



Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (BAİBÜEFD)

Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University
Journal of Faculty of Education

2023, 23(3), 1340–1360. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2023.-1194520>



**Determining the Evaluation Methods Used by Special Education Teachers Working with
Individuals with Multiple Disabilities¹**

Çoklu Yetersizliği Olan Bireylerle Çalışan Özel Eğitim Öğretmenlerinin Kullandıkları Değerlendirme
Yöntemlerinin Belirlenmesi

Damla İŞİTAN KILIÇ², **Pınar ŞAFAK³**

Geliş Tarihi (Received): 25.10.2022

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 07.07.2023

Yayın Tarihi (Published): 24.09.2023

Abstract: This research has aimed to determine the views of special education teachers on the evaluation of individuals with multiple disabilities before, during and after teaching. The findings were basically examined under the headings of the most frequently studied areas in the classroom, evaluation methods, cooperation in assessment, fields of difficulty in evaluation, and suggestions for evaluation. It was determined that the methods of family interviews, student observation, rough assessment tools, obtaining information from the previous institution and creating a portfolio were frequently used before, during and after the teaching. Within the scope of the research findings, it has been seen that the most common problems faced by teachers are inability to cooperate with experts and families, children not being physically ready for assessment, insufficient assessment material, lack of professional development, and lack of specialists at school. Within the scope of the research results, it has been thought that the family should be included in a good evaluation process along with the individual with multiple disabilities and the development of the individual should be constantly followed during this process. In connection with the findings of the research, various suggestions were made for parents and teachers.

Keywords: Multiple disabilities, evaluation methods, special education, special education teachers, special needs children.

&

Öz: Bu araştırma çoklu yetersizliği olan bireylerin öğretim öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında değerlendirilmelerine yönelik özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin görüşlerini belirlemeyi amaçlamıştır. Elde edilen bulgular temel olarak sınıfta en sık çalışılan alanlar, değerlendirme yöntemleri, değerlendirmede iş birliği, değerlendirmede güçlük yaşanan alanlar, değerlendirmeye yönelik öneriler başlıkları altında incelenmiştir. Öğretim öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında aile görüşmeleri, öğrenci gözlemi, kaba değerlendirme araçları, önceki kurumdan bilgi alma ve portfolyo oluşturma yöntemlerinin sıklıkla kullanıldığı belirlenmiştir. Araştırma bulguları kapsamında öğretmenlerin en sık karşılaştıkları sorunların uzmanlarla ve ailelerle iş birliğinin kurulamaması, çocukların değerlendirme için fiziksel olarak hazır olmaması, değerlendirme materyalinin yetersiz olması, mesleki gelişim yetersizliği, okulda uzman yetersizliği olduğu görülmektedir. Araştırma sonuçları kapsamında iyi bir değerlendirme sürecine çoklu yetersizliği olan bireyle birlikte ailenin de dahil edilmesi gerektiği ve bireyin gelişiminin bu süreç içerisinde sürekli izlenmesi gerektiği düşünülmektedir. Araştırmanın bulgularıyla bağlantılı olarak araştırma sonunda ebeveynlere ve öğretmenlere yönelik çeşitli önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çoklu yetersizlik, değerlendirme yöntemleri, özel eğitim, özel eğitim öğretmenleri, özel gereksinimli çocuklar.

Atıf/Cite as: İşitan Kılıç, D., ve Şafak, P. (2023). Determining the Evaluation Methods Used by Special Education Teachers Working with Individuals with Multiple Disabilities. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(3), 1340-1360. doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2023.-1194520

İntihal-Plagiarizm/Etik-Ethic: Bu makale, en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve intihal içermediği, araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulduğu teyit edilmiştir. / This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and it has been confirmed that it is plagiarism-free and complies with research and publication ethics. <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/aibuelt>

Copyright © Published by Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University– Bolu

¹ Bu makale 2-4 Kasım 2022 tarihinde yapılan 32. Özel Eğitim Kongresi'nde sözlü bildiri olarak sunulmuştur.

² Sorumlu Yazar: Arş. Gör. Damla İşitan Kılıç, Gazi Üniversitesi, Özel Eğitim Bölümü, damlaisitan@gazi.edu.tr, ORCID [0000-0002-8431-0748](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8431-0748)

³ Prof. Dr. Pınar Şafak, Gazi Üniversitesi, Özel Eğitim Bölümü, apinar@gazi.edu.tr, ORCID [0000-0002-3386-9816](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3386-9816)

1. INTRODUCTION

Multiple disability (MD) consists of a combination of different types of disability, and this combination causes too serious educational needs for students to be placed in special education programs due to only one type of disability (Aksoy & Şafak, 2020; Mansell, 2010). MD refers to a term that covers different types of disability that affect each other. Therefore, there is no single definition for MD (Gargiulo, 2004).

Being affected by different types of disability at different levels and limitations in cognitive and language skills cause difficulties in the evaluation and education of children affected by MD (Narayan, Bruce, Bhandari, & Kolli, 2010; Şafak, 2013, p.101). Evaluation is the information gathering process to make the appropriate decision about the individual with special needs (Levinson & Ohler, 1998). The evaluation process can be organized for different purposes. The tools and methods to be used in the evaluation, where and by whom the evaluation will be made depend on the purpose of the evaluation (Kargın, 2007). Evaluation can be used to determine whether students need help, whether they are making progress according to the applied treatment plan, and to determine the skills to be prioritized in the next stage (Downing, Hanreddy, & Peckham-Hardin, 2018).

Evaluation provides information that leads to effective response planning as well as monitoring changes (Brady et al. 2016). It is important to determine the current development level of the child and to provide the necessary support (Tunçeli & Zembat, 2017). The increase in the number of individuals with disabilities is severe and more studies are needed on the developmental characteristics of MD, its diagnosis processes, and the development of appropriate methods for teaching and assessment (Bahçivancıoğlu Yazıcı, 2009). It has been known that formal and informal evaluation methods are included in the educational evaluation and diagnosis process (Bhat & Bhat, 2019). The use of standardized relative evaluation tools used in formal evaluation in the evaluation of children with MD has long been criticized in the literature (McDonnel, Hardman, & McDonnel, 2003). Researchers state that norm groups determined for standardized evaluations often do not include children with sensory and motor disabilities, so the tests are not fully valid for these children (Venn, 2004). As the evaluation tool reduces the child's participation in the assessment process, the lack of information about the child's development, misdiagnosis, incorrect development profiles of the child, and ineffective programs brought about by such misdiagnosis appear at the end of the assessment process (Narayan & Bruce, 2006).

