



AMERICAN  
SPEECH-LANGUAGE-  
HEARING  
ASSOCIATION

# Professional Performance Review Process for the School-Based Speech-Language Pathologist

*Ad Hoc Joint Committee of Administration and Supervision and School-Based  
Issues*

Reference this material as: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2006). *Professional Performance Review Process for the School-Based Speech-Language Pathologist* [Guidelines]. Available from [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).

Index terms: performance evaluation, schools

DOI: 10.1044/policy.GL2006-00275

---

© Copyright 2006 American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. All rights reserved.

*Disclaimer:* The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association disclaims any liability to any party for the accuracy, completeness, or availability of these documents, or for any damages arising out of the use of the documents and any information they contain.

## About This Document

These Guidelines are an official statement of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). They were developed by the Ad Hoc Joint Committee of ASHA Special Interest Division 11, Administration and Supervision, and Division 16, School-Based Issues. Members of the group were Trici Schraeder (chair), Sheryl C. Amaral, Susan Bartlett, Susan Floyd, Erin Dyer, DeAnne Wellman Owre, Jeri Berman (ex officio, 2005–2006), and Michelle Ferketic (ex officio, 2006). Vice President for Professional Practices in Speech-Language Pathology (2003–2005) Celia Hooper and Vice President for Professional Practices in Speech-Language Pathology (2006–2008) Brian Shulman served as the monitoring vice presidents. The document was approved by ASHA's Legislative Council on August 31, 2006.

\*\*\*\*

## Background Information and Rationale

This document delineates the process of conducting performance appraisals, or evaluations, of the school-based speech-language pathologist (SLP). A primary purpose of this process is to promote professional growth within a system of accountability; further, professional performance review is considered a core feature of quality assurance. In educational settings, the impetus for quality assurance began with modern school reform, a movement that has progressed in three distinct phases across three decades. The first phase grew out of *A Nation at Risk*, a report published in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education that focused on issues such as lengthening the school year and requiring more academic courses. The second phase began in the 1990s with a shift in focus to strengthening and validating academic standards. The third phase originated from *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (Danielson, 2001; Moore-Brown & Montgomery, 2001; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996). This third phase of the modern school reform movement placed a strong emphasis on defining what constitutes quality educators and became one of the building blocks of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002. NCLB mandated that by the end of the 2005–2006 school year, all public school teachers in the United States must be “highly qualified” for their positions (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Thus, this current phase of educational reform is known as the accountability era.

## Purposes of Professional Performance Review

The four major purposes of professional performance review are (1) quality assurance, (2) professional development, (3) performance improvement, and (4) feedback (ASHA, 1993; Danielson, 2001). However, the only purpose “recognized by legislators and policymakers is quality” (Danielson, 2001, p. 12).

**Quality Assurance.** The quality of the evaluation instrument influences the quality of the performance review. Implementations of NCLB and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 have mandated the use of evidence-based practice and accountability by administrators, teachers, and specialists, including SLPs. Many schools have adopted union-negotiated evaluation instruments for performance review. Typically, these instruments used for evaluating classroom teachers have not reflected the unique roles and responsibilities of the SLP, which include prevention, identification, assessment, evaluation, and re-evaluation of communication disorders, differences, and delays; development of individualized educational plans (IEPs) or individualized family

service plans (IFSPs); and caseload management, intervention, counseling, transition services, dismissal, supervision, documentation, professional leadership, research, advocacy, and accountability (ASHA, 2000). Because of the limitations of general assessment tools or protocols used for teachers, it was necessary to create a performance review instrument that could adequately address the professional competencies and workloads that are unique to SLPs in the school setting. For the sake of quality assurance, the Professional Performance Review Process was developed as a mechanism for evaluating the performance of school-based SLPs.

Throughout the country, educational systems have struggled with designing and implementing appropriate appraisal systems that include a component designed to enable teachers and specialists to improve their skills. Frequently, SLPs are not evaluated by someone who has been trained, certified, or licensed in the same discipline. School-based SLPs are often evaluated by an immediate supervisor, principal, or administrator who may not be aware of the various roles and responsibilities that the school-based SLP is required, by federal, state, or local mandates, to perform. In such cases, ASHA (1993) recommends that a self-reflection exercise be incorporated into the performance review process:

The 1993 position statement on professional performance appraisal (ASHA, 1993) stated that professional performance appraisals of SLPs and audiologists engaged in the delivery of clinical services should include an assessment of the clinical skills unique to the employee's profession. This component of the performance appraisal should be conducted by people who hold ASHA certification (and licensure where appropriate) in the employee's professional area. In cases in which organizational structure precludes adoption of this position, participatory approaches (peer evaluations and/or self-evaluations) should be instituted as components of the performance appraisal process.

