Belon, & Moss, 2010), as students who attend schools with early start times are often sleepy and may fall asleep during morning classes. In addition, sleep deficits accumulate during the course of the school week (Owens, Belon, & Moss, 2010), which may lead to increasingly tired students as the school week progresses. Sleep deprivation can lead to impairments in mood, attention, memory, and behavioral control (Owens, Belon, & Moss, 2010), which all affect student behavior in class. Therefore, extrapolating data from isolated snapshots of a classroom does not necessarily lead to valid conclusions about an educator's overall level of effectiveness.

In a similar manner, school psychologists also experience a wide variety of challenges and may be better suited to some aspects of their role than others. School psychologists are expected to stay updated on current best practices (NASP, 2016; Smith,

n.d.); assess individual children (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004); provide consultation (Gonzalez, Nelson, Gutkin, & Shwery, 2004); provide instructional leadership (Lay, 2010); research interventions (Villarreal, Ponce, & Gutierrez, 2015); administer universal assessments (Eklund, Renshaw, Dowdy, Jimerson, Hart, Jones, & Earhart, 2009); collaborate with other professionals (Sulkowski, Wingfield, Jones, & Coulter, 2011); and, facilitate the RTI process (Gelzheiser, 2009, NASP, 2016). These are in addition to the wide range of services inherent in the 10 NASP Domains of Practice (NASP, 2016). Moreover, completing assessments, writing reports, and attending IEP meetings are additional aspects of a school psychologist's job. Also, school psychologists must also be prepared for school violence, natural disasters and accidents, and crisis intervention (DeNisco, 2013). Just as educators are often better suited to one group of students and content area than another, school psychologists may excel at some aspects of their jobs, such as consultation or assessment, but struggle in other areas, such as counseling or family-school partnerships. Given the vast range of skills required of school psychologists, it is easy to see why a couple observations or data points may not accurately represent the entire scope of professional proficiency.

Inter-Rater Reliability. Scriven (1990) said that traditional classroom observation models "suffer from samples that are inadequate in size and not representative, measurement artifacts, style bias, and failures of empathy, and are usually vulnerable to personal bias" (p. 91). Classroom observation instruments are rarely tested for reliability, and school administrators are usually not trained in how to use them (Noakes, 2009). There is evidence that principals are not capable of accurately

evaluating most educators due to a lack of relevant teaching experience, little to no training in observation instruments, not enough observation time, and inherent biases, including physical attractiveness of the educator (Noakes, 2009). Since principals are not usually trained in how to evaluate school psychologists (Morrison, 2013), establishing inter-rater reliability (IRR) is a difficult task. School psychologists should not be punished for having a tough evaluator or an evaluator who has a personal bias (Papay, 2012); rather, more standardization of evaluation ratings is needed (Donaldson and Papay, 2012).

Most educator evaluations are almost entirely subjective and vary greatly in terms of reliability, effectiveness, consistency, and generalization when compared to data gained from other sources (Noakes, 2009). In a pilot study of a teaching evaluation model in Arizona, educators expressed concerns about a lack of calibration in classroom ratings and the number and type of observations needed to accurately rate educator performance. Principals noted that the quality of evaluations and feedback varied among principals (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014). Only 64% of the educators in the Arizona study had confidence in their evaluator's ability to accurately score classroom observations. In a separate study, principals in Seattle reported a lack of training, leading to speculation about inconsistencies in educator evaluation ratings (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014). Given the lack of awareness of what exactly school psychologists do and which skills they bring (Morrison 2013), it is doubtful that evaluation scores of school psychologists are more accurate than educator evaluation scores.

Another aspect of observations is personal relationships. Principals who have prior knowledge of an educator's abilities may give a higher observation score than if they have no prior knowledge of the educator (Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). Known as the Halo effect, this is when a global perception of an educator affects an observation score (Welsh, 2011). Halo effects can apply to school psychologists as well, who earn reputations from the administrators, educators and staff at school, as a result of their professional and personal interactions with others. School psychologists who are well liked may receive higher evaluation scores, regardless of professional competence demonstrated.

In actuality, principals have trouble separating the personal from the professional when evaluating educators they know. Evaluators report that it is difficult to separate what they know of the educator, or the educators' contributions outside the classroom, from their judgments of the educator's instructional practice (Papay, 2012). Indeed, observations conducted by observers from outside the school building are more valid than observations conducted by school administrators who work inside the school building (Donaldson and Papay, 2012; Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). Several studies have advocated for the use of multiple observers to counter the effects of a biased evaluation. The Measure of Effective Teaching (MET) project recommended that four observers, including outside evaluators who have no relationship to the educators, score the observations in order to monitor overall observation reliability (Kane & Staiger, 2012). Additionally, the authors noted that significant training (minimum of four lessons) and adequate inter-rater agreement scores are needed to achieve reliable

observation scores (Kane & Staiger, 2012). The authors concluded that good training is not enough; observers should demonstrate accurate observations before scoring lessons and periodically get recertified in classroom observation (Kane and Staiger, 2012).

Further, Scriven's Judgment-Based Educator Evaluation (J-BTE) system calls for at least three evaluators, because "the appraisal of an educator is so complicated, it is clearly too risky to leave decisions as important as summative appraisal to one judge'' (Holland, 2006, p. 72). This data does not bode well for school psychologists, who are usually evaluated by one person, not four, and that one person typically has no formal training or knowledge of the school psychologist's domains of practice (Morrison, 2013). It is common practice for each school employee to have only one evaluator per year, and summative personnel decisions are made at the end of each year on the recommendation of only one evaluator. If educators can only receive reliable evaluation scores when they are separately rated by four trained evaluators, what are the odds that a school psychologist will be reliably evaluated by one untrained evaluator who is not a certified school psychologist?

Another part of the dilemma with IRR of observations is that classroom observation rubrics are filled with subjective criteria, including length of time for the observations and terminology. Recent studies suggest that levels of IRR can change based on the amount of time observed (Johnson and Semmelroth, 2014), so a school professional who has shorter periods of time with their students or has evaluators spending limited time in their classroom may receive less reliable evaluation scores. Observations across multiple days achieve greater reliability (Kane and Staiger, 2012).

Moreover, observation rubrics with long lists of vague terminology are not sufficient for observation instruments because the criteria are open to interpretation (Brandt, Oliva, Brown-Sims, & Hess, 2007; Kane and Staiger, 2012). Using low-inference, operationalized indicators, which are more objective and require less judgment, can improve reliability. However, professional judgment is needed to ensure the indicators are appropriately used for the context and the individual student, which makes low-inference indicators problematic (Peterson, 2004). This underscores the necessity of trained observers who can use objective indicators to minimize personal and professional bias, the Halo effect, and uninformed conclusions about professional competence, yet still situate the observation in context (e.g., student demographics, resources, long-term student goals) to determine professional effectiveness.

Content Bias. Content bias refers to the tendency to evaluate educators differently depending on which content they teach or work with. Unsurprisingly, content-specific observation tools have positive effects on student outcomes (Johnson and Semmelroth, 2014). In a study of educator evaluation scores and student achievement at a school in Los Angeles, it was found that principals' knowledge of content area affects their ability to accurately rate classroom observations, and educators whose content area and training aligns with their principal will have more accurate observation scores (Gallagher, 2004). This content component is concerning, considering that very few principals have training and knowledge of school psychology domains. It is unlikely that principal evaluators are able to accurately rate a school psychologist's professional

performance. To improve evaluations of school psychologists, it is imperative that observers are trained in the content area they are observing (NASP, 2012; Skalski, n.d.).

Furthermore, some educators, such as special education educators and school psychologists, fulfill many roles and have specialized instructional practices, which a building administrator may not be trained to recognize (Johnson and Semmelroth, 2014). These educators might facilitate instruction of many different subjects and grade levels, so evaluation of such specialized personnel needs to take these challenges into account (Johnson and Semmelroth, 2014). Evaluation models, such as Danielson's (2013) Framework for Teaching (FFT), are often grounded in a constructivist view of teaching and learning, rather than direct instruction, and are rarely effective in assessing the instruction of students with disabilities.

Value-Added Data. As mentioned earlier, VAD is the second common element found in evaluation of educators. It is a statistical measure that uses student outcome data, often in the form of standardized test scores, to estimate the effect that one person or a group of people had on academic growth for one student or a group of students, between two or more points in time (American Statistical Association, 2014; Holdheide et al., 2012; Rand, 2012; Skalski, n.d.; Value-Added Research Center, 2014). A value-added model (VAM) is used to control for background variables that may contribute to academic growth (Rand, 2012, Value-Added Research Center, 2014). Many different statistical VAMs exist (Rand, 2012; Value-Added Research Center, 2014) and different models can result in substantially different scores or rankings for educators or groups of educators (AMA, 2014). VAD methods became popular after 2009, when the RTT

competition required educator evaluations that were based in large part on a quantifiable contribution to student academic growth (Grossman et al, 2013; Skalski, n.d.).

Value-added data applied to individuals. Although VADs are commonly used in educator assessments, there have been many concerns about using VAD as a factor in educator evaluation due to statistical problems, such as large standard errors of measurement (ASA, 2014, Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010) and small sample sizes (Value-Added Research Center, 2014). Not only does this make the resulting data unstable (ASA, 2014; Grossman et al, 2013; Minke, n.d.; Skalski, n.d.), but it also results in an inability to account for, or control for, all the possible variables that affect a student or group of student's academic growth (ASA, 2014; Grossman et al, 2013).

In addition, most school employees do not have standardized tests aligned with their job role, leading to confusion over how to assign a quantitative score to those school professionals (Grossman et al, 2013; Minke, n.d.; Skalski. N.d.). In response, a common measure used for teachers of non-tested subjects is Student Learning Objectives (SLOs; ICF, 2010; Lachlan-Hache, 2015). They are typically class or subject-specific goals, measured with teacher or school-designed assessments, although standardized assessments may be used, as well (ICF, 2010). Although this may seem like an appropriate quantification of data, educators often have trouble gaining access to student data in a timely manner and analyzing student data (Lachlan-Hache, 2015). Finding, creating, or updating assessments to use with SLOs are time-consuming; further, high-quality assessments can be hard to locate (Lachlan-Hache, 2015). Most concerning, however, is that research finds inconsistent correlations between SLO achievement and

student achievement on standardized tests (Lachlan-Hache, 2015). In short, it appears that SLOs are not equivalent to standardized assessments when it comes to measuring student academic growth. And, while educators may appreciate the opportunity to create and assess their own goals, rigor and predictive validity are hard to establish with this method; and, evaluating educators who use SLOs requires much time and focus (ICF, 2010). Consequently, educators in classes of non-tested subjects are held to different professional standards than teachers of tested subjects, which many school personnel consider unfair (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014).

To further confound the issue, the Common Core standards were released in 2010, a year after RTT was announced, shortly followed by the implementation of Common Core standardized tests (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, 2016). The addition of more standards and guidelines led to even more confusion about how to measure progress since the curriculum and standardized tests covered different content and skills than before. This feeds the concern of educators teaching only the skills and content assessed on standardized tests (ASA, 2014), and ignoring non-tested subjects (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010). The concern with teaching to the test is that it reduces the curriculum, limiting students' educational experience to the content and skills that make the teacher and school appear more effective, often in a formulaic and unrealistic manner (Posner, 2015). There is no professional incentive for a teacher to cover content that will not appear on standardized assessments, particularly when class time is limited. In addition, time and energy that could be spent on subjects

that promote social-emotional growth, such as physical education, could be reduced or eliminated as schools focus their resources on tested subjects.

School-wide value-added data. In order to give educators of non-tested subjects a quantitative student growth score for their evaluation, some school districts use school-wide VAD. This approach involves applying the VAD average for all the students in the school to school employees who do not teach tested subjects, such as physical education educators, principals, and school psychologists. Instead of factoring the VAD of an educator's individual group of students to an individual educator's evaluation score, a school-wide average of all student academic growth is applied to school employees (Goe & Holdheide, 2011). However, educators do not always want to be evaluated by the test scores of students they do not know in subjects they do not teach (Goe & Holdheide 2011; Jiang, Sporte, & Luppescu, 2015; Rink 2013; Robinson, 2015; Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014). As an art educator stated, "There is no part of my certification or training that says I need to learn how to teach a student how to read, which I think is a very specific skill to try and teach" (Jiang, Sporte, & Luppescu, 2015, p. 113).

Proponents of school-wide VAD argue that education is a collaborative effort, and art educators should be infusing reading skills into their classes. However, it is possible to excel as an art educator but have difficulty with reading and writing instruction. The assumption that every school employee is trained and competent to effectively teach every core subject is faulty at best, particularly at middle schools and high schools, in which educators are trained as specialists in their unique content area and not as generalists.