Norm groups on which standardized relative evaluation tools centered are based on similar variables and assessment environments. Variables such as daily life experiences, individual differences, and differences in sensory, linguistic and cognitive levels affect the results in tests based on standardization (Sisson, Van Hasselt, & Hersen, 1987). For this reason, it is necessary to use a combination of standardized tests, developmental scales and direct observation, interview, skill analysis, environmental assessment in order to obtain an accurate overall assessment of an individual with MD (Rönnberg & Borg, 2001). As in diagnosis, evaluation for teaching should be appropriate for the development of children with MD. Current research and practices create an environment that increases student success in schools and demands stakeholders at all levels of the education system provide accurate and didactically useful information about student performance through assessments. One of the evaluation methods that can be used instead of standardized evaluation is an alternative evaluation model (Sandford & Hsu, 2013). Alternative evaluations aim to facilitate accountability and curriculum access for students with disabilities. In addition, it will be a guide for the development of alternative assessments as a state policy and the determination of variables that affect teacher perceptions in connection with these, designing teacher education programs and supporting methods that can facilitate the achievement of goals (Roach, Elliott & Berndt, 2007). Wehmeyer (2003) recommends curriculum change, increasing curriculum content, and including functional life skills in the curriculum in alternative evaluations to meet students' personal needs, including

individual, self-care, and vocational, within the scope of enabling students with MD to benefit from education programs more actively.

The role of parents and educators comes to the fore in the evaluation of children with MD. It is important that parents and educators/experts come together and plan for the child, taking into account the family's conditions and wishes. In the evaluation process of parents and teachers, it is necessary to collect functional evaluation data, which includes observations of the child with severe and MD (Narayan et al., 2010; Robbins, 1977, p.108-135). Alternative assessments are intended to inform parents, teachers and other stakeholders about the academic development of students with MD. In addition, it has been expected that alternative assessments will facilitate Individualized Education Program (IEP) creation teams to achieve goals by providing better access to the general curriculum (Roach, 2006).

In current studies, determining the current position of children in general education curricula and evaluations, analyzing the practices and adaptations that can be made in education policies can be effective in terms of the limitations expected to be eliminated in this area. In Turkey, there is no evaluation system that addresses the disability group of children with MD among the existing special education programs. It is not possible for these children to be evaluated effectively and appropriately before, during and after the education process, and it is not possible to create adequate suitable educational opportunities for them. For this reason, it is important primarily to determine the evaluations made in the classroom and the opinions of the teachers in order to develop appropriate and inclusive evaluation methods and tools for education. Choosing and using evaluation methods suitable for students' developmental characteristics helps teachers to create a good teaching plan (Sarı, 2019). Also, when considered within the scope of the right to education, benefiting from education equality and opportunity, which is one of the basic rights of children with MD, has been seen as one of the fields that should be worked on in the field of special education and that should be developed and reflected in the policy as soon as possible for these children. In this study, it is aimed to determine the evaluation methods used by special education teachers working with individuals with MD in their classrooms and to present various suggestions to the literature. In this context, the general purpose of this research is to gather information about the evaluation methods teachers use in their classrooms by conducting in-depth interviews with special education teachers working with individuals with MD through semi-structured interviews. This study is important in that it has been the first study to determine the opinions of teachers on the evaluation of individuals with MD. Within the framework of the general purpose of the research, answers to the following questions were sought:

- 1- What are the evaluation methods used by special education teachers working with individuals with MD before, during and after teaching?
- 2- How does the cooperation of special education teachers working with individuals with MD with experts and families in the evaluation process affect the process?
- 3- What are the problems experienced by special education teachers working with individuals with MD regarding evaluation?
- 4- What are the suggestions of special education teachers working with individuals with MD regarding evaluation?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research design

In this study basic qualitative research design was used. Qualitative research involves developing an understanding of how people make sense of their lives, describing this process of making sense, and describing how people interpret the phenomena they experience (Merriam, 2013). Semi-structured interview technique was used as data collection tool. In the semi-structured interview, the researcher

prepares the questions by adhering to the research focus and questions can be shaped during the interview (Glesne, 2013).

2.2. Study group

The participants of this study were determined in accordance with the purposive sampling technique. Purposeful sampling technique is based on the assumption of a sample selection, from which the researcher can learn most about the problem situation he wants to explore and understand (Merriam, 2013, p. 76). The prerequisite is that the participants who will be included in the research have worked/worked with individuals having MD for at least one year. The participants included seven volunteer special education teachers who graduated from special education departments and have worked with MD individuals or who are currently working with MD individuals. The real names of the interviewed participants were not used for the confidentiality of the participants. New names were chosen in the coding in accordance with the real names of the participants. Coding names were preferred instead of giving numbers or shortening the names, with the thought that it would reduce the distance that may occur between the participants and the readers (Glesne, 2013). Demographic information for the participants is given in Table 1.

Table 1.
Demographical Information of Special Education Teachers

Participant Teachers	Age range of teacher	Working year range	Graduation	Studying time with the students with MD	Duration of studying in the present class	Classroom size	Population of the teachers in the class
Şule	41-50	16-20 years	Education of Visual Impairment	1-5 years	3-4 years	4-6	2
Dilek	31-40	11-15 years	Education of Visual Impairment	1-5 years	1-2 years	1-3	1
Pelin	41-50	25+	Education of Visual Impairment	6-10 years	1-2 years	1-3	1
Ayça	24-30	6-10 years	Education of Visual Impairment	1-5 years	3-4 years	7	2
Beril	31-40	11-15 years	Education of Visual Impairment	1-5 years	4-5 years	4-6	2
Cemre	50+	16-20 years	Education of Mental Impairment	11+	3-4 years	4-6	2
Tülin	31-40	11-15 years	Special Education	11+	4-5 years	4-6	2

Participants have stated that their students have diagnoses of intellectual disability, visual impairment, hearing impairment, Down syndrome, autism spectrum disorder, physical disability, learning disability and MD. It was learned that only one of the participants took a course on the education of children affected by MD during their undergraduate education, and one participant took a course on the education of

children with blindness and deafness (seeing/hearing impairment). Other participants received information about MD in special education courses.

2.3. Data collection tools

In the research, semi-structured interview questions were created in order to determine the evaluation methods used by special education teachers working with individuals with MD before, during and after teaching. For semi-structured interview questions, opinions of five experts from the field of special education were got. In line with the opinions of the experts, the interview questions were shaped and rearranged. While the number of interview questions was seven before the expert opinion, the number of questions was reduced to six after the opinion was taken. The arrangement of the interview questions was carried out in the form of removing demographic information questions, developing question statements, and adding questions for suggestions and needs. Before interviewing the teachers in the study, an interview was carried out by a special education teacher working with children with MD for the pilot study. As a result of the pilot application, sentence correction was made in the corrected questions. After their corrections, interviews were started with the special education teachers, who were the determined participants of the study. Interview questions consist of six questions about the areas in which special education teachers working with individuals with MD mostly work with children with MD, the evaluation methods they use before, during and after the evaluation, the effect of cooperation in the evaluation, the difficulties experienced in the evaluation, suggestions and needs.