The need for a comprehensive, user-friendly professional performance review instrument tailored for the school-based SLP is long overdue.

**Professional Development.** Research suggests that “professional development plays a key role in addressing the gap between teacher preparation and standards-based reform” (Birman et al., p. 28). An effective professional performance review has the power to inform practitioners and performance evaluators as to where to direct their professional development efforts. School districts must be committed to professional development. This is underscored by a statement from the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities: “Unless professional development is an integral part of a school district's strategic plan, it cannot meet the learning needs of all students” (2000, p. 1). In this era of soaring costs and shrinking school budgets, judicious selection of professional development activities is essential. Few would disagree that SLPs need to learn about current research on learning, but as demands increase, professional development time is a precious commodity (Magestro & Standord-Blair, 2000). While SLPs are expected to participate in building-level, district-level, or other interdisciplinary professional development initiatives, they also require release time and funding to pursue discipline-specific learning that will result in increased knowledge and skills.

**Performance Improvement.** Performance improvement is cited as another positive outcome of an effective performance review. Performance improvement is best achieved when the practitioner feels empowered, as summarized in the work of Freire (1972, 1985) and Giroux (1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1986), who point out that an empowerment perspective has been one of the basic tenets of teacher evaluation. “This perspective purports that change is best accomplished when individuals and groups are free to look critically at what they are doing. The evaluation processes should help participants join together in a quest for an understanding of teaching” (Gitlin & Price, 1992, p. 61). The focus of performance improvement may vary greatly from professional to professional. For example, the SLP who is completing a clinical fellowship is likely to have a very different focus for performance improvement from the SLP who has many years of experience. A veteran professional may need to focus on acquiring new clinical knowledge and skills to meet challenges unique to his or her workload. As an example, an experienced school-based SLP may need to expand his or her repertoire of strategies for meeting the needs of students with communication disorders who have rare syndromes, low-incidence disabilities, degenerative health conditions, or atypical life experiences. Thus, a performance review exercise must be flexible and responsive to the needs of the individual professional from novice to expert.

**Feedback.** According to Cain (2001), approximately one third of the teaching force across America completing a second year of service does not return for a third year. Many of these disillusioned professionals lose their perspective because they lack feedback. Cain (2001) continues, “The situation has become serious enough that centers dedicated to the renewal of teachers have sprung up in several states, and more are in the planning stage” (p. 703). He identified 10 qualities of a renewed practitioner (2001):

1. a philosophical center;
2. a commitment to students, lifelong learning, and school;
3. an awareness of being an integral part of the school;
4. a sense of personal responsibility;
5. a love of life that encompasses his or her professional life;
6. the ability to see all people as individuals;
7. the ability to communicate;
8. a sense of collegiality;
9. a strongly developed sense of leadership; and
10. the ability to separate ego from work.

Feedback may facilitate the growth and development of these 10 characteristics. “By receiving feedback from multiple sources, educational leaders can reassess their skills, address their weaknesses, and become more valuable to their schools and districts” (Dyer, 2001, p. 35).

Combining a self-reflective process with elements of feedback from an outside evaluator may be the solution to developing a professional performance review process that is relevant for school-based SLPs and also useful for their evaluators. Use of the Professional Performance Review Process, as described in this document, garners all the positive outcomes cited by Cain, Dyer, and Danielson and also ensures that the ASHA position statement on professional performance appraisal (ASHA, 1993) is upheld. Research on the appraisal process shows strong

### The Role of Self-Reflection in the Professional Performance Review Process

**Formative Process  
and Summative  
Process**

support for incorporating a self-reflective component into the professional performance review process (Brown, 2000; McCarthy, 2003; Saras, 2003; Vega-Barachowitz, 2003).