Another unfortunate aspect of school-wide VAD is that it punishes effective educators in lower-performing schools and rewards ineffective educators in high-performing schools due to statistical methodology issues (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014; Whitehurst, Chingos, & Lindquist, 2014). For example, in a 2012-2013 study of evaluations in Arizona, educators received a state-generated letter grade based on the overall school growth on standardized tests, which was factored into their evaluation scores. Principals worried that teachers would move to higher-performing schools, with higher letter grades, to improve their evaluation ratings, and teachers worried that the school's letter grade would harm their individual evaluation ratings (Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014). Hence, school-wide VAD may serve as an incentive for educators to avoid working in low-performing schools (ASA, 2014; Ruffini, Makkonen, Tejwani, & Diaz, 2014), in the same way that classroom observation data punishes educators who have lower-achieving students. The same reasoning applies to school psychologists, who are increasingly required to include school-wide data in their evaluation scores (Minke, n.d.; Skalski, n.d.). School psychologists who work in low-performing schools receive lower school wide VAD scores than school psychologists who work in higher-performing schools, just as classroom teachers do.

Validity. The assumption that an individual educator is solely responsible for their students' test scores is problematic (ASA, 2014; Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Grossman et al, 2013). First of all, in order to achieve any measure of reliability, best practices suggest districts collect three or more years of VAD to reduce standard error and increase stability of the data (ASA, 2014;

Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Marshall, 2012), which is too long to wait for formative feedback and not practical for making annual personnel decisions. That said, standardized test scores are not released until the school year is over, so even annual data is not very useful, as the educator has moved onto a new group of students, and perhaps new classes and maybe even a new school, by then.

Second, as discussed previously, individual circumstances and context play a substantive role in student performance. It is not an easy task to tease out an individual educator's effect on a student because non-school factors account for much, if not most, of the variance in student achievement (ASA, 2014; Grossman et al, 2013; Robinson, 2015). Educators are not in control of all the variables in their students' lives (Jiang, Sporte, & Luppescu, 2015; Rink, 2013; Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013), which makes VAD problematic as an evaluation tool (ASA, 2014, Robinson, 2014). In addition, some educators may have more access to resources and support than others, which may affect test scores (Jiang, Sporte, & Luppescu, 2015; Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013). Students with more resources (e.g., parents who help them with homework, tutors, or camps) have an advantage over students who do not, and this may affect their standardized test scores. In addition, punishing or rewarding school employees, including school psychologists, neglects to account for the work contributed by pullout educators, educational specialists, and educators in previous grades. (Marshall, 2012). Student test scores alone are not reliable and valid indicators of educator and school employee effectiveness, even when value-added modeling is used (ASA, 2014; Economic Policy Institute, 2010; Pogodzinski, Umpstead, & Witt, 2015;

Marshall 2012) and many states have already experienced lawsuits as the result of personnel decisions that factored in student growth data (Asmar, 2016; Felton, 2016; Morton, 2015; Smith, 2015).

The issue of sole responsibility of student outcomes is problematic for school psychologists as well. School psychologists are not in control of the vast number of factors affecting students' social-emotional and academic development (ASA, 2014; Morrison, 2013). Differential summer learning loss, student health, attendance, and home and community supports may all affect a student's academic growth (Robinson, 2014). Moreover, students receive support and services from several people, such as occupational therapists, physical therapists, audiologists, and speech pathologists, making it difficult to tease out any one individual's contribution to a student growth score (Goe & Holdheide, 2011; Grossman et al, 2013; Morrison, 2013).

To confound the issue even further is the distribution of students. The assumption of VAD is that students are assigned to educators at random, so each educator's student group is comparable to every other educator's group, but this is not always the case (Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010). As discussed previously, some educators tend to have certain types of students, and the inconsistent placement of students in classrooms challenges the validity of VAD (ASA, 2014; Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013; Papay, 2012). This is particularly relevant when considering special education. Using one outcome measure for all students puts educators of students with disabilities at a disadvantage; students with disabilities often experience different growth rates and different levels of achievement

(Johnson and Semmelroth, 2014). In fact, VAD may give school employees lower ratings when they work with students with disabilities or English language learners (Grossman et al, 2013).

The validity of VAD also breaks apart when considering standardized tests, which rarely measure achievement that is well above or below grade level (American Educational Research Association, 2015; Rink, 2013; Robinson, 2015; Welsh, 2011). Therefore, students who make progress but are very low or very high achieving will not have accurate growth data; this may adversely affect their educators' evaluation scores. There is a ceiling on the amount of knowledge a standardized test can capture, so educators of students whose students tested very high the previous year will appear to have smaller gains than students with more typical achievement levels, making the school employees who work with them appear less effective. For special educators, standardized assessments are particularly unreliable. Students with disabilities are often given alternate assessments, and there is not much known about how to use VAD modeling with non-standard assessments (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012), although the overall percentage of students who take alternate assessments is small (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Addition, the lack of range affects both special educators and school psychologists, whose value-added data may be skewed by the largely atypical student population they work with.

Finally, when school employees are assigned students they work especially well or especially poorly with, VAD is becomes further unreliable (Callister, Everson, Feinauer, & Sudweeks, 2013). According to the ASA (2014), value-added data typically

measures correlation, not causation. "Effects-positive or negative-attributed to an educator may actually be caused by other factors that are not captured in the model… Most VAD studies find that educators account for about 1% to 14% of the variability in test scores" (ASA, 2014, p. 2). It seems illogical that student test scores account for up to half of an evaluation score, when a classroom educator's effect on the score is only 1-14%, and it is unknown what effect a school psychologist's work may have on a student's test scores.

Significance of Study

As demonstrated, there is a great deal of research available on how to evaluate educators. However, there is virtually no research available on how to evaluate school psychologists, who serve a unique role in school. Evaluations of school psychologists can be anchored in the NASP Practice Model, which includes the 10 NASP Domains of Professional Practice, to give them validity (NASP, n.d.; Minke, n.d.; Morrison, 2013). This study will evaluate the degree to which school psychologists are being evaluated in the 10 Domains of Practice – practices for which they have received specialized training and that guide professional behavior. Results from this study will inform future evaluations of school psychologists and the construction of a school psychology specific evaluation model.

Methodology

Study Design

This study is a content analysis, which is a technique of systemic coding used to compress text into different categories based on content. It allows for discovery of the focus of the data, and it provides an empirical basis for assessing public opinion (Stemler, 2001). Six questions must be addressed in every content analysis (Krippendorf, 1980): (1) Which data are analyzed; (2) How are they defined; (3) What is the population from which they are drawn; (4) What is the context relative to which the data are analyzed; (5) What are the boundaries of the analysis; and, (6) What is the target of the inferences?

Question 1: Type of data. The primary form of data was school psychologist evaluation rubrics. The researcher began by going to state department of education websites and looking for the name and contact information of the state department of education employee or employees who were responsible for school psychologists. The researcher then emailed or called those people and requested rubrics. If the state department of education was unable to provide a rubric, then the researcher contacted the school district with the greatest number of students and requested a rubric. If that district did not provide a rubric, then the researcher contacted the school district with the second greatest number of students. If that district was unable to provide a rubric, the researcher contacted the district with the third greatest number of students. If that district was

unable to provide a rubric, then no rubric was obtained for that particular state for this study. Multiple attempts to locate rubrics were made at the state and local level. Data collection began on 3/26/17 and ended on 9/19/17. The researcher asked state departments of education if their rubrics were required in their states, and if the rubrics were available online.

Question 2: Definition of data. The data consisted of rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists in the United States, for the 2016-2017 school year. The NASP Domains of Practice was used as the measure by which all school psychologist evaluation rubrics were compared.

Question 3: Population. The population for this study was the checklists of evaluation criteria used to evaluate school psychologists, which are also known as rubrics, and include a scoring method for each item (see Appendix B for a sample).

Question 4: Context. The context was a comparison of rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists to the NASP Domains of Practice, in an effort to determine the extent to which evaluations are aligned with the NASP Domains for school psychologists.

Question 5: Data analysis. This is a content analysis study with reported descriptive statistics. First, the researcher tabulated the number of times each NASP Domain aligned with each state's evaluation rubric, using Microsoft Excel. The researcher noted the frequency of selected NASP terminology from the Domains of Practice and entered them into Excel. The researcher noted rubric items that did not align with the NASP Domains of Practice, and NASP Domains that were not included in state

evaluation rubrics. After this content analysis was completed, the researcher looked for regional differences in school psychologist evaluation. Frequencies and themes were interpreted for further discussion. When trying to decide if a rubric item aligned to a NASP domain, the researcher asked herself if a valid argument could be made linking the two. If the answer was yes, then she coded the item as aligned to the respective domain of practice. Findings were validated by connecting each NASP domain to specific words or phrases in each rubric, so the results were easy to track back to the original sources, the rubrics themselves. The researcher used the NASP Domains of Practice as working guidelines, to aid in fidelity of interpretation. In addition, a second coder coded 10 of the state rubrics, to check for IRR. The second coder was a doctoral student in school psychology who previously worked as a certified school psychologist. Although IRR conflicts with the theory of educational criticism and connoisseurship, which was the overarching framework that guided this research study, it was measured because it is a common method of establishing reliability in educator evaluation. The second coder agreed with the researcher on 90% of the items analyzed in rubrics, as evidenced below, which is a strong level of agreement for qualitative coding (Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3

Second Coder's Ratings

NASP Domains of Practice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Georgia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10/10
Indiana	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10/10
Michigan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	9/10
Nevada	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10/10*
Colorado	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10/10
New Mexico	1	1	X	X	1					1	4/10
Missouri	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10/10
Rhode Island	1	1			1				1	1	5/10
Utah	1				1		1	1	1	1	6/10
South Carolina										1	1/10

*If you include the Additional Standards of Practice (3/10 if you include Compulsory Standards of Practice)

Table 4

Comparison of Researcher and Second Coder's Ratings

Inter-Rated State Rubric	Difference Between Ratings
Georgia	same
Indiana	same
Michigan	same
Nevada	same
Colorado	same
New Mexico	4/10 (SC) versus 9/10 (R)
Missouri	same
Rhode Island	5/10 (SC) versus 7/10 (R)
Utah	6/10 (SC) versus 8/10 (R)
South Carolina	1/10 (SC) versus 2/10 (R)

Descriptive statistics produced by Excel revealed frequencies of NASP Domains and terminology and the degree of alignment to NASP Domains for each state. Finally,

the researcher collected information regarding where the rubric was obtained, if it was mandatory or suggested by the state department of education, if it was a school psychology-specific rubric, and additional notes if they provided context for the rubric.

Question 6: Inference standardization. While it was predicted that the majority of evaluation rubrics would not include all 10 NASP Domains of Practice, the researcher strived to remain open to the possibility that a majority of rubrics would touch on all 10 Domains of Practice.

The researcher chose the specified terminology as a result of her ten years of experience as a classroom teacher, master's degree in educational policy and leadership, principal certification, and her many experiences as a principal intern in Texas and Colorado. In addition, the researcher completed doctoral coursework in school psychology, passed the Praxis exam for school psychologists, completed over 2000 supervised hours as a school psychology practicum student and intern, and currently works as a certified school psychologist at a K-8 school in Phoenix, Arizona. The researcher experienced inconsistent and often perplexing evaluations during her ten years as a classroom teacher; this has created a sense of purpose in evaluating educator evaluations for reliability and validity. Rather than bracketing her previous experience and education in the area of educator evaluation, the researcher utilized the principles of educational criticism and connoisseurship, which was largely developed by Elliot Eisner (Uhrmacher, Moroye, & Flinders, 2016).

Connoisseurship involves the act of using one's senses to make small distinctions during an experience, to increase understanding as a result of experience. Sharing the

knowledge gained through connoisseurship leads to criticism, which is a form of judging various aspects of human experience. Educational critics impart an understanding of the major themes in a topic in education, and the themes guide the reader through their own experience of exploration and research. The theories help place the subject matter into the context of the educational critic's experience. Educational criticism is a type of empirical research, requiring the researcher to interpret the data. Educational critics are willing to provide both an insider's view of a topic as well as an outsider's view of the material. Lastly, educational criticism is not simply about describing and interpreting an area of education, but in evaluating and changing it, as a form of action (Eisner, 1975; Uhrmacher, Moroye, & Flinders, 2016).

As an educator who has been evaluated and certified in three educational roles (teacher, principal, and school psychologist), the researcher has a unique perspective on the nuances of educator evaluation. This experience gave her the confidence to interpret words and phrases in the state rubrics, to determine if they relate to NASP Domains of Practice, or refer to another school role, such as classroom teacher. The researcher's experience with educator rubrics is that they are intentionally vague, which invites a wide range of interpretation and application. Therefore, the researcher allowed for the possibility that the evaluator could apply rubric items to school psychologists in a variety of ways, to inform formative and summative performance appraisals.

Results

This research study involved obtaining a rubric used to evaluate school psychologists from each U.S. state and comparing the rubrics to the NASP Domains of Practice and selected terminology from the NASP Domains of Practice, in order to understand evaluations of school psychologists. A content analysis approach, which allows for the quantification of qualitative data, was employed to better understand the representation of the 10 NASP Domains across state rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists for formative and summative evaluation purposes; identify the predominant themes represented in state evaluation rubrics of school psychologists; and, determine the agreement between predominant themes identified in the evaluation rubrics and the predominant NASP domains.