2.4. Data collection and analysis

After the research was planned and data collection tools were developed, the necessary approvals and permissions were obtained from the Gazi University Assessment and Evaluation Ethics Committee. After obtaining the necessary ethics committee permission, appointments were made with the participants who volunteered for the study in May and June, on the days when they were available. Participants were informed about the research and signed a voluntary consent form containing the research information. Interviews were conducted by the first author remotely/online in the Zoom application. The teachers were informed during the interview that the interviews would be recorded and their consent was obtained. Before the interview, a short conversation was held with the participants. The interview process was initiated when the participants were ready to be interviewed.

The analysis of the data was made with the computer aided qualitative data analysis program Nvivo 12 Plus. The transcription of the audio recordings was made after the interview process with the participants was completed. The shortest interview took 20.14 minutes, the longest one took 44.46 minutes. Average call duration were calculated as 28.05 minutes. While the audio recordings were being recorded, the expressions of the participants were written down as they were. All the data obtained from the study were transferred to the Nvivo 12 Plus program and coding was made for each question in the interview form in line with the answers given by the teachers. While the data were being dumped, certain themes were created and the information was systematically coded. Descriptive analysis method was used to analyze the data of the research. The data accessed by this method are classified, coded and interpreted (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Merriam, 2013). The data obtained can be organized according to the themes that emerged with the research questions and can be analyzed and interpreted by considering the questions used in the interview and observation processes, which are qualitative data collection techniques (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). The purpose of analysis is to establish concepts and relationships that can explain the accessed data. For this reason, connections have been established between data that are basically similar to each other, certain concepts and themes.

2.5. Ensuring validity and reliability

In this study, we tried to ensure validity by reporting the data obtained as a result of the interviews with the participants in detail. In order to ensure internal validity during the formation of the interview questions, a conceptual framework was created by reviewing the relevant literature. In this way, it has been tried to cover the related concepts while making descriptive analysis. The research process (selecting the participants, setting the interview platform, conducting the interviews and data analysis) was explained in detail to ensure external validity in the research process. In order to ensure internal validity, the audio recording and interview transcripts of the interview process were coded and analyzed by two separate researchers. In this context, four different themes were created in line with the opinions of the researchers: evaluation methods, areas of difficulty in evaluation, cooperation in evaluation, and suggestions for evaluation. Interview recordings were listened to again by the practicing researcher who conducted the interviews, and they were checked to evaluate the accuracy of the interview. For the calculations of the reliability ratio, 30% of the interview recordings were selected by random assignment method. Calculation of the inter-coder reliability ratio was made by dividing the number of codes agreed by the researchers by the total number of agreed and disagreed codes. According to the Miles-Huberman model, which is mostly used in qualitative research, the consensus on reliability is expected to be at least 80% (Baltacı, 2017; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Consensus and disagreement were determined, and the mean reliability among researchers was calculated as 98% (range = 90%-100%).

2.6. Ethical permission to research

In this study, all the rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. None of the actions specified under the title of "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, were not carried out. Ethics committee permission information:

Ethics committee permission information:

Name of the committee that made the ethical evaluation: Gazi University Assessment and Evaluation Ethics Committee

Date of ethical review decision: 01.04.2021

Ethics assessment document issue number: 77082166-604.01.02-64589

3. RESULTS

In this section, the findings regarding the answers given by the participants to the questions in the interview form prepared in line with the purposes of the research have been presented. The answers of the participants were examined under the relevant themes. During the interviews, questions were asked to the participants in order. The most frequently studied areas in the classroom created as a result of the analysis of the data, assessment methods, cooperation in assessment, areas of difficulty in assessment, suggestions for assessment were given together with the relevant research questions, respectively.

3.1. Most frequently studied areas

In the research, first of all, information was obtained from the participants about the areas where they work most frequently with their students in the classroom. The purpose of this general question is to identify the areas that teachers prioritize to work before getting information about assessment methods and to establish their relationship with the assessment methods they use. For this reason, the questions were asked to the teachers, which are the areas in which you work most frequently with your students.

Teachers generally stated that they determined different study areas for each student according to their needs. While Dilek teacher, one of the participants, explained that she prioritized communication skills, Ayça teacher prioritized self-care, Beril teacher prioritized communication and independent movement, Cemre teacher prioritized independent movement skills and daily life skills, Tülin teacher prioritized self-care and independent movement skills, Pelin teacher stated that she had tried to follow the academic program in accordance with the level of her class and she additionally had worked on independent movement skills, and Şule teacher stated that she also did academic studies in addition to independent movement due to the performances of the students.

3.2. Evaluation methods

In the study, questions were asked to the teachers about the assessment methods they used before, during and after the teaching. One of the main questions asked is "what do you do to evaluate students?" (before, during, and after teaching). Based on the answers of the teachers, it was determined that family interviews and student observation were the most frequently used evaluation methods. All teachers (Şule, Pelin, Beril, Cemre, Tülin, Ayça, Dilek) have preferred family interview and observation first. Teachers also stated that they use rough assessment tools (Şule, Pelin, Beril, Cemre, Tülin), obtaining information from the previous institution (Ayça) and portfolio creation methods (Ayça, Dilek, Beril).

Teacher Şule made the following statement about the family interview:

"First of all, we conduct family interviews. I usually have family and parent interview forms. I definitely have a family interview form about the phases of the family from the birth of the child to the age when the child comes to my class. I apply family interview forms with them, by using the questions such as at what age the child encountered the type of disability, did it happen during childbirth, how did the family react, which doctors did they go to, where did they apply, or did they go to special education so far."

Teacher Cemre, who thinks that she does family interviews but sometimes families do not give enough information, explained the situation as follows:

"As I said before, parents do not state their performances very clearly from parent interviews. You say something, you know, can he do that? I'm not just speaking for my class anyway. I speak in general because the school has a registration commission, we also participate in that registration commission, I am talking about this in general because I see the students coming in, the parents do not give the performances correctly due to various concerns at work. Sometimes he says 'a yes he can' at work. However, when we look at it, it is clear that the child will not be able to do it, but the parents can make different comments with concerns such as they will not be admitted to the school."

Teacher Ayça, who included the family in the process, explained the method she followed in the form as follows:

"For example, if you are asking what you do before, during and after teaching to evaluate eating skills, I can explain it as follows. Is there a situation that I should pay attention to about the eating habits of getting information from the family beforehand? For example, is there a doctor's report? In other words, I check first whether there is a physiological problem or not. Then I have a conversation with the family about eating skills. Then I want portfolio content about it, so I want videos, I want visuals."