Research on teaching over the past two decades has shown that effective practice is linked to inquiry, reflection, and continuous professional growth (Brown, 2000; Harris, 1998; McCarthy, 2003; Saras, 2003; Vega-Barachowitz, 2003). The *ERIC Digest* (Ferraro, 2000) reviews the concept, levels, techniques, and benefits of reflective practice. It offers a historical overview of reflective practice and how it may benefit teacher professional development, both for pre-service and in-service teachers: "In 1987, Donald Schon introduced the concept of reflective practice as a critical process in refining one's artistry or craft in a specific discipline" (p. 1). He recommended reflective practice as a way for beginners in a discipline to recognize consonance between their own individual practices and those of successful SLPs. As defined by Schon, reflective practice involves considering one's own experiences thoughtfully in applying knowledge to practice while being coached by professionals in the discipline (Schon, 1996). Reflective practice can be a beneficial form of professional development at both the pre-service and in-service levels of teaching. By gaining a better understanding of their individual teaching styles through reflective practice, teachers can improve effectiveness (Ferraro, 2000). Stones (1994) proposed three important elements for reflection to happen: (1) practical experience, (2) a meaningful knowledge base, and (3) interaction with others. The Professional Performance Review Process incorporates all three.

The Professional Performance Review Process is a formative process as well as a summative process in an objective, improvement-oriented format. Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus (1971) were the first authors to define the terms *formative process* and *summative process* in the educational arena. They described a formative process as "the use of systematic evaluation in the process of curriculum construction, teaching, and learning for the purpose of improving any of these three processes" (p. 117). The concept continues to be advocated. As stated by Howard and McCloskey, "formative evaluation provides a structure for individualized professional growth through a process of self-assessment, goal setting, and feedback" (2001, p. 48). Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus described a summative process as "the type of evaluation used at the end of a term, course, or program for purposes of grading, certification, evaluation of progress, or research on the effectiveness of a curriculum, course of study, or educational plan" (1971, p. 117). The concepts of formative and summative assessment processes have been advanced by ASHA's Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA) and Council For Clinical Certification (CFCC; ASHA, 2001). Together, they form a platform for assessing an individual's acquisition of skills and knowledge believed to be necessary for achieving competency in the areas of preventing, assessing, and treating communication disorders.

Based on this foundation, that is, the combination of the formative and summative procedures, the Professional Performance Review Process uses a two-phased approach to evaluating school-based SLPs. The first phase comprises a formative process during which the SLP conducts a self-study of his or her own knowledge and skills relative to performance indicators for fulfilling the roles and

responsibilities of an SLP in educational settings. Here the SLP rates his or her own level of performance using a scale that ranges from 0 to 3, progressing from *not applicable* (0) to *I believe this is an area of strength* (3). The individual then evaluates the resulting patterns or trends of this self-evaluation, recognizing areas of strength and deficiencies, and proceeds to develop a plan for addressing them.

The second phase of the performance review is a summative process. The SLP and the outside evaluator—for example, a principal, administrator, or director of special education—engage in open dialogue and participate in an on-site observation or conference where information gathered from all forms of evaluation results in the completion of a one-page performance summary using a 0–5 rating scale. The second phase may be conducted initially with a peer for additional formative growth and then with the outside evaluator as the summative exercise. The one-page performance summary rating system may serve as—

- a framework to be used during a conference in the absence of an observation;
- a means to document four separate observations that focus on specific aspects of performance;
- a cumulative record of four separate, comprehensive reviews throughout a school year;
- a supplement to a school district's standard assessment instrument that is applied to all its educators;
- a complement to an evaluation instrument that has been union-negotiated and is already in use in a district; or
- a format that is consistent with the local school district's policy regarding performance reviews.

The combination of the outcomes from phase 1, using the lengthier self-assessment protocol, and phase 2, using the shorter, one-page performance summary, may provide the SLP with specific information for creating a professional development plan and/or artifacts for a portfolio.

### **Five Steps of the Professional Performance Review Process**

The Professional Performance Review Process consists of a two-phase, five-step procedure that includes self-reflection, self-rating, role definition, open dialogue, and observation and/or conference with evaluator feedback. It comprises a formative as well as a summative assessment by the individual school-based SLP and/or an outside evaluator (e.g., CF supervisor, mentor, peer educator, special educator, regular educator, principal, consumer, administrator, or other appropriate evaluator). The five-step process gives the SLP the opportunity to engage in self-reflection, self-rating, and self-initiated modification of practice before initiating an open dialogue with an outside evaluator. It enables clear definition of roles and expected outcomes preceding relevant and focused dialogue between the evaluator and the individual whose performance is being assessed. The opportunity for the SLP to confer jointly with his or her evaluator is compatible with Danielson's observation that, “As part of many districts' new teacher evaluation systems, educators are building in multiple opportunities for professional conversation. Educators recognize that such conversation promotes reflection on practice and mutual learning” (2001, p. 15).