Demographic Information

A total of 36 school psychologist rubrics were collected from state and local education agencies, and these rubrics comprise the sample for this study. Of the 50 state departments of education that were contacted by email and phone from March 26, 2017 through April 20, 2017, 24 (48%) had a rubric for evaluating school psychologists available. Of those 24 states, 6 (25%); Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Nevada, North Carolina, and Rhode Island) required their school districts to use the specified rubric; the remaining 18 (75%) allowed each school district to decide if they want to use the schoo

psychologist rubric. Twelve (24%) rubrics provided for this study were at the local (school district) level. Table 5 provides detailed information about responses from state and local education agencies.

Table 5

State and Local Education Agencies

State	Did the state DOE reply?	Does the state DOE have a rubric available?	Did a school district reply?	Did a school district have a rubric available?
Alabama	No	Unknown	No	Unknown
Alaska	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Arizona	Yes	No	No	Unknown
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	--	--
California	Yes	No	Yes	No
Colorado	Yes	Yes	--	--
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	--	--
Delaware	Yes	Yes	--	--
Florida	Yes	Yes	--	--
Georgia	Yes	Yes	--	--
Hawaii	Yes	No	No	Unknown

Idaho	Yes	Yes	--	--
Illinois	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Yes	Yes	--	--
Iowa	Yes	Yes	--	--
Kansas	Yes	Yes	--	--
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	--	--
Louisiana	Yes	No	Yes	No
Maine	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Maryland	No	Unknown	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	--	--
Michigan	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	No	No	No
Mississippi	Yes	No	Yes	No
Missouri	Yes	Yes	--	--
Montana	No	Unknown	Yes	No
Nebraska	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Nevada	Yes	Yes	--	--
New Hampshire	Yes	No	No	Unknown
New Jersey	No	Unknown	Yes	Yes
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	--	--

New York	Yes	No	Yes	No
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	--	--
North Dakota	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ohio	Yes	No	No	Unknown
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	--	--
Oregon	Yes	Yes	--	--
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	--	--
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	--	--
South Carolina	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	Yes	--	--
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	--	--
Texas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Utah	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Vermont	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Washington	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	--	--
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	--	--

Four out of 50 (8%) state departments of education never replied, so the researcher does not know for sure if they have a rubric available. Twenty-two out of 50 (44%) state departments of education reported they do not have a rubric for school psychologist evaluation available. Twenty-four out of 50 (48%) state departments of education provided a rubric for this study. Six out of 26 (23%) states had school districts that never replied to the researcher, so it is not known if they had a rubric available. Twenty out of 26 (77%) states had a local education agency that replied to the researcher, and 12 of 26 (46%) provided a rubric for this study. The fact that a state or local education agency did not reply to the researcher for this study does not mean that a rubric was not available, but rather that a rubric was not provided for this study.

Alignment of NASP Domains of Practice and School Psychologist Rubrics

The sample of school psychologist rubrics varied in NASP alignment. Twenty rubrics out of 36 (56%) had criteria that were aligned with all ten NASP domains of practice. These rubrics were from states in the Northeast, Southeast, West, Midwest, and Pacific Northwest regions of the United States. Six states of 36 (17%) had 9 out of 10 NASP Domains represented in their rubrics. Two states of 36 (6%), Utah and Maine, had 8 out of 10 NASP domains represented, and 4 states of 36 (11%) had 7 out of 10 NASP domains represented. Three states of 36 (8%), Iowa, Oklahoma, and Wyoming, had 6 out of 10 NASP domains represented. The state least aligned to NASP domains was South Carolina, with only two NASP domains represented on the rubric. Overall, there did not appear to be regional differences in alignment of NASP domains to rubrics. Table 6 provides a visual representation of alignment of the sample of rubrics.

Table 6

State Alignment with the 10 NASP Domains of Practice

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
AL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
AK	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	7
AZ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
AR	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	9
CA	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	X	7
CO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
CT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
DE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
FL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	9
GA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
HI	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	--	6
ID	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
IL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
IN	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	8
IA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
KS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	9
KY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
LA	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	9
ME	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
MD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
MA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	9
MI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
MN	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	--	X	6
MS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
MO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
MT	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	X	7
NE	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	2
NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
NH	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	9
NJ	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	7
NM	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	8
NY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
NC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
ND	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
OH	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
OK	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	X	6

The most frequently represented NASP domains in the sample included 1 (Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability), 2 (Consultation and Collaboration) 4 (Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills), and 10 (Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice) with 97.22% representation (n = 35). The frequency of NASP domains is summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency of NASP Domain Representation

Domain	N (number of rubrics)	Percentage (%)
1. Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability	35	97.22
2. Consultation and Collaboration	35	97.22
3. Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	34	94.44
4. Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	35	97.22
5. School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	30	83.33
6. Preventive and Responsive Services	24	66.66
7. Family-School Collaboration Services	33	91.66
8. Diversity in Development and Learning	25	69.44
9. Research and Program Evaluation	32	88.88
10. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice	35	97.22

The most frequently used term in the rubric sample was “data,” with 622 instances among the 36 rubrics obtained. “Data” was mentioned at least once in 29 of 36 rubrics (81%). The next most frequent term was “assessment,” with 457 instances noted.

"Assessment" was mentioned at least once in 34 of 36 rubrics (94%). "Collaboration" was next, with 190 instances, mentioned at least once in 24 of 36 rubrics (67%). The complete number of instances of terminology is summarized in Table 8, and the acronyms are explained again in Table 9.

Table 8

State Alignment with Selected NASP Terminology

	ASM	ADV	CLB	COM	CNS	CNT	DAT	DMK	DIV	ECL	PDV	SJT	TCH	TFD
AK	46	1	8	24	17	1	75	7	8	1	11	0	1	0
AR	32	5	6	11	12	0	31	8	0	0	10	0	0	0
CO	19	6	5	7	7	1	23	4	6	0	8	0	8	0
CT	19	0	4	2	0	0	12	1	3	0	0	0	6	0
DE	8	0	2	9	1	0	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
FL	6	1	1	6	0	3	28	3	0	0	2	0	0	0
GA	16	1	22	5	8	1	33	7	14	2	1	0	13	1
ID	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	0	0	0
IL	5	6	0	3	3	1	3	4	0	0	4	0	0	0
IN	20	0	16	0	22	0	34	1	5	0	10	0	2	0
IA	10	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KS	19	1	15	0	21	3	33	3	5	0	10	0	2	0
KY	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
ME	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
MA	43	0	33	23	7	3	33	16	5	0	0	1	0	0
MI	10	0	3	1	4	0	17	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
MO	5	0	3	4	3	0	14	2	1	0	2	0	1	0
NE	6	0	1	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
NV	27	1	16	5	6	0	29	11	11	1	8	0	4	0
NJ	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
NM	5	0	4	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	6	1	0	0
NC	16	0	6	11	4	1	35	2	5	2	10	0	1	0
OK	9	0	0	8	5	0	5	1	0	0	6	0	0	0
OR	26	0	3	12	0	0	8	0	0	0	4	0	5	0
PA	43	1	16	9	22	17	47	2	1	0	9	0	1	0

RI	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
TN	3	0	0	10	7	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
TX	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	15	2	0	1	0	0	0
UT	6	0	1	7	1	0	6	2	3	0	0	0	3	0
VT	5	0	6	2	3	2	11	1	4	0	1	1	4	0
VA	8	0	0	4	2	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	0
WA	5	1	0	1	3	0	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
WI	15	0	10	6	9	2	25	6	6	1	6	0	5	0
WY	11	0	2	1	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	457	33	1079	179	178	35	622	213	80	7	137	3	259	144

Table 9

Terminology and Corresponding Acronyms

Acronym	Terminology
ASM	assessment
ADV	advocacy
CLB	collaboration
COM	communication
CNS	consultation
CNT	continuum
DAT	data
DMK	decision-making
DIV	diversity
ECL	ecological
PDV	professional development
SJT	social justice
TCH	technology
TFD	treatment fidelity

Predominant Themes in Rubrics

As evidenced in the tables above, the most frequent terms in the rubric sample were "data" and "assessment." The least frequent terms were "treatment fidelity," "social justice," and "ecological." The NASP domains most frequently represented in the rubrics were Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability; Consultation and Collaboration; Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills; and Legal,

Ethical, and Professional Practice, as they were referred to at least once in 35 out of 36 rubrics (97%). Therefore, the predominant theme that emerged from this study was Data-Based Decision Making, as the domain and terminology ("data" and "assessment") were the most frequently noted in the sample for this study.

Discussion

Evaluation of school psychologists is critical for many reasons. Many school districts do not have a rubric specific to school psychologists, leading to school psychologists being evaluated with criteria designed for classroom teachers or other staff members. Some school psychologists are not evaluated at all, because no one at their building knows how to evaluate them. The role of the school psychologist varies from state to state, district to district, and school to school, which affects domains of evaluation. In addition, school psychologists can be required to provide student outcome data for their evaluations, which may be difficult to collect and interpret. Lastly, school psychologists are often evaluated by school administrators who are often not trained in school psychology, may not understand the domains of practice, and are unaware of the ethical and professional responsibilities of being a school psychologist.

This suggests that school psychologists are often evaluated on criteria that may not pertain to their training and experiences. In addition, school administrators may have goals that conflict with NASP ethical and professional standards. As mentioned in the literature review, principals prefer educators who have the same teaching philosophy that the principals do (Dunton, 2001; Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014). Therefore, they tend to give higher evaluation scores to teachers who have the same beliefs about how to work

with students. The same thing happens when principals evaluate school psychologists. Further, some principals lean towards admitting all students with academic and/or behavioral difficulties into special education, regardless of whether interventions were appropriate, implemented with fidelity, or successful. Principals may want an IEP in order to remove a student from their schools and place them in alternative settings. Or, principals may push for students to be admitted to special education, because they believe Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions are not strong enough to provide support. This can put pressure on school psychologists to produce results that may not align with professional goals. In addition, administrators are sometimes under pressure to increase numbers of students in special education in order to increase their school funding. Some states pay different amount of money to schools depending on the percentages of students in different eligibility categories. On the other hand, state departments of education often impose caps on percentage of students in special education, and districts may face pressure to increase or decrease their percentage of students in special education, so the district is not punished by the state. The number of students admitted to special education is not an appropriate metric to use when evaluating school psychologists. However, school psychologists are sometimes removed from their positions when they decline to bend to pressure from others. Besides the obvious ethical problem of facing consequences for a professional decision like that, there is the issue of the time needed to conduct initial evaluations, which principals may not be familiar with. Evaluations take time and cannot be rushed just because an administrator has a list of students they want in special education. Principals who evaluate school psychologists typically have the power

to remove school psychologists they do not agree with. This puts school psychologists in an unfair predicament, as they must face the consequences of making unpopular recommendations in special education meetings.

Furthermore, most of the time, principals are unable to identify best practices that lead to academic growth (Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014). Principals might observe school psychologists in special education evaluation meetings, and that observation becomes the basis for evaluation scores. However, what criteria are principals using in the meeting observations? Validity must be questioned, in part, because principals are not trained in the nuances or standards of school psychology. As an example, anecdotally, the researcher successfully navigated a long and contentious evaluation meeting with a student and her mother, and all parties agreed to the school psychologist's recommendation. The principal's feedback consisted of, "don't say 'sort of' in your meetings." Whether this is appropriate feedback or not is a matter of opinion, and that is the very point.: It is not always easy for principals to identify effective school psychologists and appropriate practices. In addition, it may be unfair to the principal to be put in a situation in which they are assumed to be competent to evaluate a wide variety of certified employees, regardless of whether they were trained in each employee's specialized area.

Last but not least, some school psychologists may be admitting students to special education incorrectly, leading to disproportionality in special education. They require appropriate feedback, training, and supervision in order to correct this practice, and admit students to special education appropriately. On the other hand, some school

psychologists may not be admitting students who should be admitted to special education, and these school psychologists also require feedback, training, and supervision in order to make sure students receive the services and specialized supports needed. Appropriate evaluation by certified and experienced school psychologists can remedy this problem.

This paper proposes that rubrics for evaluating school psychologists must be more closely examined so that they reflect the code of ethics they must follow, and the training, education, and experiences they acquire to become a school psychologist. In addition, school psychologists should be evaluated by other school psychologists, preferably those with at least three years of certified experience as a school psychologist, and preferably those who work at the district level, so they can successfully mediate any problems.