For observation, which is one of the most frequently used methods, teacher Şule said as follows:

"If the student starts the first grade in about one, one and a half months, or if he/she is in the kindergarten, we make an observation period of one month. After observing, we look at the fact that every child's needs are different. For example, in one of my students who started this year, I found that it was more beneficial for him to focus on social skills and Turkish rather than giving too much weight to academic courses. When

I noticed that another student, for example, could not raise his hand or click the mouse, I realized that working on fine motor skills and muscles was much more important to him.”

Dilek teacher also stated the process of using observation as follows:

“I usually include observations and interviews before teaching. For a certain period of time, I make observations by offering opportunities by making adaptations and observing in the natural environment, and I also meet with the parents. After the teaching, there are observation forms that I create according to the steps of the skills I will teach again, and I fill them out from time to time. Here I am preparing forms such as how long he did it, how many times he did it.”

Pelin teacher stated that she uses instant observation regarding skills as follows:

“Observation takes place and this time observation is made. From time to time, you look at it, so how is it in the independent movement, can it find the class? In other words, he could not express himself at that moment, let's see in another period, like a number of people, asking from time to time and getting this performance, this is a preliminary evaluation. When it first comes, let's say once a month from time to time after that, we look at how far ahead and what happened.”

Tülin teacher, who stated that she included the family in the observation process, explained the practice process as follows:

“Since you are always at school with the families, you are in contact with them at every break, you can talk about the evaluation, you can also talk about the teaching process. My teacher says, I want to get help from you, can I enter the classroom and observe? I'm taking class there. We also do this, for example, we also tell the family, what do you need in this child. I always do this. I use this more in natural teaching, what do you need most at home. When this happens, for example, when we cooperate with the family, the child's life also improves.”

Pelin, one of the participating teachers, stated that she used the rough assessment tools she prepared before the teaching as follows: “We have rough assessment tools. In other words, I had my own assessment tool that I prepared since I started teaching.” He later stated that he also made family interviews as follows: “When the student first comes, I also meet with the family. We also have a family interview form with the family. After meeting with the family, we can obtain data about the child by making use of the rough evaluation forms about the academic condition of the child.”

Tülin teacher also stated that she developed materials for rough evaluation and made the following statements: “I create it myself, I create three-dimensional concepts that they can touch and hold. Before, I make a normal evaluation, I put it in front of the child and I want him to give what I want. He did it, he didn't, I mark it or take notes. I draw something general and make an evaluation at the beginning of each semester. I am making an overall assessment of all the work I have worked on during the term.”

Pelin teacher, one of the teachers who shared with her colleagues about the assessment tools and stated that they were doing research on the internet as follows: “We are four friends at vocational school. Which is your rough evaluation tool, what do you use? Can I have a look? Let me see if it's different from mine, we have communication with each other or I'm researching. What Guidance Research Centers use. I am looking at the website of the General Directorate of Special Education. When I find something suitable for us, they download it and I give it to friends.”

Ayça teacher stated that she communicated with the student's previous institution as follows: “I also meet with the teachers in the previous institution. Especially if the child has a pharyngeal problem at work, for example, if he is going to a doctor, I want an opinion letter from the doctor. I want your phone, I'm calling, I'm talking, how I should feed. In other words, the evaluation is not just like taking a checklist and sitting

the child in front of me and giving him a plate of soup and holding his spoon, take it, fill it, swallow it, but whoever is in the child's life and in the support circle until he reaches that point... He becomes his teacher in the rehabilitation center, that is, I am me. Passing time first. I interview these people and then I actually ask for prints and videos to justify these conversations and analyze them."

Drawing attention to the importance of portfolio files, teacher Dilek said: "I have observation forms that I have created according to the steps of the skills that I will teach after the teaching, and I fill them out from time to time. Here I am preparing forms such as how long it takes, how many times he does it. I also prepare a portfolio at the end of the semester. I also share it with their parents. In this way, a document is created in front of me, both the progress of the students and what they have been up to now."

Teacher Beril, who stated that she used video recordings in her portfolio files, explained the method she used as follows: "But I record every teaching I do on video. Besides, the development of the child is recorded as a portfolio for me. Also, maybe there is a mistake I made during the teaching, maybe the child has a reaction that I did not notice, so I record them and evaluate them later. And these are very useful for me at parent meetings. I follow this way in order to show the level of the child, to show the teachings I have done, to show the development of the child."

3.3. Cooperation in evaluation

During the interviews, the teachers were asked the question of how collaborating with the experts in the evaluation methods and evaluation of the general process (before-during-after) affects the process. In line with the answers obtained from the teachers, it was concluded that the process progressed more pleasantly and easily when cooperation was established, but when cooperation could not be established, the process felt difficult and lonely.

Dilek teacher stated that cooperation with other teachers is difficult as follows: "Unfortunately, I cannot talk about cooperation. I work alone. I don't have another teacher with me. But there was last year, and besides me, branch teachers attend classes. Visual arts, music and physical education branches. Unfortunately, I can say that we do not have any cooperation for any evaluation or IEP. Why not? It may be somewhat personal. How can I say, I tried a lot from the beginning, actually, let's set our goals together and evaluate them together, but they convey that they do not have much knowledge and leave it to the special education teacher. Therefore, there is obviously no cooperation and there is not much motivation for us."

Teacher Beril mentioned that other teachers are closed to cooperation and not open to innovations as follows:

"Friends who do not have knowledge are generally more introverted or there may be teacher friends who do not want to work. In other words, when I say those who do not want to work, I mean this, more comfortable, in terms of teaching friends who do not worry about this issue. We are discussing it with our teacher friends who take this issue as a problem in themselves. How do you teach it, what do you play? They even ask me more questions. What are you doing, what can we do about it. We do these kinds of things, but these discussions do not exceed two or three people. It is very limited and there are many teachers who do not want to learn."

Teacher Cemre, who is more advantageous in cooperation with other teachers, stated that she is in a guiding position and explained the process as follows:

"Let me talk about the branch teachers first, we are in communication with the branch teachers every minute in the classroom. I usually plan the training, my friend has been working as my partner for five years. Branch teachers do not know our children as much as we do, frankly, I always make the guidance myself. Here's what I'm saying, if we take this and put that in your IEP, it needs that more. Of course, that's

not the case, it's not like entering their field, no, don't teach it, teach it, of course, we are brainstorming, we are communicating. But rather, I suggest working according to whatever their needs are."

Tülin teacher explained that they created a system that requires students to take classes together on a rotational basis and that requires cooperation as follows:

"When I was working, everyone was teaching in their own class since I started there. No one was communicating with anyone. Then, when I started, I said that this would not be the case, the child should see another teacher in a different environment, I started the common lesson event. It was very nice, other teachers are also in cooperation, they know the student of another class. Here, music, painting, social skills, these are the house of life, and we always do common lessons with other teachers, with classes with children who are suitable for their age groups and have good performance."