**Step 1: Self-Reflection.** The school-based SLP first reviews the Self-Reflection Professional Performance Review Instrument performance indicators and the 0–3-point rating scale. Then he or she reflects on the meaning of each performance indicator as it relates to his or her own roles, responsibilities, and workload activities.

**Step 2: Self-Rating.** The SLP considers his or her strengths, challenges, and needs while rating himself or herself using Professional Performance Review Instrument performance indicators. The rating scale ranges from 0 to 3, progressing from *not applicable* (0) to *I believe this is an area of strength* (3).

**Step 3: Role Definition.** The SLP sets up an on-site observation and/or conference with the outside evaluator, who could be a CF supervisor, mentor, peer educator, special educator, regular educator, principal, administrator, or other designated assessor. The SLP and the evaluator review the steps involved in this assessment process—each defining his or her roles—and discuss the possible use of the outcome(s) of the evaluation.

**Step 4: Open Dialogue.** Following the on-site observation and/or conference, the SLP and outside evaluator discuss the SLP's strengths, challenges, and needs. During this step, the outside evaluator may be informed of the roles and responsibilities of the SLP and his or her total workload. Work samples may be used to provide evidence of quality.

**Step 5: Feedback.** Using the 0–5 rating scale, the SLP and outside evaluator complete the one-page summary of the Professional Performance Review Instrument. Their discussion at this point addresses (1) evidence of quality assurance, (2) ideas for professional development, (3) targets for performance improvement, and (4) feedback for positive renewal. Together, they create a professional development plan, develop a timeline, and identify resources for achieving the planned outcomes. The outside evaluator may even become an advocate for the SLP at this stage of the process; for example, the evaluator may document the need for continuing education funding. Documentation and materials resulting from the Professional Performance Review Process may be incorporated into a professional portfolio.

## Summary

The need for a professional performance review instrument that is designed for the school-based SLP is long overdue. NCLB and IDEA '04 mandate staffing by highly qualified professionals who engage in evidence-based practices. The Professional Performance Review Process described in this document is a two-stage, five-step process designed to achieve four important outcomes: (1) quality assurance, (2) professional development, (3) performance improvement, and (4) feedback for renewal. Educational research has paved the way for the use of new evaluation approaches such as self-reflection, practitioner empowerment, open dialogue, formative processes, and summative evaluations that are conducted using an objective and evidence-based approach. The results of the Professional Performance Review Process may be one component of a more comprehensive, portfolio-based assessment system.

## References

- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1993). Professional performance appraisal by individuals outside of the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2000). Guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of the school-based speech-language pathologist. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). *Guidelines for developing formative assessment plans for implementation of new standards for the Certificate of Clinical Competence*. Retrieved May 12, 2005, from [www.asha.org/about/credentialing/accreditation/CAA\\_Formative\\_Assess.htm](http://www.asha.org/about/credentialing/accreditation/CAA_Formative_Assess.htm).
- Birman, B., Desimone, L., Porter, A., & Garet, M. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership*, 57(8), 28-32.
- Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T., & Madaus, G. F. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, J. C. (2000, June). Costs and benefits of reflective supervision. *Asha Administration and Supervision*, 15-18.
- Cain, M. S. (2001). Ten qualities of the renewed teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 702-705.
- Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 58(5), 12-15.
- Dyer, K. (2001). The power of 360-degree feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 58(5), 35-38.
- Ferraro, J. M. (2000). Reflective practice and professional development. *ERIC Digest (ED449120)*. Retrieved May 12, 2005 from [www.ericdigests.org/2001-3/reflective.htm](http://www.ericdigests.org/2001-3/reflective.htm).
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, United Kingdom: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. Amherest, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1985a, September). Intellectual labor and pedagogical work: Rethinking the role of teacher as intellectual. *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 20-32.
- Giroux, H. (1985b, May). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. *Social Education*, 49, 376-379.
- Giroux, H. (1986, January). Critical pedagogy and the resisting intellectual. *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*, 3(2), 84-97.
- Gitlin, A., & Price, K. (1992). Teacher empowerment and the development of voice. In Glickman, C. (Ed.), *Supervision in transition* (pp. 61-74). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Harris, A. (1998). Effective teaching: A review of the literature. *School Leadership & Management*, 18(2), 169-183.
- Howard, B., & McColskey, W. (2001). Evaluating experienced teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 58(5), 48-51.
- Magestro, P., & Standford-Blair, N. (2000). A tool for meaningful staff development. *Educational Leadership*, 57(8), 34-35.
- McCarthy, M. P. (2003, October). Promoting problem-solving and self-evaluation in clinical education through a collaborative approach to supervision. *Asha Administration and Supervision*, 20-26.
- Moore-Brown, B., & Montgomery, J. (2001). *Making a difference for America's children*. Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* 1983 Washington, DC U.S. Government Printing Office
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (2000). *Professional development for teachers* [Technical report]. Available from: [www.asha.org/about/publications/reference-library](http://www.asha.org/about/publications/reference-library).