NASP Domain and Terminology Representation

The NASP Domains are represented in the rubric sample to varying degrees, as indicated by the frequency counts detailed in Table 5, above. The hypothesis for Question 1 was that a minority of evaluation rubrics for school psychologists would represent all 10 NASP Domains of Practice. However, 20 of the 36 (56%) rubrics had criteria that represented all 10 Domains of Practice. It was correctly predicted that Domain 1 (data) would be represented in most rubrics and Domains 3 (academics) and 4 (social-emotional) would be represented in at least half of the rubrics. However, the prediction that Domains 5 (school-wide) and 9 (research) would be represented in a minority of rubrics was false. Although this data would seem to indicate that many school psychologists are evaluated according to all ten NASP Domains of Practice, the

researcher believes that the number is likely far lower. Most rubrics are not mandatory, and state departments of education were not required to share their rubrics, which may have skewed the data. So, even if the state department has an appropriate rubric to evaluate school psychologists with, there is no guarantee school psychologists will be evaluated with it, in most cases.

Since a majority of rubrics in this sample included all domains of practice, it would follow that most NASP terminology would also be represented in a majority of rubrics. It was predicted that the terms "assessment," "data," "collaboration," "communication," "diversity," "technology," and "professional development" would be represented in the majority of state rubrics. The prediction was true for all terms except for "diversity" and "technology," which were mentioned in 16 of 36 (44%) rubrics. It was also predicted that "ecological" "treatment fidelity," "consultation," "continuum," "decision-making," "advocacy," and "social justice" would be represented in a minority of state rubrics. This prediction was true except for "consultation," which was represented in 26 of 36 (72%) of rubrics, and "decision-making," which was represented in 20 of 36 (56%) rubrics. The fact that data, academics, and social-emotional were evident in at least half the rubrics. This makes sense, as school psychologists are primarily seen as people who use data to support academic and social-emotional progress. However, the fact that many states do not yet recognize the importance of respect for and understanding of diversity in education is highly disturbing, given the increasing representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. education system. Technology was also not a predominant term, which implies that many states have not

yet embraced the marriage of school psychology and computer, mobile, and stand-alone devices and programs. Finally, although consultation was included in a majority of rubrics in this sample, it can take many forms. It is not clear if school psychologists consult to the extent that they could, based on their training.

Overall, the results of this sample of rubrics imply that school psychologists are primarily seen as people who test students for academic and behavioral disabilities, share the information with a group of people, and follow district, state, and federal laws, regulations, and policies. Preventive and responsive services take a backseat to special education evaluations, and school-wide practices are also not as important, according to the rubrics. Most alarming of all, diversity in development and learning is not at the forefront of the rubrics. This is highly concerning, as one cannot appropriately and fairly evaluate any student without first considering the unique factors that have contributed to their development and progress at school. This is a legal and ethical responsibility and cannot be overlooked or emphasized enough. Students are part of a complex web of language, culture, family, resources, and prior education, and these factors affect their progress and behavior at school. Intelligence is a cultural construct, just as the Specific Learning Disability is an educational construct. Context is everything in education, and it must be accounted for.

Predominant Theme in Rubrics

The predominant theme that emerged from this rubric sample, as indicated by the frequency of NASP Domains of Practice and NASP terminology representation, was Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability (Domain 1). It was hypothesized that significant regional differences would become apparent in Domains 4 (social-emotional) and 8 (diversity), with regard to states' evaluation rubrics for school psychologists. However, there were no remarkable differences in representation of NASP domains and terminology between regions of the United States. This suggests that knowledge of NASP domains exists throughout various regions of the United States.

It was also hypothesized that there would not be agreement between the predominant themes identified in evaluation rubrics and the predominant NASP domains, in a majority of the evaluation rubrics. However, Domain 1 was represented in 35 of 36 (97%) rubrics, and the associated terminology (data and assessment) were mentioned in a majority of the rubrics. This final hypothesis was false; there was overlap between the most frequently used NASP terms and the most frequently represented NASP domains of practice, and this overlap provides a clear indication of this theme in rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists. This suggests that school psychologists are primarily seen as people who conduct assessment in order to obtain data. While most psychologists do conduct assessment, many would argue that this is not the most important role of the school psychologist. Indeed, school psychologists are trained in nine other domains of practice and are capable of supporting students in many ways besides testing them.

Implications for Practice

Results of this study indicated that the predominant theme in this sample of rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists in the United States is Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability (NASP Domains of Practice 1). This suggests that the perceived primary responsibilities of a school psychologist, according to this sample, are to collect data through assessment, to inform decisions and accountability. The responsibilities represented the least in the rubric sample were related to diversity, social justice, advocacy, and preventive and responsive services.

School psychologists typically serve as gatekeepers to special education. They decide if interventions were appropriate, implemented with fidelity, resulted in too little progress, and if any external factors affected the student's lack of progress. In many school districts, school psychologists serve as district representatives in special education evaluation meetings; their recommendations overrule all other team members' opinions. In short, school psychologists alone ultimately decide who is admitted to special education and who remains with their general education peers the entire day.

Some school districts use failure to respond to intervention (RTI) as the primary evidence needed for special education eligibility. Other districts require cognitive and academic assessment, which is used to determine if a discrepancy exists between cognitive areas and/or overall cognitive score and areas of achievement, but all methods of special education evaluation include a large dose of clinical judgment. Intervention data and assessment scores can be interpreted in a variety of ways, and it is typically the school psychologist whose opinion matters when the evaluation team is seated in the

conference room. Assessment provides data, but it is up to the school psychologist to decide what the data means, and if it indicates eligibility for special education.

In the 2015 NASP Membership Survey, participants reported they spend more than "quite a bit" of time evaluating students for special education eligibility. In fact, special education evaluations took up more time than any other task or responsibility, according to the 2,654 survey participants (Walcott et al, 2016). This is troubling, as school psychologists are trained and capable in all ten Domains of Practice, not just the first one. Many students need mental health services that school psychologists are qualified to provide, but those students do not receive those services at all. In addition, prevention and intervention can reduce the number of students who require individualized education plans and keep more students in their general education classroom. However, if school psychologists spend most of their time in assessment and special education evaluation, they are not able to prioritize preventive efforts. It is difficult to convince school and district level administrators to evaluate school psychologists in areas other than data collection and assessment if that is seen as their primary responsibility. If school psychologists are seen as people who simply test and place students, they are not staffed in numbers that would allow them any time to do anything else. Indeed, many school psychologists find that if they want to take on additional roles, they must extend the hours they work without additional pay.

The multi-tiered system of supports that school psychologists practice in was designed to reduce the number of students receiving individualized special education plans. It was intended to keep students in their general education classrooms, while also

considering them as individuals with unique learning needs before assuming a disability was the cause of their lack of educational progress. This is why is it concerning that Domain 6, Preventive and Responsive Services, does not play a larger role in school psychologist evaluation rubrics. The role of an effective school psychologist is not simply to admit students to special education, but to make sure they receive the interventions needed to make adequate progress in their curriculum. If school psychologists are not evaluated in these domains, then one can infer that many students are incorrectly admitted to special education, reducing their exposure to their general education classroom.

In addition to preventive interventions and supports, school psychologists must advocate for social justice; diverse and vulnerable students and families; and cultural competence and awareness. It is easy to decide a student with a language acquisition issue is struggling due to a disability, when in fact the obstacle may simply be an issue of language exposure. Students who are exposed to environmental trauma or temporary stress may find themselves at a disadvantage educationally, but this does not mean they have a learning disability. Students who are removed from their general education classroom have less opportunity to socialize with their general education peers, and reduced access to grade level instruction. On the other hand, students who have disabilities require additional services in the educational setting, and they deserve fair and unbiased evaluations, free from prejudice and discrimination. Most of all, school psychologists are tasked with the responsibility of making sure every possible resource is exhausted at every level of inclusion, so students are placed in the least restrictive and

most inclusive setting possible, regardless of how convenient or inconvenient it is for school administrators and staff. These roles must be included in rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists, so they get credit and are retained as a result of their advocacy and inclusive efforts. Leaving this role out sends the message that it does not matter, and school psychologists do not have to serve as advocates for social justice in order to keep their jobs. Also, this role can fall by the wayside if not properly documented and discussed with supervisors, leaving our most vulnerable students and families at risk. This is concerning, as school psychologists must advocate for social justice, diverse and marginalized students and families, and preventive and responsive practices

In addition, this study indicates that evaluation of school psychologists is largely delegated to local education agencies (school districts). School districts locate rubrics and decide who evaluates school psychologists. Only 6 states of this sample require their schools to evaluate school psychologists with a particular rubric, and a majority of states in this sample had no rubric available at all or did not reply to the researcher's request for a rubric. That implies that evaluation of school psychologists is largely unregulated and open to interpretation, possibly by people who are not trained in the roles and responsibilities of school psychologists or are under pressure to increase or decrease the number of students in special education. School psychologists have extensive and specific training in areas principals are not experts in. This often conflicts with knowledge school administrators are trained in. Principals are generally trained to believe they can fairly evaluate all school employees, regardless of whether they were trained in the role they evaluate. While this may be true to different extents for

classroom teachers, this is definitely not the case for school psychologists. For example, principals are usually in charge of discipline, which is an unwanted consequence for a choice a student made. A school psychologist would focus on the conditions and events that led the student to that choice and prevent the student from making a similar choice in the future. These are conflicting solutions to the same problem, and they could be interpreted differently.

The potential lack of validity and reliability of evaluations of school psychologists leaves the door open for issues of liability, particularly if a school psychologist is evaluated by a school principal, with a rubric designed or adapted from one used for classroom teachers. Even more concerning than an inaccurate evaluation is the power dynamic that results from a school administrator having the authority to recommend whether a school psychologist is renewed. There is a great deal of grey area in special education, in which data can be interpreted a variety of ways, leading to a student being eligible for special education, or not. School psychologists need to be able to use professional judgment in deciding how to handle each special education referral, without worrying about professional repercussions.

To confound the issue, there is currently no official guide to best practices in school psychologist evaluation, and no official rubric that school psychologists can advocate for when being evaluated. It is time to create an evaluation framework for school psychologists, so they can be free to make decisions based on what it is best for each child, not what is best for their school or district administrator.

After considering the results of this study and incorporating her areas of expertise, the researcher proposes the following recommendation for a framework for school psychologist evaluation. First, the evaluation must be based on NASP Domains of Practice, with a formula to account for variations in scope of practice. It should be administered by two certified school psychologists with at least three years of experience as a school psychologist; significant discrepancies in ratings are referred to a third evaluator for resolution. Additionally, the evaluation should be administered three times a year, with scores below proficient sent to third rater for verification. Any scores below proficient must be tied to professional development tasks and opportunities during the school year, before the next evaluation takes place. The evaluation should allow the school psychologist to create professional goals for themselves, with opportunities for revision three times a year. The evaluation would require periodic, non-evaluative collaboration with other school psychologists, to discuss problems and questions as they arise. Furthermore, a supplementary domain for school psychologists, self-care, should be included. This will allow school psychologists to cultivate professional boundaries and career longevity. This domain might include considerations such as, "What is the school psychologist doing to take care of their own physical and mental health needs," "How are they advocating for themselves," and "How are they preventing burn-out, and ensuring a long-term career in school psychology."

This framework would ensure ongoing supervision with formative feedback, recurring professional collaboration, and training and professional development. All of these elements ensure that school psychologists are following appropriate steps when

making special education eligibility recommendations. School psychologists can learn from their evaluators and colleagues as they tackle various issues in special education evaluation and work through the nuances of each student's unique situation. This ongoing collaboration can prevent students from being incorrectly admitted to special education or not admitted when they should be, so that all students are able to receive the appropriate supports and services needed to achieve success.

School Psychology Evaluation Impact

The results of this study provide insight to which school-psychologist specific evaluation components are needed and readily implemented. Training programs can use this information to advocate for change in the evaluation criteria and give their students strategies to use when faced with inappropriate evaluations. School districts can use the results of this study to more accurately align their evaluation methods to the assess the full range of domains school psychologists are trained in, and to compare their evaluation criteria to those of other states. State departments of education can use the results of the study to educate their school leaders on the specific needs of one of the professional members in every school building; they can foster awareness of the comprehensive skills and knowledge that school psychologists bring to the administrative table.

Imagine if instead of principals and special education directors untutored in the NASP domains serving as evaluators, school psychologists were used to evaluate each other. In a 2009, an Ohio school psychology internship program required field-based internship supervisors (school psychologists) to evaluate their interns with a 4-point rating scale in six school psychology specific domains (Morrison, Graden, & Barnett,

2009). The use of a profession-specific evaluation process was considered successful, as it communicated the impact and effectiveness of the services provided. Using the results of this current study and the components of a successful school psychology tested rubric, evaluations could be expanded to develop a professional school psychologist's rubric. It is an ethical dilemma when school administrators evaluate personnel who perform tasks the evaluators are not trained in. For example, should a principal who was formerly a Physical Education teacher evaluate a speech pathologist, an art teacher, or a nurse? The common belief in public education is that all certified school administrators are trained and qualified to evaluate the professional performance of all school employees, despite the large amount of research that disproves this practice. It is time to revisit this assumption and close the research to practice gap with regard to evaluation of school personnel.