All teachers agree that they do not communicate with the RAM staff and that they stay away from communicating with the teachers in order to establish cooperation. Teacher Dilek, who shared one of these views, explained the process as follows:

"We have only communicated through documents when we directed the student to RAM. In other words, there was no demand from the other party or from me in that direction. We fill out the forms with the standard official. The staff at RAM examine and evaluate him, but we do not have any face-to-face or other communication."

Tülin teacher explained her thoughts on cooperation with RAM staff as follows:

"No, people in RAM do not communicate with us in any way. We contact special education teachers, you know, we call them by force, sometimes with physiotherapists as they go to rehab. The special education teacher of any of the children I have worked with has not voluntarily contacted me. I am sending news or putting pressure on the family, please call me..."

When the answers obtained from the interviews are examined, it is seen that the teachers find the evaluation effort of the RAM staff insufficient. In this context, teacher Cemre explained her thoughts as follows:

"...What does she do when we go to RAM, she looks at the type of child, the same doctors do it. He looks at his type, looks at his movements, asks a few questions and thinks, he thinks he exaggerates, sometimes mothers can't describe it correctly, they can't give the performance of the child, but if you give it right, he also thinks that we can't say that he is doing something at work this time, doing things independently. That's why I don't think the assessments there are very accurate."

Stating that she communicated with the RAM staff for evaluation, Ayça teacher made the following statement:

"I mean, I have done this for each of my children. You identified these needs, but based on what? I mean, sometimes something happened in his educational performance, for example, let's say he puts three cubes on top of each other. I've never done it either. I've never seen him do it independently. For example, the gain I will receive for the next term is for my work. But it comes from RAM, for example, that it puts six cubes on top of each other. So there is a difference. I have analyzed and searched for them. I mean, did you see what it showed? I couldn't see it, I couldn't do it independently, do I have a defect? Or is there a job there, let me tell you frankly. So I've questioned this a lot."

3.4. Fields in which difficulties occur

In order to determine the difficulties they experience in the evaluation of the classroom before, during and after the instruction, the question of which subjects do you have the most difficulties in evaluating the

students and in which subjects do you need support to overcome the difficulties you experience was asked. The answers obtained show that there are difficulties in different subjects and that teachers need support in different ways. Teachers also interpreted the difficulties experienced in assessment as general difficulties that they felt their presence in the classroom. Failure to cooperate with experts and families (Ayça, Dilek, Beril, Tülin, Cemre), children not being physically ready for assessment (Ayça), insufficient evaluation material (Cemre, Tülin), lack of professional development (Ayça), lack of specialists at school (Şule) are the difficulties expressed by the teachers. Dilek teacher explained the difficulties as follows:

"There is no such thing as systematic. So no cooperation. For example, I also worked with a partner. If two special education teachers or all teachers working with children do not talk about the same things in that evaluation, do not follow the same path, and have different opinions, it becomes very difficult. Other than that, I can't say that I have had too many difficulties in skill areas. Sometimes it can be difficult with parents. They may not give correct information. They can make their own children look better."

Ayça teacher, who has similar problems with teacher cooperation, used following statements:

"As a special education teacher in Turkey, yes, it is not possible as a special education teacher at the moment. Not everyone accepts this. This is because it takes effort. But when multiple inadequacies are in question, this effort must be expendable anyway. Because we are talking about much, much more special children. We're talking about children who are much more careful and more difficult to get back in case of loss. I mean, of course, it happened to my colleagues who were surprised by this and participated in the process very normally and continued with me. It didn't happen. But if you ask me to rate it, I mean, if I interviewed a hundred people and a hundred experts, maybe twenty of them were like me."

Beril Teacher explained the difficulties she had with families as follows:

"Let me put it this way, not every family is very open about teaching or talking about their child. There are families that are open and there are families that do not exist, but we always tell the families what we are working with with the child. ...we have parents who are not open to communication. This affects evaluation and teaching."

Tülay teacher said that she tried to involve families in the process and had difficulties in doing this as follows:

"If this is normally taught in the home environment, the child will adopt it more quickly because the classroom is a restricted environment. The biggest problem for all children with MD is that they cannot reflect what they have learned in this restricted environment. The cooperation of the family at work is very important here, but as much as I could add, for example, I was forcing these families to take the class."

Expressing that families also differ within themselves, teacher Cemre explained her views as follows:

"Now, let's say we can actually establish a relationship, so we try very hard to establish it, we talk to families, especially on the phone, we talk about them, but there are some problems in families. There are other children besides the disabled child, it is difficult to reach, they have different family dynamics, they have traumas, there are problems with them, but we can communicate very well with some families. This also varies from family to family, there are families where we can be like that, a situation related to the dynamics of the person. We can make very good progress with them."

Stating that professional competence and the support she receives from the field are also important, Ayça teacher explained her views as follows:

'For example, if there is a regulation that I really need as a teacher working in Ministry of National Education, if there is a curriculum and if I do not have sufficient equipment, in terms of a document, If my ministry is not able to present these to me or if it cannot provide me with regular training on these issues

and train me only in this field, of course, I need this the most in the constraints I experience at the point of evaluation. So, first of all, my professional development. I mean, I work with children with MD, yes, but I am a graduate of Gazi University for the visually impaired. For example, I did not graduate from the department of MD.”

Teacher Şule stated that she needed the support of different experts used following statements:

“I do not agree with this, I am a special education teacher, there is no such thing as I know everything. I mean, because I'm really observing, for example, the things that my student who speaks that language get, for example, my interviews did this to me. For example, I bought a book. Language and speech is something that requires extra skill, for example, how language and sound are produced. ... I can't do as much work as language therapists, for example. Or, for example, let's say that the child collapsed on the ground, for example, I have trouble lifting it like this, I wonder if I would intervene incorrectly. For example, I would love to have a physiotherapist in that regard.”

Teacher Cemre stated that she had difficulties with the material by using following words:

“We also prepare our own materials because we do not have materials suitable for children. Now, while I am working with my daughter, while working with my own little daughter, I take various materials and adapt them to those materials, frankly, I differentiate them. I try at home first and then with the kids in the classroom. If we look at other teachers, teachers have a lot of trouble in this sense. As I said I cannot say I am alive, different materials are constantly being revealed in our classroom. We are doing it, we are doing it even momentarily, so we have to do something right away.”

Tülin teacher, who stated that she had a material shortage during the evaluations, made the following sentences:

“Our children have a lot of material shortage. So the materials for these children are very limited. Pre-concept skills, concepts, academic stuff, we have a hard time evaluating them. We make our own materials, but still, as I said, we cannot meet the criteria. That's why we find it difficult to evaluate them. We are now trying to simplify the criterion even more. It's not three-quarters, it's two-quarters or something, because our material limitations are too much...”