- Saras, L. (2003, October). Reflective journals: A tool in a clinical supervision model. *Perspectives on Administration and Supervision, 11*, 25-26.
- Schon, D. A. (1996). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stones, E. (1994). Reform in teacher education: The power and the pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45*, 310-318.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *New No Child Left Behind Act flexibility: Highly Qualified Teachers fact sheet*. Retrieved May 12, 2005, from [www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/teachers/hqtflexibility.html](http://www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/teachers/hqtflexibility.html).
- Vega-Barachowitz, C. D. (2003, June). Review of the reflective practitioner. *Perspectives on Administration and Supervision, 11*, 14-15.

**Appendix A Self-Reflection Professional Performance Review Instrument for the School-Based Speech-Language Pathologist**

Name of speech-language pathologist: \_\_\_\_\_ Period of review: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name and title of evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of review with evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Assignment and location: \_\_\_\_\_ Length of time employed in this setting: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sources of information for this performance review: \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose of the Review (check all that apply) \_\_\_\_\_ Self-evaluation \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor review \_\_\_\_\_ Peer review

**Current Roles & Responsibilities**

<p><b>Roles:</b></p> <p>_____ Case manager</p> <p>_____ IEP team member</p> <p>_____ Administrator</p> <p>_____ Mentor/supervisor (CF, other)</p> <p>_____ Advocate</p> <p>_____ Member of IEP team</p> <p>_____ Member of committees: (school or schoolwide)</p> <p>_____ Other</p>	<p><b>Responsibilities:</b></p> <p>_____ Assessment</p> <p>_____ Screening</p> <p>_____ Intervention</p> <p>_____ Prevention</p> <p>_____ School duties (hall, bus, lunch, recess)</p> <p>_____ Consultation</p> <p>_____ Transition services</p> <p>_____ Pre-referral intervention</p> <p>_____ Collaboration with regular education</p> <p>_____ Preparation of third-party billing</p> <p>_____ Research</p> <p>_____ Continuing education</p> <p>_____ Other:</p>
--	--

**Workload**

Hours per month spent in the following categories of service/activities:

<p>1. Direct service to students in the district</p> <p>_____ Screening:</p> <p>_____ Assessment:</p> <p>_____ Intervention:</p> <p>Total:</p>	<p>2. Related services</p> <p>_____ Scheduling:</p> <p>_____ Observation:</p> <p>_____ Consultation:</p> <p>_____ Collaboration:</p> <p>_____ Curriculum development:</p> <p>_____ Preparation:</p> <p>_____ Co-teaching:</p> <p>_____ Team meetings:</p> <p>_____ IDEA documentation:</p> <p>_____ IEP development:</p> <p>_____ Data collection:</p> <p>_____ Medicaid documentation:</p> <p>_____ Transition services:</p> <p>_____ Supervision:</p> <p>_____ Other:</p> <p>Total:</p>	<p>3. Professional activities and responsibilities</p> <p>_____ Faculty meetings:</p> <p>_____ School duties:</p> <p>_____ PTO meetings:</p> <p>_____ School/district in-service:</p> <p>_____ Continuing education:</p> <p>Total:</p>
--	---	--