Study Limitations and Future Directions

Evaluation of school psychologists is an under researched area in school psychology. This study attempted to rectify this matter with an analysis of state rubrics used to evaluate school psychologists. However, there are several limitations to the study that must be considered. Since only 36 states provided a rubric for this study, not all methods of school psychology evaluation were included. There is also a possibility that only the states with a comprehensive and well-constructed rubric offered to share their rubric for this study, and the states that did not share a rubric did not have a comprehensive rubric for school psychologists available, which would further skew the validity of the data.

In addition, the research methodology did not allow for every possible rubric to be collected from each state; just one rubric was collected per state, and that one rubric may not accurately represent evaluation of school psychologists in the entire state, due to variation between school districts. Considering the emphasis on local control in education – meaning that in most states, each school district can decide how to evaluate their school psychologists, and no requirement exist regarding the types of rubrics to use – the information in this study is likely not a representative picture of the state of school psychology rubrics in the U.S. In addition, the 36 rubrics in the sample for this study are comprised of 24 rubrics provided by state departments of education and 12 rubrics provided by school districts. Since there are two separate sources for this sample (state education agencies and local education agencies), the sample data may be skewed. A future study could separate the rubrics provided by state departments of education from the rubrics provided by local education agencies, and tabulate the data separately, to better understand any similarities and differences.

Another limitation to this study is that interpretation of rubrics is a subjective activity, as some of the terminology in the rubrics can mean different things to different people, just as some of the NASP domains can be viewed in various ways in various contexts. In order to establish inter-rater reliability, a doctoral student at the University of Denver rated ten of the state rubrics against the NASP Domains of Practice. This student was chosen to be the second rater because she was knowledgeable about the field of school psychology, had worked as a school psychologist for many years, and had taken coursework in research methods, so would likely understand the importance of the task.

The approach and theory of educational criticism and connoisseurship, which informs the methodology for this study, does lend itself to using a second rater to establish inter-rater reliability. Educational critics believe other people's views of information, data, and experience is not important, and it is the critic's view that is. The educational critic's way of seeing experience, content, and information leads to action and educational change. However, the researcher was aware that inter-rater reliability is a key component of education evaluation, and she thought it would be interesting to see how the researcher's perceptions of rubrics would align with someone else's. These are two different perspectives and approaches to educational criticism and change, but they were brought together for the purpose of this research study.

Out of the ten states rated by the doctoral student, six received identical ratings to this researcher. Out of the four rubrics that did not receive identical ratings, three had a different of two or less. Out of the 100 domains rated on ten rubrics, the second rater scored identically on 90 of them, for a 90% overall agreement on ratings. While this indicates the ratings used for this research study are valid and reliable, overall, the data collected in this study lends itself to a number of quantitative analyses. Future research could include running a cluster analysis on frequency of terms by region, for example. Another content analysis study could involve looking for terminology and themes that are not related to the NASP Domains of Practice and noting their frequency in each rubric.

Considering the importance of appropriate methods of evaluation, more studies examining rubrics, criteria, and training alignment is warranted. While this study did not specifically tabulate rubric items that did not align with the NASP Domains of Practice,

the researcher noted that four states (Connecticut, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas) provided rubrics that had items not aligned to NASP domains. In particular, the Connecticut rubric mentioned effective routines and transitions, which is more appropriate for a teacher rubric. The Oklahoma rubric mentioned using appropriate discipline, and the Tennessee rubric referred to managing student behavior/modeling performance. The Texas rubric referred to customer service and adhering to productions benchmarks. These items are not tasks typically associated with school psychology. Future research could examine why school psychologists are evaluated on responsibilities not usually associated with school psychology. Other possibilities for future research include exploring training and certification of the school administrator who evaluates school psychologists, possibly through a national survey for school psychologists. The survey could ask school psychologists if they are evaluated with a rubric specific to school psychologists, or one that is designed for teachers or other instructional support personnel. Recommendations for additional studies may include a national survey regarding evaluation of school psychologists, developing guidelines for the evaluation of school psychologists, and creating a school psychology specific evaluation framework.

Conclusion

School psychologists deserve valid, reliable, and appropriate evaluations by people who are trained and knowledgeable in the domains of practice to promote professional growth, responsible personnel decisions, and effective service delivery. School psychologists have been largely neglected in the millions of dollars of research spent on educator evaluations, but they serve one of the most vulnerable and important

populations. It is time to make mental health services a priority in education, instead of an afterthought. Results from this study provide foundational information to begin the building of appropriate local and national policies and procedures regarding evaluation of school psychologists. This study informs these policies by revealing the lack of appropriate rubrics available at the state level and lack of consistency of rubric alignment to NASP Domains of Practice. In addition, this study explains why school psychologists should not be evaluated by people who do not understand what they do and how much time it takes and are not bound to the same ethical code.

While most states have a rubric that is aligned with NASP Domains of Practice and the NASP Practice Model according the sample for this research study, the predominance of local control in education means there is no guarantee that school psychologists are being evaluated with rubrics specific to school psychology. School districts do not like being dictated to, and state departments of education do not generally like to impose mandates on local education agencies. In addition, there is no guarantee that school psychologists are being evaluated by certified and trained school psychologists, leading to possible misinterpretation of rubric criteria. Inaccurate evaluations can lead to incorrect personnel decisions, such as loss of employment, loss of pay, or loss of promotion. Even more worrisome is the lack of professional development and growth that results from a lack of accurate and authentic formative assessment data.

Evaluations are intended to provide feedback that informs future professional development activities, career goals and changes, effectiveness, collaboration, and ability to better serve our diverse student population. It is time to create and mandate a NASP-

aligned and NASP-endorsed rubric, to be used for all school psychologist evaluations throughout every state, administered by certified and experienced school psychologists. School psychologists deserve appropriate feedback that utilizes their strengths to improve their ability to serve students, and students and families deserve school psychologists who are able to help all students achieve success.

REFERENCES

Abernathy, T.V., Forsyth, A., & Mitchell, J. (2001). The bridge from student to teacher: What principals, teacher education faculty, and students value in a teaching applicant. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 28*(4), 109-119. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/62270072?accountid=14608

Allbritten, D., Mainzer, R., & Ziegler, D. (2004). Will Students with Disabilities Be Scapegoats for School Failures? *Educational Horizons, 82*(2), 153-160. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.du.idm.oclc.org/stable/42927144

American Educational Research Association. (2015). AERA statement on use of value-added models (VAM) for the evaluation of educators and educator preparation programs. *Educational Researcher*, *44*(8), 448-452. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x15618385

American Statistical Association. (2014). *ASA statement on using value-added models for educational assessment*. https://doi.org/10.1080/2330443x.2014.956906

Aragon, S. (2017). *This response was prepared for Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Supervisor, Nevada Department of Education*. Retrieved from Education Commission of the States website:

https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/79th2017/Exhibits/Senate/EDU/SEDU1064S.pdf

Asmar, M. (2016, March 22). Colorado supreme court to hear Denver teachers' lawsuit challenging "mutual consent" | Chalkbeat. Retrieved from http://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/co/2016/03/21/colorado-supreme-court-to-hear-denver-teachers-lawsuit-challenging-mutual-consent/#.V_Zc7ZMrKT8)

Bell, C.A., Gitomer, D.H., McCaffrey, D. F., Hamre, B.K., Pianta, R.C., & Qi, Y. (2012). An argument approach to observation protocol validity. *Educational Assessment, 17*(2), 26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2012.715014

Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). *Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest region. issues & answers. REL 2007-no. 030*. Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest. 1120 East Diehl Road Suite 200, Naperville, IL 60563. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/62051055?accountid=14608

Callister Everson, K., Feinauer, E., & Sudweeks, R.R. (2013). Rethinking teacher evaluation: A conversation about statistical inferences and value-added models. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(2), 349-370. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.83.2.m32hk8q851u752h0

Cherry Creek Schools. (2015). *July 2015 through June 2016 teachers' salary schedule* (4141). Retrieved from http://www.cherrycreekschools.org/HumanResources/Employees/Policies/teachers/4141%20Salary.pdf

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2016). Development process. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/

Council for Exceptional Children. (2012). *The Council for Exceptional Children's position on special education teacher evaluation*. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991304500308

Danielson, C. (2012). Observing Classroom Practice. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(3), 32-37.

DeNisco, A. (2013). Training for Tragedy. *District Administration*, *49*(2), 45-47.

Donaldson, M.L., & Papay, J.P. (2012). *Reforming teacher evaluation: One district's story*. Center for American Progress. 1333 H Street NW 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1322239413?accountid=14608

Doherty, K., & Jacobs, S. (2013). *Connect the dots: using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice*. National Council on Teacher Quality.

Dunton III, J.C. (2001). Selection criteria used by high school principals in Virginia when hiring first-year career and technical education teachers.

Eisner, E. W. (1975). *The perceptive eye: Toward the reformation of educational evaluation*

Eklund, K., Renshaw, T. L., Dowdy, E., Jimerson, S. R., Hart, S. R., Jones, C. N., & Earhart, J. (2009). Early identification of behavioral and emotional problems in youth: Universal screening versus educator-referral identification. *California School Psychologist, 14*, 89-95. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03340954

Felton, E. (2016, May 27). Miami Teachers Look to Sue District Over Merit Pay Raises – Teacher Beat - Education Week. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/2016/05/miami_teachers_merit_pay_raises.html

Gallagher, A. H. (2004). Vaughn elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 79-107. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327930pje7904_5

Gelzheiser, L. M. (2009). Preparing for the Future of School Psychology: A Special Educator's View. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, *19*(3), 259-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903106455

Gilman, R., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Perceptions of school psychological services by education professionals: Results from a multi-state survey pilot study. *School Psychology Review, 33*(2), 271-286. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/219645864?accountid=14608

Goe, L., & Holdheide, L. (2011). *Measuring teachers' contributions to student learning growth for nontested grades and subjects*. Retrieved from National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality website: http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/MeasuringTeachersContributions.pdf

Gonzalez, J.E., Nelson, J.R., Gutkin, T.B., & Shwery, C.S. (2004). Teacher resistance to school-based consultation with school psychologists: A survey of educator perceptions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 12*(1), 30-37. https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266040120010401

Greene, L.L. (2010). *Principals' attitudes about school psychological services: a qualitative study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Rutgers, New Brunswick, NJ.

Grossman, P., Loeb, S., Cohen, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). Measure for measure: The relationship between measures of instructional practice in middle school English

language arts and teachers' value-added scores. *American Journal of Education, 119*(3), 445-470. https://doi.org/10.3386/w16015

Grossman, P., Cohen, J., Ronfeldt, M., & Brown, L. (2014). The test matters: The relationship between classroom observation scores and teacher value added on multiple types of assessment. *Educational Researcher, 43*(6), 293-303. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x14544542

Hanushek, E.A., & Rivkin, S.G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *The American Economic Review*, *100*(2), 267-271. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.267

Harris, D. N., Ingle, W. K., & Rutledge, S.A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(1), 73-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213517130

Harrison, P. (n.d.). Continuing professional development: A foundation for the future of school psychology. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/communique/issues/volume-38-issue-5/continuing-professional-development-a-foundation-for-the-future-of-school-psychology

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": A forum of state special education and teacher effectiveness experts and researchers. forum summary*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Washington, DC 20007. Retrieved from http://0-du.idm.oclc.org.bianca.penlib.du.edu/login?url=http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1413416916?accountid=14608

Holdheide, L. R., Hayes, L., & Goe, L. (2014). *Evaluating specialized instructional support personnel*. Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

Holland, P. (2005). The case for expanding standards for teacher evaluation to include an instructional supervision perspective. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*(1), 67-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-006-9009-0

Hynd, G., Pielstick, N., & Schakel, J. (1981). Continuing professional development in school psychology: current status. *School Psychology Review*, *10*(4), 480-486. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/spr/volume-10/volume-10-issue-4/continuing-professional-development-in-school-psychology-current-status

Measuring student growth for teachers in non-tested grades and subjects: A primer. (2010). ICF International. 9300 Lee Highway, Fairfax, VA 22031. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/1826540818?accountid=14608

International Baccalaureate. (2016). University FAQs about the IB | International Baccalaureate® - International Baccalaureate®. Retrieved from http://www.ibo.org/university-admission/recognition-of-the-ib-diploma-by-countries-and-universities/faqs/

Jiang, J. Y., Sporte, S. E., & Luppescu, S. (2015). Teacher perspectives on evaluation reform: Chicago's REACH students. *Educational Researcher, 44*(2), 105-116. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x15575517

Johnson, E., & Semmelroth, C.L. (2014). 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508413513315

Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D.O. (2012). *Gathering feedback for teaching: Combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains. policy and practice brief. MET project*. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. P.O. Box 23350, Seattle, WA 98102. Retrieved from http://0-

search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1347461212?accountid=14608

Klem, A.M., & Connell, J.P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x

Lachlan-Haché, L. (2015). *The art and science of student learning objectives: A research synthesis* American Institutes for Research. 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW, Washington, DC 20007. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/1720064733?accountid=14608

Lay, M.M.(2010). Securing a place at the table: School psychologists as educational leaders. *Communique, 39*(3), 12. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/822507032?accountid=14608