Thinking that recording the reactions during the evaluation process and the physical well-being of the students are also important factors for the evaluation process, Ayça teacher explained her views as follows: “In other words, not to skip something you have to fill in certain printed papers. When it comes to children with MD, this can be a bit of a limitation. Apart from that, if he has a physiological ailment, yes, we expect a student with a visual impairment to not be hungry, to be on that day, to have done the toilet at work, and so on. But when there are children with MD, maybe if she didn't wake up happy that day, maybe if the mother did something that was not in her routine at that moment, if she tied her shoes a little tight, that is, if there is no verbal communication, of course all of these are reflected in the evaluation process.”

Pelin teacher stated that she did not have a serious problem with the evaluation as follows:

“So I do not have any difficulties. I am developing my own methods. I ask the family, for example, let's say I'm meeting with the family. I said, I taught these, does he do it at home too? Does he do it himself? I ask them with their feedback, it means I said it here or I taught it here, but it doesn't use it. ...Let's say I evaluate it by asking the family at work or by observing, if it's a skill at work, by asking them to do it independently. If it's academic, let's say I taught addition. Let's say, add this and that, without me getting involved, by doing addition as an exercise, can he or she not?”

3.5. Suggestions regarding evaluation

In the interviews, the participants gave different answers to the question of what would you recommend to your colleagues who have similar problems in eliminating the difficulties experienced in evaluating students. Among the answers are that cooperation should be established with families (Beril), the resources published by the ministry should be used (Ayça), generalization studies should be done, Tülin), cooperation with teachers should be established (Dilek, Ayça), observation should be increased (Dilek, Pelin, Beril, Cemre) , experts should be informed (Cemre).

Emphasizing the establishment of cooperation with families, Beril teacher said as follows:

"It is very important to observe the child, it is very important to meet with the family because such things happen that children with disabilities may not perform well, especially with you. He may not have shown his performance because he was ill. There can be many factors, so first of all, the cooperation with the families should be good. It is necessary to understand well what the child is doing about the question we ask at home and what we want to learn."

Expressing the need for cooperation between teachers, Ayça teacher expressed her thoughts as follows: "For example, what I observed in my colleagues, most of my friends don't even know how to prepare forms. So how do I prepare the evaluation form, which columns and which rows do I really need to include? Here's how I should interpret what I wrote in the comments section. There are friends who came with a field change. They are not aware of this line in the printed sense anyway. To help them, to give their best, to take them to the classroom, to say that's what I'm doing, come and have a look."

Dilek teacher, said as follows on increasing the student observation time for evaluation and teacher cooperation:

"I think that he should increase the observation time a little more. Because I was encountering this. It's classic. If he takes any rough evaluation forms he finds and gives the materials in front of him to the child and does not do it at that moment, he marks it as a minus. This child is like that, you know, he needs to get rid of his prejudices and give that child a little more opportunity. It should increase the observation time. Adaptations must be made. I recommend it and I think it should be open to developments by being a little more collaborative."

In order to increase the observation time, Pelin teacher also stated the following words:

"Sometimes, there are such shy children, let's say he saw us for the first time, so he can't open up because he doesn't know the teacher yet. You think it's something, you think it doesn't know. You see what he knows. So after a while, I think they can open that child with a little patience. (...) So, that would be my advice for them to examine children very well, observe them very well, and find out what they can do. From there, the thing that already exists with support is also revealed. Does the child's self-confidence come, courage comes, something comes out."

Beril Teacher also made similar statements:

"It is very important to observe the child over a long period of time. For example, it would be wrong to say that the child's performance in a week and two weeks, that is, in the first evaluation, is wrong, we need long-term observation. Observations are required in different areas of development. It surprises you so much that the children look at his performance, you say that this child cannot do this, but he does it, for example, a child who is very behind in one area can act very well in another area. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate each area for a long time."

Teacher Cemre talked about both the importance of observation and the tools used:

"As I said, whatever they say to the classroom teachers, their own performance is important, in fact, in order for the child to be able to get good performance and make a good evaluation, first of all, the child must observe the child very well. And he needs to determine the evaluation tools very well. You may also get a wrong result because you give different material that the child does not know at work while evaluating. In other words, the materials you will prepare should be appropriate according to the child's characteristics."

4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, it is aimed to access various information about the assessment methods used by special education teachers working with individuals with MD. As a result of the interviews with the teachers, it is seen that different evaluation methods are used and there are some factors affecting these evaluation methods. It was determined that the methods of family interviews, student observation, checklists, obtaining information from the previous institution and creating a portfolio were frequently used before, during and after the teaching. In terms of the developmental characteristics of students with WB, these methods seem to be the most practical and supportive methods for teaching (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007).

Within the scope of the research findings, it has been seen that the most common problems faced by teachers are inability to cooperate with experts and families, children not being physically ready for assessment, insufficient assessment material, lack of professional development, and lack of specialists at school. These results of the research are similar to the problems experienced by special education teachers working with children with severe and MD carried out by Adıgüzel, Kizir, and Eratay (2017). In the study, it was concluded that there were problems such as insufficient number of experts working in the field, problems in training special education teachers, problems related to materials, problems related to families, inadequacy of teamwork, inadequacy of legal regulations, and problems related to the curriculum.

Within the scope of the findings reached in the study, the necessity and importance of cooperation both during teaching and evaluation are emphasized. It is noteworthy that teachers who will share the educational environment with children with MD should be supported in cooperation (Işıtan & Dayı, 2021). In a study conducted for this purpose, it was seen that the performance feedback given to teacher candidates working with students with severe and MD positively affected the collaborative approach (Dayı, Yılmaz, Özdemir Kılıç & Okyar, 2020). Studies on the cooperation of teachers and families show that both teachers and families experience different difficulties (Yıldırım & Akçamete, 2014). Overcoming these difficulties is important for both parties because the child's environment and therefore his family should be included in the evaluation process. Otherwise, when family members are deprived of the evaluation process, the information obtained may be limited for the performance of the child to be increased. In this case, the educational goals created may not be functional enough (Aksoy & Gönüldaş, 2021, p. 64-65).

Alternative evaluation tools should be developed and used while evaluating the performance of children with WB in the learning process and monitoring their development in the learning process. Bowen and Rude (2006) state that alternative assessments can be used while developing IEP in order to achieve the highest expected success from the child. Alternative assessment is generally designed for students with severe or MD who need an entirely different assessment to demonstrate their knowledge or skill. Alternative evaluation methods include performance evaluation, checklists, observations, individual-centered evaluation, ecological evaluation and portfolio evaluation (Safak, 2018). Although portfolios seem to focus on products, they actually focus on the process (Silberman & Brown, 2005). For this reason, it is thought that the portfolio should be used to monitor the development of children with WB and to obtain information about the process of teaching before and after teaching. When the findings of this study were examined, a limited number of participating special education teachers stated that they used portfolios. In

addition to the portfolio, it is seen that they also benefit from alternative assessment tools such as observation, interview and checklists. While it is positively evaluated that teachers working with children with MD use alternative assessment methods, it is important that other alternative evaluation methods are known and used by teachers.