**Total Workload Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of hours of service provided (average per week)**

<p>_____ Inclusion:</p> <p>_____ "Pull-out" sessions:</p> <p>_____ Classroom intervention (non-IEP):</p>	<p>_____ Teacher/parent conferencing:</p> <p>_____ Private/charter schools (off campus):</p> <p>_____ Other (e.g., general education support):</p>
--	--

**Caseload size and distribution:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Current number of students
- \_\_\_\_\_ Average per week during school year

Level	No. of Students	Individual	Group	Severe	Moderate	Mild	No. of Sessions per Month
Birth-3							
Preschool							
K-4th Grade							
5th-8th Grade							
9th-12th Grade							
18-21							

**Composition of the current caseload:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Articulation/phonology
- \_\_\_\_\_ Fluency
- \_\_\_\_\_ Voice and/or resonance
- \_\_\_\_\_ Hearing
- \_\_\_\_\_ Swallowing
- \_\_\_\_\_ Receptive & expressive language
- \_\_\_\_\_ Social aspects
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cognitive aspects
- \_\_\_\_\_ Augmentative/alternative communication

Rating scale: 0 = N/A; 1 = I believe I need more information and practice in this area; 2 = I believe this skill is emerging satisfactorily; 3 = I believe this is an area of strength					
Skill	0	1	2	3	Comments
<b>A. Prevention</b>					
1. Promotes healthy lifestyle practices for the prevention of conditions that result in communication disorders in education settings					
2. Fosters others' awareness of communication disorders and their prevention					
<b>B. Identification</b>					
1. Screening					
a. Administers, scores, analyzes, and interprets results of screening protocols accurately					
b. Makes appropriate recommendations					
2. Assessment					
a. Case history					
i. Obtains information from a variety of sources, including interviews, file review, questionnaires, checklists, and minutes of meetings to gather relevant information					
ii. Relates case history information to purpose and outcomes of evaluation					
3. Evaluation Protocols					
a. Includes assessment strategies that are nondiscriminatory and are based on evidence-based practice or scientific principles					
i. Uses tools, protocols, and strategies that are the most current and evidence-based					
ii. Strategies and tools are related to the population(s) served.					
iii. Rationales for protocols are inclusive of evidence-based practice and theoretical principles.					
iv. Protocols are culturally and linguistically sensitive.					

<p>4. Evaluation procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Administers standardized measures according to the directions outlined by the tests themselves</li> <li>b. Supplements standardized measures with:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. classroom observations</li> <li>ii. curriculum-based activities (i.e., authentic tasks)</li> <li>iii. dynamic assessment procedures</li> <li>iv. other educationally relevant measures that are aligned with academic standards of the setting</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Scores data accurately from all standardized assessment procedures</li> <li>d. Scores data accurately from all other sources</li> <li>e. Analyzes and interprets information from standardized assessment measures</li> <li>f. Analyzes and interprets information from all other measures and sources</li> </ul>					
<b>C. Evaluation</b>					
<p>1. Integrates results from all assessment information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Integrates all results from the evaluation process and develops diagnostic impressions</li> <li>b. Constructs a developmental profile</li> <li>c. Develops a functional needs profile</li> </ul>					
<p>2. Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Collaborates with members of the educational team to synthesize information from the evaluation to determine:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. if there is a disability and its level of severity</li> <li>ii. the extent of its impact on learning</li> <li>iii. eligibility for speech, language, and/or hearing services</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					
<b>D. Intervention</b>					
<p>b. Contributes to the IEP process to ensure due process and access to free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment for the student</p>					
<p>1. Development of intervention plans (i.e., IEPs, IFSPs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Collaborates with the educational team to create curriculum-based intervention plans that include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. educationally relevant and measurable long-term goals</li> <li>ii. educationally relevant and measurable short-term goals or benchmarks related to the goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Chooses service delivery model(s) that meets the needs of individual students</li> </ul>					
<p>2. Service delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prepares for intervention sessions thoroughly by:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Organizing materials</li> <li>ii. Selecting/adapting materials, equipment, devices to meet students' needs</li> <li>iii. Incorporating academic/instruction/curriculum into intervention strategies to achieve communication goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Accommodates students' unique learning styles</li> <li>c. Develops strategies for students' successful participation in the classroom/curriculum</li> <li>d. Provides sufficient and effective learning opportunities</li> <li>e. Constructs culturally, linguistically, and developmentally appropriate learning activities</li> <li>f. Uses instructional language that is consistent with students' comprehension levels</li> </ul>					