Lazarev, V., Newman, D., & Sharp, A. (2014). *Properties of the multiple measures in arizona's teacher evaluation model. REL 2015-050*. Regional Educational Laboratory West, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20208. Retrieved from http://0-

search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1651828514?accountid=14608

Littleton Public Schools. (2015). *2015-16 licensed salary schedule* (Exhibit B). Retrieved from Littleton Public Schools website: http://www.littletonpublicschools.net/sites/default/files/HR%20Licensed%20Salary%20schedule%20Fall%202015.pdf

Losen, D., Hodson, C., Keith II, M. A., Morrison, K., & Belway, S. (2015). Are we closing the school discipline gap? University of California. Los Angeles. Retrieved from https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/are-we-closing-the-school-discipline-gap

Marshall, K. (2012). Fine-tuning teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 50-53. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1373089224?accountid=14608

Marzano, R.J. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 70*(3), 14-19. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1373086431?accountid=14608

Measuring school effectiveness: Technical report on the 2011 value-added model. technical report. (2014). National Center on Scaling Up Effective Schools. 230 Appleton Place PMB 414, Nashville, TN 37203. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/1773212630?accountid=14608

Mertler, C.A. (1997). *Students as stakeholders in teacher evaluation: Teacher perceptions of a formative feedback model*. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/62537561?accountid=14608

Minke, K. (n.d.). *Performance evaluation and accountability: are you at the table?* Retrieved from National Association of School Psychologists website: http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/communique/issues/volume-39-issue-6/performance-evaluation-and-accountability

Morton, N. (2015, July 9). 15 fired teachers file federal lawsuit against Clark County School District | Las Vegas Review-Journal. Retrieved from http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/education/15-fired-teachers-file-federal-lawsuit-against-clark-county-school-district

Morrison, J.Q. (2013). Performance evaluation and accountability for school psychologists: Challenges and opportunities. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(3), 314-324. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21670

Morrison, J.Q., Graden, J.L., & Barnett, D.W. (2009). Steps to evaluating a statewide internship program: Model, trainee, and student outcomes. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(10), 989-1005. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20439

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2015). *State of the states: evaluating teaching, leading, and learning*. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/StateofStates2015

National Association of School Psychologists. (2016). *School Psychology at a Glance: 2015 Member Survey Results*. Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/.../Membership%20Survey%202015%20Handout.pdf

National Association of School Psychologists. (2016). NASP Practice Model 10 domains. Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-practice-model/nasp-practice-model-implementation-guide/section-i-nasp-practice-model-overview/nasp-practice-model-10-domains

National Association of School Psychologists. (2016). NASP Practice Model overview. Retrieved December 21, 2016, from https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-practice-model/nasp-practice-model-implementation-guide/section-i-nasp-practice-model-overview/nasp-practice-model-overview

National Association of School Psychologists. (2016). Part 1: Individual level: embedding the NASP Practice Model in personnel evaluation. Retrieved from

http://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-practice-model/nasp-practice-model-implementation-guide/section-iv-evaluating-school-psychological-services-utilizing-the-nasp-practice-model/part-1-individual-level-embedding-the-nasp-practice-model-in-personnel-evaluation

National Association of School Psychologists. (2006). *Supporting student success: remedying the shortage of school psychologists*. Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/.../personnelshortages(0).pdf

National Association of School Psychologists. (n.d.). Section IV: evaluating school psychological services utilizing the NASP Practice Model. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-practice-model/nasp-practice-model-implementation-guide/section-iv-evaluating-school-psychological-services-utilizing-the-nasp-practice-model

National Association of School Psychologists. (2012). *A Framework for the Personnel Evaluation of School Psychologists Utilizing the NASP Practice Model*. Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/.../V41N3_AframeworkforthepersonnelEvaluation.pdf

New Mexico Public Education Department. (2017). *School psychologist evaluation rubric*. Santa Fe, NM.

Noakes, L.A. (2009). Adapting the utilization-focused approach for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation, 6*(11), 83-88. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/61895717?accountid=14608

Owens, J.A., Belon, K., & Moss, P. (2010). Impact of delaying school start time on adolescent sleep, mood, and behavior. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*, *164*(7), 608-614. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpediatrics.2010.96

Papay, J.P. (2012). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purposes and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(1), 123-141. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.1.v40p0833345w6384

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers | PARCC. (2016). Test Development. Retrieved from http://www.parcconline.org/assessments/test-design/test-development

PERA. (2016). *Your PERA benefits*. Retrieved from Colorado Public Employees Retirement Association website: https://www.copera.org/sites/default/files/documents/5-5.pdfPeterson, K.D. (1988). Evaluation that accommodates minority teacher contributions. *Urban Education, 23*(2), 133-149. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/63107013?accountid=14608

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263650408863906

Pogodzinski, B., Umpstead, R., & Witt, J. (2015). Teacher evaluation reform implementation and labor relations. *Journal of Education Policy, 30*(4), 540-561. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.999827

Posner, D. (2004). What's wrong with teaching to the test? *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(10), 749. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/62128595?accountid=14608

Prince, C. D., Schuermann, P. J., Guthrie, J. W., Witham, P. J., Milanowski, A. T., & Thorn, C. A. (2009). The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of nontested subjects and grades. *Washington, DC: Center for Educator Compensation Reform.*

Race to the top program executive summary. (2009). U.S. Department of Education.

Rand. (2012). *Value-added modeling 101*. Retrieved from Rand Education website: http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/corporate_pubs/2012/RAND_CP693z4-2012-09.pdf

Rink, J.E. (2013). Measuring teacher effectiveness in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 84*(4), 407-418. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2013.844018

Robinson, M. (2015). The inchworm and the nightingale: On the (mis)use of data in music teacher evaluation. *Arts Education Policy Review, 116*(1), 9-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.944966

Roorda, D.L. (2012). Teacher-child relationships and interaction processes: Effects on students' learning behaviors and reciprocal influences between teacher and child.

Ruffini, S.J., Makkonen, R., Tejwani, J., & Diaz, M. (2014). *Principal and teacher perceptions of implementation of multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems in Arizona. REL 2015-062*. Regional Educational Laboratory West., 730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1651828613?accountid=14608

Scriven, M. (1990). Teacher selection. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers (pp. 76-103). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin. ttps://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986250.n5

Senft, L.B., & Snider, B. (1980). Elementary school principals assess services of school psychologists nationwide. *Journal of School Psychology, 18*(3), 276-282. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(80)90069-2

Sinnema, C.E., & Robinson, V.M. (2007). The leadership of teaching and learning: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4), 319-343. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760701431603

Skalski, S. (n.d.). *Should student achievement data be considered in the evaluation of school psychologists*. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/communique/issues/volume-39-issue-6/badvocacy-in-actionb-should-student-achievement-data-be-considered-in-the-evaluation-of-school-psychologists

Smith, L. (2015, July 23). Teachers terminated based on ineffective evaluation ratings are appealing charges | MLive.com. Retrieved from http://www.mlive.com/news/jackson/index.ssf/2015/07/teachers_appealing_termination.html

Smith, A. (n.d.). Leaders and professional development. Retrieved from http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/communique/issues/volume-41-issue-3/leadership-and-professional-development

Strong, M., Gargani, J., & Hacifazlioğlu, Ö. (2011). Do we know a successful teacher when we see one? Experiments in the identification of effective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110390221

Social Security. (n.d.). Retirement Planner: state and local government employment. Retrieved February 14, 2016, from https://www.ssa.gov/planners/retire/stateandlocal.html

Sulkowski, M.L., Wingfield, R. J., Jones, D., & Coulter, A. W. (2011). Response to intervention and interdisciplinary collaboration: Joining hands to support children's healthy development. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 27*(2), 118-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2011.565264

Uhrmacher, P. B., Moroye, C. M., & Flinders, D. J. (2016). *Using Educational Criticism and Connoisseurship for Qualitative Research*. Routledge.

United States Department of Education. (2017). *Revised state template for the consolidated state plan the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act* (1810-0576).

U.S. Department of Education. (2015, February 25). ESEA flexibility. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Fundamental change: innovation in America's schools under Race to the Top*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/rttfinalexesumm1115.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *N146 – children with disabilities (IDEA) alternate assessment caps file specifications* (7.1). Retrieved from www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/eden/non-xml/n146-7-1.doc

Value-Added Research Center. (2014). *Measuring school effectiveness technical report on the 2011 value-added model*. Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Villarreal, V., Ponce, C., & Gutierrez, H. (2015). Treatment acceptability of interventions published in six school psychology journals. *School Psychology International, 36*(3), 322-332. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034315574153

Waite, Duncan. "Do teachers benefit from supervision." *Educational Supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies* (1997).

Watkins, M., Crosby, E., & Pearson, J. (2001). *Role of the school psychologist: perceptions of school staff*. https://doi.org/10.1177/01430343010221005

Watson, J.G., Kraemer, S.B., and Thorn, C.A. (2009). The Other 69 Percent. Center for Educator Compensation Reform. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Washington, D.C.

Weber, N. D., Waxman, H. C., Brown, D. B., & Kelly, L. J. (2016). Informing teacher education through the use of multiple classroom observation instruments. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 43*(1), 91-106. Retrieved from http://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/1850121174?accountid=14608

Welsh, M. E. (2011). Measuring teacher effectiveness in gifted education: Some challenges and suggestions. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 22*(5), 750-770. https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202x11424882

Whitehurst, G.J., Chingos, M.M., & Lindquist, K.M. (2014). *Evaluating teachers with classroom observations: Lessons learned in four districts*. Brookings Institution. 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20036. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/docview/1697487727?accountid=14608

Appendix A

Data Collection Procedures

State Level

State	Rubric	DOE contact	Reply(s) from DOE	Rub. Req?	Rubric online?
Alabama	No	Emailed 3/26/17 and 4/14/17	Employee replied on 4/14 and referred me to someone else. Emailed 4/18/17 Emailed again on 4/20. Emailed again on 4/21.		
Alaska	No	Emailed 3/26/17	Employee replied on Mar 31 and said there are no rubrics for SP's available or required at the state level.	No	No
Arizona	No	Emailed 3/26/17 and 4/14/17	Each district can evaluate as they want. They emailed a general ed eval rubric to me. Employee emailed me 4/21 and said there are no SP rubrics at state level.	No	No
Arkansas	Yes	Emailed 3/26/17	Employee emailed me back on 3-27-17 and sent the handbook with the rubric used to evaluate school psychs. Schools in Arkansas are required to use the rubric.	Yes	Yes: http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/HR_and_Educator_Effectiveness/TESS/Handbook6-80968.0.pdf

California	No	Emailed 3/26/17	Educator excellence: Districts evaluate as they like. Left ms 4/18/17 Emailed on 4/20. Emailed on 4/21. Employee emailed on 4/24 and said districts create their own rubrics.	No	No
Colorado	Yes	Emailed 4/18/16	Emailed 4/18/17 to ask if the rubric posted on the DOE website is required. They replied it is not on 4/18.	No	Yes https://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/ssppsychologistrubric
Connecticut	Yes	Emailed 3/26/17	Their rubric has to align with state standards if they don't use the rubric on website, according to talent office at CTDOE. So the SP rubric is not required. Called them, as employee never replied to my email.	No	Yes http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/CCT_Rubric_for_Effective_Service_Delivery_2014.pdf
Delaware	Yes	Emailed on 4/18.	Delaware requires the DPAS-II rubric for specialists for school psych evaluation throughout the state, according to employee on 4/21	Yes	Yes http://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib09/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/375/2016_Component_Rubric

					_for_Specialists.pdf
Florida	Yes	Emailed 3/26/17	See email from 4/16. The state DOE provides the Student Services Personnel Rubric for SP evaluation, but school districts are not required to use that particular model.	No	Yes http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7503/urlt/0071808-fsspessm.pdf
Georgia	Yes	Emailed on 4/14/17	They do have one, but it's on the Georgia Association of School Psychologists' website and not the Georgia DOE website. It is not required or mandatory.	No	Yes, sort of http://www.gaspnet.org/resources/Documents/GASP%20SEI%20ver%2010.14.16%20with%20updated%20forms.pdf
Hawaii	No	Emailed on 4/14/17	Left message 4/18/17. Emailed on 4/20. They replied 4/20 and said there were no rubrics for SP's.	No	No
Idaho	Yes	Emailed on 4/14/17	Emailed 4/19/17. They replied 4/19/17. Employee replied 4/20. They said the Danielson framework has a section for SP eval, sent me a 54-page doc of ed regulations in Idaho. I emailed employee on 4/21, asking if the Danielson SP rubric is required or optional. Employee said it is optional on April 24.	No	It's the Danielson rubric, so they can't post it online. (use Danielson SP rubric for Idaho)

Illinois	No	Call	None at state level. Each district makes their own, according to educator effectiveness office. No rubrics available at all at state DOE.	No	No
Indiana	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	State association made a rubric which the state DOE made available to districts and posted online on the Learning Connection on posted on their website. It is not required or mandatory, according to employee on April 17.	No	Yes http://www.iasponline.org/School-Psychologist-Effectiveness-Rubric
Iowa	Yes and not posted anywhere	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17, with the rubric used to evaluate SP's. Emailed them to ask if it's required 4/19/17. They said the rubrics are old and not posted anywhere, but people can email them if they want the rubrics. The rubrics are optional.	No	No-email employee if you want the rubric.
Kansas	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed to ask if the rubric is online 4/19/17. Long convo over phone with employee 4/19. They emailed me the Kansas rubric.	No	No-available through state DOE's teacher licensure and accreditation department by request for now.