The material inadequacy expressed in the difficulties experienced by the teachers also affects the evaluation and teaching process. In a study, it has been seen that the graduates of the special education department experience similar difficulties related to the lack of materials in their institutions, the fact that the existing materials are not suitable for special education, and that the missing material is not replaced (Çetin, 2004). In different studies, material deficiency emerges as one of the areas where teachers working with children with MD have difficulties (Adıgüzel et al., 2017). Providing a sufficient number of materials for the quality of assessment and teaching in the school plays an important role in eliminating this difficulty.

As a result, the views of seven special education teachers working with children with MD about the evaluation methods they use, cooperation in assessment, areas of difficulty in assessment, and suggestions for assessment were examined in this study. A good evaluation requires a good evaluation process to reach healthy decisions about both the process and the students. Appropriate decisions should be made regarding the teaching to be carried out by constantly monitoring the student's development during this process. The purpose of the evaluations in the field of special education includes the determination of services for the priority needs of the child with special needs and their families (Kizir, 2020). For this reason, it is necessary to increase the number of studies to determine the needs of teachers, families and children in order to carry out the evaluation processes in a quality way.

Recommendations

In this study, some suggestions are presented based on the opinions of the special education teachers working with children with MD. Considering the importance that family interviews add to the evaluation before and after teaching, it is necessary for the family to participate in the education process of the students. Parents and teachers should cooperate in order to be a source that provides detailed information to teachers about their children and to follow their own children's development. At this point, the teacher should clearly express how the family can be involved in the process and explain what the family can do. In addition to the cooperation of families and teachers, it is also important to establish cooperation between teachers and other specialists dealing with children. Ensuring information exchange about the student concerned can enable the teaching process to progress more effectively.

Student observations should also be recorded in a planned manner by participating in the evaluation process. It can be ensured that the recorded data are used for the purpose in the evaluation process. In addition, alternative assessment methods should be preferred rather than systematic assessment methods for collecting data about the child. Each child's developmental and learning characteristics differ, and choosing the most appropriate assessment method for the child is important in this context. In addition, special education teachers should be provided with the skills to evaluate with alternative evaluation methods through pre-service and post-service training.

Kaynakça / Reference

- Adıgüzel, S., Kizir, M., & Eratay, E. (2017). Ağır ve çoklu yetersizliği (AÇYE) olan bireylerle çalışan özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin yaşadıkları sorunların belirlenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 18(01), 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.296901>
- Aksoy, V., & Gönüldaş, H. (2021). Aileye ilişkin bilgilerin toplanması ve değerlendirme. Cavkaytar, A. (Ed.), *Özel eğitimde aile eğitimi içinde*. Ankara: Vize Akademik.
- Aksoy, V., & Şafak, P. (2020). 573 Sayılı KHK'dan Günümüze özel eğitimde eğitsel tanılama ve değerlendirme: Neredeyiz, nereye gitmeliyiz?. *Turkish Journal of Special Education Research and Practice*, 2(1), 47-67. <https://doi.org/10.37233/TRSPED.2020.0108>
- Bahçivancıoğlu Yazıcı, A. (2009). Çok engelli çocukların annelerinin, çocuklarının gelişimlerine ilişkin görüşlerinin betimlenmesi. Yüksel Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Baltacı, A. (2017). Nitel veri analizinde Miles-Huberman modeli [Miles-Huberman model in qualitative data analysis]. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Bhat, B. A., & Bhat, G. J. (2019). Formative and summative evaluation techniques for improvement of learning process. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences* 7(5), 776-785.
- Bowen, S. K., & Rude, H. A. (2006). Assessment and students with disabilities: issues and challenges with educational reform. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 25(3), 24-30.
- Brady, N. C., Bruce, S., Goldman, A., Erickson, K., Mineo, B., Ogletree, B. T., Paul, D., Ronski, M. A., Sevcik, R., Siegel, E., Schoonover, J., Snell, M., Sylvester, L., & Wilkinson, K. (2016). Communication services and supports for individuals with severe disabilities: guidance for assessment and intervention. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 121(2), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1944-7558-121.2.121>
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss Bruce, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21.
- Çetin, Ç. (2004). Özel eğitim alanında çalışmakta olan farklı meslek grubundaki eğitimcilerin yaşadığı güçlüklerin belirlenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(01). https://doi.org/10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000073
- Dayı, E., Yılmaz, H. C., Özdemir Kılıç, M., & Okyar, S. (2020). Ağır ve çoklu yetersizliği (açye) olan öğrencilerle çalışan öğretmen adaylarına verilen dönütün işbirlikçi çalışma becerilerine etkisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(3), 526-539. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2019054153>
- Downing, J. E., & Peckham-Hardin, K. (2007). Supporting inclusive education for students with severe disabilities in rural areas. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 26(2), 10-15.
- Downing, J. E., Hanreddy, A., & Peckham-Hardin, K. D. (2018). *Teaching communication skills to students with severe disabilities: Evaluation of communication skill*, M.A. Melekoglu (Trans. Eds). Nobel Academic Publishing.
- Gargiulo, R.M. (2004). *Special education in contemporary society an introduction to exceptionality*. Thomson Wadsworth.
- Glesne, C. (2013). *Introduction to qualitative research*. A. Ersoy & P. Yalçinoğlu. (Trans. Eds.). Ani Publishing.
- Işitan, D., & Dayı, E. (2021) Sınıfında özel gereksinimli öğrenci bulunan genel eğitim öğretmenlerinin özel eğitim danışmanlığına ilişkin görüşleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.790359>
- Kargın, T. (2007). Eğitsel değerlendirme ve bireyselleştirilmiş eğitim programı hazırlama süreci. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000103