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. Uses teaching strategies to enhance students' participation and learning in the curriculum (e.g., pacing presentation, providing feedback, redundancy, behavior management)</li> <li>h. Enables students to develop self-monitoring skills</li> <li>i. Provides efficient and effective service delivery and maximizes available time to:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. achieve students' optimal time-on-task</li> <li>ii. promote students' progress</li> </ul> </li> <li>j. Promotes generalization as an outcome of intervention</li> <li>k. Makes referrals for other services when necessary (audiology, medical, psychology, social, and vocational services)</li> </ul>					
<p>3. Theory-practice relationship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Selects and defends intervention strategies using evidence-based practice and theory related to the populations served</li> <li>b. Understands theoretical models of intervention (sociolinguistic, developmental, ecological, etc.)</li> <li>c. Matches students' needs for services with appropriate intervention models and makes appropriate modifications</li> </ul>					
<p>4. Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Uses data collection systems that are meaningful and manageable</li> <li>b. Collects quantitative data</li> <li>c. Collects qualitative data</li> <li>d. Interprets and uses data to measure progress related to the general education curriculum and other needs related to the student's disability</li> <li>e. Uses data to modify intervention as necessary</li> </ul>					

E. Managerial Skills					
1. Devises and maintains an efficient and effective schedule for meeting roles and responsibilities of a school-based speech-language pathologist					
2. Prioritizes workload					
3. Maintains accurate records					
4. Meets school district's requirements for timely record keeping					
5. Documents clearly and objectively all activities and correspondence relating to children on the caseload					
6. Writes clearly and succinctly with sensitivity to the readers of any written documentation or correspondence					
7. Organizes workspace, materials, and equipment					
8. Follows established guidelines when enrolling, maintaining, or dismissing children from services					
9. Delivers services promptly and consistently					
10. Complies with all state, federal, and local regulatory policies relating to the education of children in a school setting (including knowledge and practice of infection control)					

F. Interpersonal Skills and Professionalism					
1. Speaks clearly, using excellent grammar, syntax, and enunciation					
2. Demonstrates appropriate nonverbal communication skills					
3. Demonstrates active listening skills with others (e.g., teachers, parents, students, and colleagues)					
4. Respects needs and cultural values of others					
5. Maintains professionalism during interaction with others (e.g., teachers, parents, students, and colleagues)					
6. Provides information, counseling, and support to individuals, families, educational teams, and others regarding a student's communication disorder					
7. Creates successful transitions for students through collaboration and communication with others					
8. Demonstrates competence in written and oral communication					
9. Completes tasks, responsibilities, and documentation on time					
10. Is responsive to suggestions and feedback					
11. Maintains confidentiality					
12. Identifies needs and develops a plan for own continuing education					

13. Provides professional development presentations for teachers, parents, administrators, and/or community organizations					
14. Plans and executes a continuing education program for ongoing professional growth					
G. Knowledge of School Culture					
1. Knows and understands the governance of public schools from local, state, and federal levels					
2. Understands how the organization of the district and individual schools affects the education of students					
3. Understands and upholds the rights and responsibilities of students, parents, teachers and other stakeholders in the education process					
4. Understands how the budget process affects the work of the SLP					
H. Supervision (as appropriate)					
1. Clearly defines expectations for the supervisee(s)					
2. Establishes positive working relationships					
3. Provides ongoing support and feedback					
4. Models ethical practices and professional conduct					
5. Responds to concerns in a timely manner					
6. Adheres to schedules for planned observations					

7. Models cultural competence					
8. Conducts regularly scheduled assessments of the supervisees' performance					
9. With the supervisee, makes relevant recommendations for skills that need to be developed, refined, and/or strengthened					
10. Summarizes and documents the outcome of all performance reviews and shares the information with the supervisee					
11. Manages paperwork and documentation effectively					
12. Accepts and nurtures individuality					