Kentucky	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19 Emailed on 4/21 Employee replied 4/21. There is a rubric for SP's, but it may be revised in accordance with new Senate Bill 1 (2017). The SP rubric is mandatory throughout the entire state.	Yes	Yes http://education.ky.gov/teachers/PGES/otherpages/Documents/OPGES%20Framework%20school%20psychologists.pdf
Louisiana	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	They sent me a link about school counselors. I emailed them back, clarifying my request, on 4/18. Employee said there is no rubric for SP's.	No	No
Maine	No	Emailed 4/16/17	Emailed 4/19/17. Emailed 4/19. Employee replied 4/21. No rubrics for SP's.	No	No
Maryland	No	Called. Was told they handle certification, not ed eval.	Left message for employee after being transferred all over the place. Emailed employee on 4/21.		
Massachusetts	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	MSPA rubric available on DOE website. Link is broken but will be fixed this summer. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/rubrics/. The SP rubric is available but not required. Employee emailed me April 18.	No	link is broken but separate website works http://mspa.wildapricot.org/resources/Documents/MSPA_school_psychologist_evaluation_rubric.pdf

Michigan	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19. Employee replied 4/19. No SP rubric available at state level.	No	No
Minnesota	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19/17. No rubrics for SP's at state level.	No	No
Mississippi	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19/17. No SP rubric available at state level.	No	No
Missouri	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19/17. Emailed on 4/21 Employee emailed me back May 8 and provided the rubric link I already had. Said rubrics are optional in their state.	No	Yes- SP assoc site https://maosp.wildapricot.org/Performance-Evaluation-Tools/
Montana	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19.		
Nebraska	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17. No rubric for SP's.	No	No
Nevada	Yes	Emailed 3/26/17	Emailed 4/18. Employee replied 4/18. Once it's approved, the SP rubric will be required throughout Nevada.	Yes	Yes, the state board approved the rubric
New Hampshire	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/18 No rubric for SP's.	No	No
New Jersey	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Left message 4/19. Emailed again on 4/21.		
New Mexico	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	Preliminary rubric available, should be approved within a few	No	No

			months. Employee said the rubric is available but not required.		
New York	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed 4/19/17. Emailed 4/19. They said on 4-21 that there are no SP rubrics available at the state level.	No	No
North Carolina	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/18. Yes, the rubric is required statewide.	Yes	Yes http://ncees.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/School+Psychologists
North Dakota	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/19. They replied 4/20. No rubrics for SP's. Each district on their own.	No	No
Ohio	no	Emailed on 4/16/17	See email 4/17. No SP rubric available at the state level.	no	no
Oklahoma	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17. I emailed them again on 4/19. School districts in OK are allowed to use one of two eval frameworks, and the Tulsa option has a rubric for SP's. Most use the Tulsa model.	no	Sort of: the district that uses the Tulsa model has access to all rubrics via the Tulsa framework online portal.
Oregon	Yes	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17. Yes, a SP rubric is available, and no, it is not required.	No	Yes http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educatoreffectiven

					ess/Pages/EEToolkit-Performance-Rubrics.aspx
Pennsylvania	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	Emailed 4/19. Emailed 4/21. Employee forwarded my request to educator effectiveness, and I followed up, but they never got back to me. Found the rubric, but not sure if it's required.		http://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Teachers-Administrators/Educator%20Effectiveness/Non-Teaching%20Professionals/School%20Psychologist%20Rubric.pdf
Rhode Island	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	School psychologists are evaluated with the support personnel rubric, and it is mandatory if you use the RI eval model.	Yes	Yes http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation/GuidebooksForms.aspx#19331-forms
South Carolina	No	Emailed 4/16/17 then a few others	See employee's email- I have to file a records request. Employee emailed me May 9 to say there are no rubrics for SPs at state level.	No	No

South Dakota	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	Employee emailed me on 4/19. I emailed them back on 4/19. They emailed back on 4/20. The Danielson framework for school psychologists is optional, and schools must purchase it for $30 per school. Even the DOE can't access the rubric.	No	No- schools purchase the Danielson specialty rubrics (including SP's) for $30 per school. The DOE only provides the teacher and principal rubrics, so even the DOE doesn't have access to the school psycholog y rubric.
Tennessee	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17 with a link to the rubric. I emailed on 4/19 asking if it's optional. She replied that it is optional, as there are many eval models that are state board approved.	no	Yes http://tea m-tn.org/wp-content/up loads/201 3/08/TEA M-School-Services-Personnel-2016-17.pdf
Texas	No	Emailed 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/20. Emailed on 4/20. Employee replied on 4/24, and said the TEA does not evaluate school	No	No

			psychologists. Employee emailed on May 5 to say there was no state level rubric for school psychs.		
Utah	No	Called	Emailed on 4/20. Employee replied on 4/24 and sent me a rubric for school counselors. I emailed back on 4/24 and explained that school counselors are different from school psychologists, and asked for a SP rubric. Employee replied and said they don't have rubrics for school psychologists.	No	No
Vermont	No	Emailed 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17. No rubrics at state level.	No	No
Virginia	No	Emailed 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/20. Employee emailed me back on April 20 and said there is no state rubric to evaluate SP's, nor is one being developed.	No	No
Washington	No	Emailed on 4/16/17	Employee replied 4/17. I emailed them back 4/20. Employee does not provide or advocate for a rubric at the state level. No one has asked her for an SP rubric before, so she hasn't looked into it.	No	No
West Virginia	No	Emailed 4/16/17	Emailed on 4/20. Emailed on 4/20. Both emails have bounced back to me. Emailed employee 4/20. They replied 4/20. No rubrics for school	No	No

			psychologists. Employee said the same thing on 4/21.		
Wisconsin	Yes	Emailed 4/16/17	Yes, there is an SP rubric at the state level, and no, districts are not required to use it.	No	Yes https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/sspw/pdf/psschoolpsychrubric.pdf

Local Level

State	First District	Second District	Third District	Rubric
Alabama	Mobile County Schools Emailed May 15	Jefferson County Schools Emailed on May 15	Montgomery County Schools emailed 5/24	no
Alaska	Anchorage School District Emailed May 15 Employee emailed me the rubric May 18, through link on district web site.	Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District Emailed May 15	Fairbanks North Star Borough School District	yes

Arizona	Mesa Unified School District emailed May 15	Tucson Unified School District emailed on May 15	Chandler Unified District #80 emailed May 24	no
California	Los Angeles Unified School District emailed May 15. Employee said they would ask around on May 15. Never got back to me.	San Diego Unified School District Emailed May 15. Employee replied on May 15 and said they don't have an SP rubric.	Long Beach Unified School District Emailed on May 24	no
Hawaii	James Campbell High School Emailed May 15	Mililani High School Emailed May 15	Waipahu High School Emailed May 31	no
Illinois	Chicago Public Schools Emailed May 15 Employee emailed me the SP rubric May 16.	School District U-46 Emailed on May 15. Employee emailed me the rubric on May 18	Rockford School District No. 205	yes
Louisiana	Jefferson Parish Public Schools Emailed May 15	East Baton Rouge Parish Public Schools Emailed on May 15. Employee emailed me back on May 17 and said there was no rubric for SP eval, but they had a professor friend	Caddo Parish Public Schools Emailed on May 24.	no

		who had one for externs.		
Maine	Portland Public Schools Emailed on May 15. Employee sent me Danielson's SP rubric on May 15.	Lewiston School Department Emailed on May 15. Employee replied and said they don't evaluate school psychologists because they are only contracted providers on May 15.	Regional School Unit No. 23 (MSAD 23)	yes
Maryland	Montgomery County Public Schools Emailed May 15 Emailed employee May 24. They replied May 24. Employee replied 5-25 and said they don't have a rubric for SP's.	Prince George's County Public Schools Emailed May 15	Baltimore County Public Schools Emailed employee through district website May 31.	no
Michigan	Detroit Public Schools Emailed May 15	Utica Community Schools Emailed on May 15	Dearborn City School District Emailed me rubric May 25 Emailed May 24	yes
Minnesota	Anoka-Hennepin Public School District Emailed on May 15	St. Paul Public School District Emailed May 15	Minneapolis Public School District Emailed May 31	no

Mississippi	DeSoto County School District Emailed on May 15	Jackson Public School District Emailed May 15	Rankin County School District Emailed May 31. They replied that they don't have one, but just googled it and found some.	no
Montana	Billings High School District Emailed 6-26-17	Missoula County Public Schools Emailed 6-26-17	Great Falls Public Schools Emailed 6-26-17. They emailed on 6-26 and said they didn't have a SP rubric.	no
Nebraska	Omaha Public Schools emailed May 15. Employee emailed me the Omaha rubric May 18.	Lincoln Public Schools emailed May 15. Employee emailed me SP rubric May 15.	Millard Public Schools Emailed May 31	yes
New Hampshire	Manchester School District Emailed May 15	Nashua School District Emailed on May 15	Concord School District Emailed May 31	no
New Jersey	Newark Public Schools Called on 6-27. The employee said call Thursday, as everyone is out now. Called 9-13-17, and they referred me to employee. I called on 9-13-17, but no answer.	Jersey City Public Schools Emailed on 6-27-17.	Elizabeth Public Schools called. Said call back after July 5, when the SP's come back. Transferred me to employee and my message went straight to voicemail on 9-13-17. Employee called on 9-13 and said they use the Danielson rubric.	yes

New York	New York City Geographic District No. 2 Emailed May 15. Left message on May 31. Emailed me back and said they don't work with SP's, and good luck.	New York City Geographic District No. 31 called but no answer.	New York City Geographic District No. 24 Left message on May 31	no
North Dakota	Bismarck School District No. 1 Emailed them through website May 15	Fargo Public Schools- Emailed May 15. Employee emailed me a handbook from Marzano that didn't have a rubric in it on May 15. They said they use the Marzano rubric for SP's but they are not allowed to share it with me. Get permission.	West Fargo Public Schools (called employee, left a message, and never heard back).	No- the rubric I found online seemed wrong for SP's.
Ohio	Columbus City School District emailed on May 15	Cleveland Municipal School District emailed on May 15	Cincinnati City School District Emailed the district through website on 5-31	no
South Carolina	Greenville County School District emailed on May 15. Employee emailed me the rubric used to evaluate SP's	Charleston County School District emailed on May 15	Horry County Schools	yes

	in Greenville on May 15.			
Texas	Houston Independent School District Emailed May 15 Employee sent me the rubric 5-25.	Dallas Independent School District Emailed on May 15 Employee replied May 16- there is no rubric for SP's	Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District Emailed 5/31	yes
Utah	Alpine School District emailed May 15. Employee emailed me back with the rubric for SP's on May 15.	Davis School District emailed on May 15	Granite School District	yes
Vermont	Burlington School District emailed May 15. Employee emailed me May 23 and said they don't have a rubric but would like one, if I can recommend one.	South Burlington School District emailed on May 15. Employee emailed me SP rubric May 15.	Colchester School District	yes
Virginia	Fairfax County Public Schools emailed through their	Prince William County Public Schools emailed May 15	Loudoun County Public Schools	yes

	website May 15 Employee emailed me SP rubric May 19.			
Washington	Seattle Public Schools emailed on May 15. Employee emailed me Seattle rubric on May 17.	Spokane School District emailed on May 15	Tacoma School District	yes
West Virginia	Kanawha County Schools emailed May 15	Berkeley County Schools emailed on May 15	Wood County Schools Emailed May 31. Employee emailed June 1- no rubric for SP eval.	no

Appendix B

Sample Rubric: New Mexico

Domain 1 for School Psychologists:	Planning and Preparation				
Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Exemplary
1a **Demonstrating knowledge and skill in using psychological instruments to evaluate students**	Psychologist demonstrates little or no knowledge and skill in using psychological instruments to evaluate students.	Psychologist uses a limited number of psychological instruments to evaluate students.	Psychologist uses appropriate psychological instruments to evaluate students and determine accurate diagnoses; determines appropriate evaluation instruments based on student needs.	Psychologist uses a wide range of psychological instruments to evaluate students and determine accurate diagnoses; determines appropriate evaluation instruments based on student needs.	Psychologist uses a wide range of psychological instruments to evaluate students and determine accurate diagnoses; determines appropriate evaluation instruments based on student needs; mentors colleagues in appropriate administration of evaluation instruments.
1b **Demonstrating knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopatholog y**	Psychologist demonstrates little or no knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopathol ogy.	Psychologist demonstrates basic knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopatholo gy.	Psychologist demonstrates thorough knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopathology.	Psychologist demonstrates extensive knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopathology ; knows variations of the typical patterns.	Psychologist demonstrates extensive knowledge of child and adolescent development and psychopathology, knows variations of the typical patterns; actively serves as a resource to colleagues and/or community.
1c **Establishing goals for the psychology program appropriate to the setting and the students**	Psychologist has no clear goals for the psychology program, or they are inappropriate	Psychologist's goals for the psychology program are rudimentary and are	Psychologist's goals for the psychology program are clear and appropriate to the setting and the	Psychologist's goals for the psychology program are clear and appropriate to the setting and the age of the	Psychologist's goals for the psychology program are clear and appropriate to the setting and the age of the

served, *if applicable*	to either the setting or the age of the students.	partially suit-able to the setting and the age of the students.	age of the students.	students; have been developed following consultations with students, parents, and colleagues.	students; have been developed following consultations with students, parents, and colleagues; serves as a resource for others in establishing goals for the psychology program.
1d **Demonstrating knowledge of state and federal regulations and of resources both within and beyond the school and district**	Psychologist demonstrates little or no knowledge of governmenta l regulations or of resources for students available through the school or district.	Psychologist displays basic awareness of governmental regulations and of resources for students available through the school or district, but does not have a broader knowledge of resources beyond the district.	Psychologist displays thorough awareness of governmental regulations and of resources for students available through the school or district and some familiarity with resources beyond the district.	Psychologist's knowledge of governmental regulations and of resources for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district and in the community.	Psychologist's knowledge of governmental regulations and of resources for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district and in the community; takes a leadership role in reviewing and revising district policies.