## Appendix B Performance Review

Rating scale: 0 = not applicable; 1 = unsatisfactory; 2 = inconsistent; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = strength; 5 = demonstrates excellence				
II. Roles and responsibilities (using the evaluation scale of 0-5)	1 (date)	2 (date)	3 (date)	4 (date)
<b>1. Prevention:</b> a. Educates and collaborates with educators, families, parents, and the community to eliminate or inhibit the onset and development of communication disorders by minimizing risks and exposure b. Coordinates, supervises, and/or conducts screenings Comments:				
<b>2. Identification:</b> Participates in the team process of identifying students who may need assessments to determine a continuum of intervention strategies and/or possible eligibility for special education or related services Comments:				
<b>3. Assessment:</b> Conducts thorough, appropriate, and balanced speech, language, and/or communication assessments using a comprehensive assessment plan. Applies assessment models that incorporate standardized and non-standardized procedures and tools. Collects data using a variety of sources including interviews, curriculum, checklists, portfolios, and observation. Comments:				
<b>4. Evaluation:</b> Interprets data to determine the nature and severity of a student's communication disorder, delay, or difference and its effect on academic and social performance. Summarizes all information relative to the student's history, impairment/disability/handicap, and other factors such as age, attention, cognition, sensory deficits, social/emotional development, and cultural and/or linguistic diversity. Contributes to the process of determining eligibility for services and makes appropriate recommendations to the team. Comments:				
<b>5. Caseload Management:</b> Uses service delivery options efficiently and effectively. Fulfills the duties of case manager as appropriate. Meets responsibilities and obligations to students on the caseload. Follows risk management procedures. Keeps clear and comprehensive records and informs parents and teachers of the students' progress. Comments:				
<b>6. Interpersonal skills and professionalism:</b> Creates a positive learning environment for students and colleagues. Promotes positive interpersonal relationships through open communication, honesty, and respect. Takes responsibility and conducts self in an ethical manner. Advocates for students. Pursues ongoing professional development. Participates in research activities when appropriate. Provides guidance and leadership to school staff. Comments:				
<b>7. Supervision (when appropriate)</b> Assists supervisees/mentees to develop goals for achieving and evaluating skills and knowledge. Evaluates supervisee's skills and knowledge for purposes of periodic performance reviews, completion of certification requirements, and/or professional advancement. Comments:				

III. Summary of evaluation:

IV. Recommendations:

V. Date of next review:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of speech-language pathologist

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of evaluator

## Appendix C Resources Used in Creating the Performance Review & Self-Reflection Instrument

- Alabama Department of Education. (2004). *Alabama professional education personnel evaluation program evaluation summary report—electronic format speech/language pathologist system*. Montgomery, AL: Author.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1993). *Professional performance appraisal by individuals outside the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1999). *Guidelines for the roles and responsibilities of the school-based speech-language pathologist*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). *Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists with respect to reading and writing in children and adolescents: Guidelines*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). *Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists with respect to reading and writing in children and adolescents: Position statement*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2001). *Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists with respect to reading and writing in children and adolescents: Technical report*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2002). *A workload analysis approach for establishing speech-language caseload standards in schools: Guidelines*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2002). *A workload analysis approach for establishing speech-language caseload standards in schools: Position statement*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2002). *A workload analysis approach for establishing speech language caseload standards in schools: Technical report*. Available from: [www.asha.org/policy](http://www.asha.org/policy).
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2003). *A workload analysis approach for establishing speech-language caseload standards in schools: Implementation guide*. Rockville MD: Author.
- Cobb County School District. (2004). *Performance Assessment Instrument for Speech-Language Pathologists* Available from Cobb County School District, 514 Glover Street, Marietta, GA 30060; (770) 426-3300.
- Cumberland School Department. (2004). *Teacher Evaluation Rubric* Cumberland Public Schools, 2602 Mendon Road, Cumberland, RI 02864.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Montgomery County Public Schools. (2004). *Speech Pathologists' Performance Observation Form* Available from Montgomery County Public Schools, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, MD 20850.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2000). *South Carolina System for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching. Performance dimensions for speech-language therapists*. Available from South Carolina Department of Education, 1429 Senate Street, Columbia, SC 29201.
- State of Connecticut Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services. (1999, revised 2000). *Determining eligibility for special education speech and language services*. Hartford, CT: Author. Available from State of Connecticut Department of Education, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106-1630.
- University of Wisconsin—Madison, Department of Communicative Disorders. (2004). *Clinical Skills Learner Outcomes Tracking System*. Madison WI: Author.
- Wake County Public School System. (1989). *Performance Appraisal Criteria: Speech-Language Specialist*. Available from Wake County Public School System, 3600 Wake Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27609; (919) 850-1600.