1e **Planning the psychology program, integrated with the regular school program, to meet the needs of individual students including prevention, *if applicable***	Psychologist's plan consists of a random collection of unrelated activities, lacking coher-ence and is not integrated with the regular school program.	Psychologist's plan includes a number of worthwhile activities, but is lacking in alignment to the regular school program.	Psychologist's plan is aligned to the regular school program to meet individual student needs.	Psychologist's plan is based on collaboration with staff and is aligned to the regular school program to meet individual student needs.	Psychologist's plan is based on collaboration with staff and is aligned to the regular school program to meet individual student needs; serves as a resource to others regarding integrating with the regular school program.
1f **Developing a plan to evaluate the psychology**	Psychologist has no plan to evaluate the program or	Psychologist has a rudimentary plan to evaluate	Psychologist's plan to evaluate the program is organized around	Psychologist's evaluation plan is highly sophisticated,	Psychologist's evaluation plan is highly sophisticated,

program, *if applicable*	resists suggestions that such an evaluation is important.	the psychology program.	clear goals and the collection of evidence to indicate the degree to which the goals have been met.	with multiple sources of evidence.	with multiple sources of evidence; continually reviews and revises the plan in an effort to improve the program on an ongoing basis.

Domain 2 for School Psychologists:	The Environment				
Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Exemplary
2a **Establishing rapport with students**	Psychologist's interactions with students are negative or inappropriate; students appear uncomfortable.	Psychologist's interactions are both positive and negative; efforts at developing rapport are partially successful.	Psychologist's interactions with students are positive and respectful; students appear comfortable.	Students seek out the psychologist, reflecting a high degree of comfort and trust in the relationship.	Students seek out the psychologist, reflecting a high degree of comfort and trust in the relationship; assists others in establishing and maintaining rapport with students.
2b **Establishing a culture for positive mental health throughout the school**	Psychologist makes no attempt to promote a culture for positive mental health throughout the school, either among students or teachers, or between students and teachers.	Psychologist's attempts to promote a culture for positive mental health throughout the school, either among students or teachers, or between students and teachers, are partially successful.	Psychologist promotes a culture for positive mental health throughout the school, among students and teachers.	The culture in the school for positive mental health among students and teachers, while actively guided by the psychologist, is maintained by both teachers and students.	The culture in the school for positive mental health among students and teachers, while actively guided by the psychologist, is maintained by teachers, students, parents and community.
2c **Adhering to procedures for referrals**	Psychologist does not adhere to the established	Psychologist is aware of procedures for referrals but does not	Psychologist is aware of procedures for referrals and	Psychologist is aware of procedures for referrals and consistently	Psychologist is aware of procedures for referrals and consistently

	procedures for referrals.	consistently adhere to them.	consistently adheres to them.	adheres to them; offers input regarding referral procedures for continuous improvement.	adheres to them; offers input regarding referral procedures for continuous improvement; serves as a resource for others regarding referral procedures.
2d **Establishing standards of conduct in the testing environment**	No standards of conduct have been established, and psychologist disregards or fails to address negative student behavior during evaluation.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established in the testing environment; attempts to monitor and correct negative student behavior during an evaluation are partially successful.	Standards of conduct have been established for the testing environment; monitors student behavior against those standards; response to students is appropriate and respectful.	Standards of conduct have been established for the testing environment; monitoring of students is aligned to school/district positive behavior supports/strategies.	Standards of conduct have been established for the testing environment; monitoring of students is subtle, preventive and aligned to school/district positive behavior supports/strategies; students engage in self-monitoring of behavior.
2e **Organizing physical space for testing of students and storage of materials**	The testing environment is disorganized and poorly suited to working with students; materials are difficult to find when needed.	The testing environment is inconsistently organized and sometimes suited to working with students; materials are usually available.	The testing environment is well organized; materials are available when needed.	The testing environment is highly organized and is inviting to students; materials are accessible when needed.	The testing environment is highly organized and is inviting to students; materials are readily accessible and do not disrupt the testing of students; serves as a resource to others regarding organizational strategies.

Domain 3 for School Psychologists:	Delivery of Service				
Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Exemplary
3a **Responding to referrals; consulting with teachers**	Psychologist fails to consult with teachers and administrators; fails to respond to	Psychologist consults on a sporadic basis with teachers and	Psychologist consults frequently with teachers and administrators;	Psychologist consults frequently with teachers and administrators; is	Psychologist consults frequently with teachers and administrators; is

and administrators	referrals; fails to secure necessary consent for evaluation (if applicable), and/or completes a hasty evaluation based on student needs.	administrators; responds to referrals when pressed; secures necessary consent for evaluation (if applicable), and/or completes an adequate evaluation based on student needs.	responds to referrals in a timely manner; secures necessary consent for evaluation (if applicable), and completes a thorough and individualized evaluation based on student needs.	proactive in responding to referrals; secures necessary consent for evaluation (if applicable), and completes a highly competent, individualized evaluation based on student needs.	proactive in responding to referrals; secures necessary consent for evaluation (if applicable), and completes a highly competent, individualized evaluation based on student needs; serves as a resource to other staff regarding responding to referrals and consulting with team members.
3b **Evaluating student needs in compliance with National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) guidelines**	Psychologist resists administering evaluations; selects instruments inappropriate to the situation, or does not follow established timelines, procedures and/or guidelines.	Psychologist attempts to administer appropriate evaluation instruments to students but does not always follow established timelines, procedures and/or guidelines.	Psychologist administers appropriate evaluation instruments to students and ensures that all established timelines, procedures and/or guidelines are consistently followed.	Psychologist selects, from a broad repertoire, those assessments that are most appropriate to the referral questions; ensures that all established timelines, procedures and/or guidelines are consistently followed.	Psychologist selects, from a broad repertoire, those assessments that are most appropriate to the referral questions; ensures that all established timelines, procedures and/or guidelines are consistently followed; serves as a resource to others in complying with procedural timelines, procedures and/or guidelines.
3c **Collecting information; maintaining accurate records; writing reports**	Psychologist's records are either nonexistent or in disarray; reports are inaccurate or not appropriate to the audience.	Psychologist collects most of the important information related to student needs; reports are accurate but	Psychologist collects and considers all the important information related to student needs; reports are accurate and appropriate to the audience.	Psychologist collects and considers all the important information related to student needs; reports are accurate, clearly written, and	Psychologist actively seeks important information related to student needs; reports are accurate, clearly written, concise, and

		lacking in clarity and not always appropriate to the audience.		appropriate to the audience.	tailored for the audience.
3d **Actively contributes to Eligibility Determination Team (EDT) and Individualized Education Program (IEP)**	Psychologist does not contribute to the EDT/IEP process.	Psychologist inconsistently contributes to the EDT/IEP process.	Psychologist consistently contributes to the EDT/IEP process.	Psychologist consistently contributes to the EDT/IEP process; consistently collaborates with team members.	Psychologist consistently contributes to the EDT/IEP process; consistently collaborates with team members; serves as a resource to others regarding EDT/IEP process.
3e **Planning interventions to maximize students' likelihood of success**	Psychologist fails to plan interventions suitable to students, or interventions are mismatched with the findings of the assessments.	Psychologist's plans for students are partially suitable for them or are sporadically aligned with identified needs.	Psychologist's plans are aligned to individual student needs.	Psychologist's plans are comprehensive; aligned to individual student needs and based on collaboration with others.	Psychologist's plans are comprehensive; aligned to individual student needs and based on collaboration with others; serves as a resource to others in planning interventions.
3f **Maintaining contact with physicians and community mental health service providers (*when applicable consents are obtained)***	Psychologist declines to maintain contact with physicians and community mental health service providers based on individual student needs.	Psychologist maintains occasional contact with physicians and community mental health service providers based on individual student needs.	Psychologist maintains ongoing contact with physicians and community mental health service providers based on individual student needs.	Psychologist maintains regularly scheduled contact with physicians and community mental health service providers based on individual student needs; shares community based information with educational team.	Psychologist frequently maintains ongoing contact with physicians and community mental health service providers and initiates contacts based on individual student needs; leads educational team in consideration of community based information to

					maximize student success.
3g **Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness**	Psychologist adheres to the plan or program, in spite of evidence of its inadequacy.	Psychologist makes modest changes in the psychology program when confronted with evidence of the need for change.	Psychologist revises the psychology program based on the collection of therapy data at the required timelines determined by the district.	Psychologist continually revises the psychology program based on the collection of therapy data for individual students.	Psychologist continually revises psychology program in accordance with evidence based practices utilizing multiple sources of data across settings for individual students.

Domain 4 for School Psychologists:	Professional Responsibilities				
Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Exemplary
4a **Reflecting on practice**	Psychologist does not reflect on practice, or the reflections are inaccurate or self-serving.	Psychologist's reflection on practice is moderately accurate and objective without citing specific examples, and with only global suggestions as to how it might be improved.	Psychologist's reflection provides an accurate and objective description of practice, citing specific positive and negative characteristics; makes some specific sugges-tions as to how the therapy program might be improved.	Psychologist's reflection is highly accurate and perceptive, citing specific examples that were not fully successful for at least some students.	Psychologist's reflection is highly accurate and perceptive, citing specific examples that were not fully successful for at least some students; draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies.
4b **Communicating with families**	Psychologist fails to communicate with families or communicates in an insensitive manner.	Psychologist communicates with families in an inconsistent and insensitive manner.	Psychologist communicates with families, as required, in a sensitive manner.	Psychologist frequently communicates with families in a sensitive manner.	Psychologist frequently communicates with families in a sensitive manner; reaches out to families of students to enhance trust.
4c **Participating in a**	Psychologist's relationships with colleagues	Psychologist's relationships with	Psychologist maintains positive and productive	Psychologist assumes a leadership role	Psychologist assumes a leadership role

professional community	are negative or self-serving; avoids being involved in school or district events/projects.	colleagues are cordial; participates in school or district events/projects when specifically asked to do so.	relationships with colleagues; participates actively in school or district events/projects.	with colleagues; makes a substantial contribution to school and district events/projects.	with colleagues; makes an extensive contribution to school, district, parents and community events/projects.
4d **Engaging in professional development**	Psychologist does not participate in professional development activities, even when such activities are clearly needed for the development of skills.	Psychologist's participation in professional development activities is limited to those that are convenient or are required.	Psychologist seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need.	Psychologist actively pursues professional development opportunities that are based on an individual assessment of need and students' needs or aligned to district initiatives.	Psychologist actively pursues professional development opportunities and makes a substantial contribution to the profession through such activities as offering workshops to colleagues.
4e **Showing professionalism, including integrity, advocacy, and maintaining confidentiality**	Psychologist displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public; violates principles of confidentiality and fails to advocate for students.	Psychologist either displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public and/or violates principles of confidentiality and/or fails to advocate for students.	Psychologist is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public; serves as an advocate for students and adheres to norms of confidentiality.	Psychologist is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public; serves as an advocate for students and adheres to norms of confidentiality; actively makes others aware of the norms of professionalism and confidentiality.	Psychologist is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public; serves as an advocate for students and adheres to norms of confidentiality; takes a leadership role in school/district/community regarding professionalism and confidentiality.

Note. Rubric was adapted from the New Mexico Public Education Department rubric for school psychologists (2017).