- Kizir, M. (2020). Çoklu Yetersizliği Olan Öğrencilerin Değerlendirilmesi. İçinde S. Rakap (Ed.), *Çoklu Yetersizliği Olan Çocukların Eğitiminde Güncel Yaklaşımlar*. Vize Akademik.
- Levinson, E. M., & Ohler, D. L. (1998). Transition from high school to college for students with learning disabilities: Needs, assessment, and services. *The High School Journal*, 82(1), 62-69.
- Mansell, J. (2010). Raising our sights: Services for adults with profound intellectual and multiple disabilities. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 15(3).
- McDonnel J., Hardman, M, & McDonnel. A. (2003). *An introduction to persons with moderate and severe disabilities: Educational and social issues: Understanding people with severe disabilities*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Merriam, S. B. (2013). *An example for qualitative research patterns and applications*. S. Turan (Trans. Eds.). Nobel Publication Distribution.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Narayan, J., & Bruce. S. M. (2006). Perceptions of teachers and parents on the cognitive functioning of children with severe mental disability and children with congenital deafblindness. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, 29(1), 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.mrr.0000185946.49186.4e>
- Narayan, J., S. Bruce, M., Bhandari, R., & Kolli Bruce, P. (2010). Cognitive functioning of children with severe intellectual disabilities and children with deafblindness: A study of the perceptions of teachers and parents in the USA and India. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 23(3), 263-278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2009.00529.x>
- Roach, A. T. (2006). Influences on Parent Perceptions of an Alternate Assessment for Students with Severe Cognitive Disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* 31(3), 267-274.
- Roach, A. T., Elliott, S. N., & Berndt, S. (2007). Teacher Perceptions and the Consequential Validity of An Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 18(3), 168-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073070180030501>
- Robbins N. (1977). State of the Art: Perspectives on Serving Deaf-Blind Children. In E. L. Lowell & C. C. Rouin (Eds.), *State of the art Perspectives on Serving Deafblind Children: Educational Assessment of Deafblind and Auditorily-Visually Impaired Children: A Survey*. State Department of Education.
- Rönnerberg, J., & Borg Bruce, E. (2001). A Review and Evaluation of Research on the Deaf-Blind from Perceptual, Communicative, Social and Rehabilitative Perspectives. *Scandinavian Audiology*, 30(2), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/010503901300112176>
- Sandford, B. A., & Hsu, C. C. (2013). Alternative Assessment and Portfolios: Review, Reconsider, and Revitalize. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1,215-221.
- Sarı, H. (2019). Çoklu Yetersizliği Olan Öğrenciler. İ. Diken (Ed.), *Özel Eğitime Gereksinimi Olan Öğrenciler ve Özel Eğitim içinde* (508-510). Pegem Akademi.
- Silberman, R. K. & Brown, F. (2005). Alternative Approach to Assessing Students Who Have Visual Impairment with Other Disabilities in Classroom and Community Environments, In S. Z. Sacks & R. K. Silberman (Eds.), *Educating Students Who Have Visual Impairments with Other Disabilities*. Paul H. Brookes.
- Sisson L. A., Van Hasselt, V. B., & Hersen, M. (1987). Psychological Approaches with Deaf-Blind Persons: Strategies and Issues in Research and Treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 7,303-28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358\(87\)90038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-7358(87)90038-9)
- Şafak, P. (2013). *Ağır ve Çoklu Yetersizliği Olan Çocukların Eğitimi*. Vize Yayıncılık.
- Tunçeli, H. İ., & Zembat, R. (2017). Evaluation and Importance of Development In Early Childhood. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research*, 3(3),1-12.
- Venn J. (2004). *Assessing Students with Special Needs: Test Scores and What They Mean*. Pearson/Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Wehmeyer, M, L. (2003). Defining Mental Retardation and Ensuring Access to the General Curriculum. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38(3), 271-282.

- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, E. S., & Akçamete, G. (2014). Determining the Difficulties Faced by Mothers of Children with Multiple Disabilities in The Process Of Early Childhood Special Education Services. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 3(1), 74-89. <https://doi.org/10.30703/cije.321336>

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

Çoklu yetersizliği (ÇY) olan çocukların değerlendirilmesinde ebeveynlerin ve eğitimcilerin rolü ön plana çıkmaktadır. Ebeveynlerin ve eğitimcilerin/uzmanların bir araya gelerek çocuk için ailenin koşullarını ve isteklerini göz önünde bulundurarak plan yapmaları önem taşımaktadır. Ebeveynlerin ve öğretmenlerin değerlendirme sürecinde ağır ve çoklu yetersizliği olan çocuğa dair gözlemlerini içeren işlevsel değerlendirme verilerinin toplanması gerekmektedir (Narayan vd., 2010; Robbins, 1977). Yapılacak güncel çalışmalarda genel eğitim müfredatı ve değerlendirmelerinde ÇY çocukların mevcut konumunun belirlenmesi, eğitim politikalarında yapılabilecek uygulama ve uyarlamaların analiz edilmesi, bu alanda giderilmesi beklenen sınırlılıklar konusunda etkili olabilir. Türkiye’de mevcut özel eğitim programları içerisinde ÇY olan çocukların yetersizlik grubuna hitap eden bir değerlendirme sistemi bulunmamaktadır. Bu çocukların eğitim süreci içinde öğretim öncesi, sırası ve sonrasında etkili ve uygun biçimde değerlendirilememesi, onlar için yeterli ve uygun eğitim fırsatlarının yaratılması mümkün olmamaktadır. Ancak eğitim hakkı kapsamında ele alındığında ÇY olan çocukların temel haklarından olan eğitim eşitliği ve fırsattan yararlanma, özel eğitim alanında çalışılması ve bu çocuklar için bir an önce geliştirilip politikaya yansıtılması gerekli alanlardan biri olarak görülmektedir. Bu çalışmada ÇY olan bireylerle çalışan özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin sınıflarında kullandıkları değerlendirme yöntemlerini belirlemek ve alanyazına çeşitli öneriler sunmak amaçlanmıştır. Bu kapsamda bu araştırmanın genel amacı ÇY olan bireylerle çalışan özel eğitim öğretmenleriyle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla derinlemesine görüşmeler yaparak öğretmenlerin sınıflarında kullandıkları değerlendirme yöntemlerine ilişkin bilgi toplamaktır.

2. YÖNTEM

Bu çalışmada temel nitel araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Nitel araştırma, insanların hayatlarını nasıl anlamlandırdıkları ile ilgili bir anlayış geliştirerek, bu anlamlandırma sürecini betimleyerek ve insanların deneyimledikleri olguların nasıl yorumlandığını tarif etmeyi içerir (Merriam, 2013). Veri toplama aracı olarak yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme tekniği kullanılmıştır. Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmede ise araştırmacı soruları araştırma odağına bağlı kalarak hazırlar ve görüşme sırasında da soruları şekillendirilebilir (Glesne, 2013). Bu araştırmanın katılımcıları, amaçlı örnekleme tekniğine uygun şekilde belirlenmiştir. Amaçlı örnekleme tekniği, araştırmacının keşfetmek ve anlamak istediği problem duruma dair çoğu şeyi öğrenebileceği bir örneklem seçimi varsayımına dayanır (Merriam, 2013). Araştırmaya dahil olacak katılımcıların en az bir yıl ÇY olan bireylerle çalışmış/çalışıyor olması önkoşulu aranmıştır. Katılımcıları ÇY olan bireylerle çalışmış/çalışıyor olan özel eğitim bölümlerinden mezun olan gönüllü yedi özel eğitim öğretmeni oluşturmuştur. Katılımcılar öğrencilerinin zihinsel yetersizlik, görme yetersizliği, işitme yetersizliği, Down sendromu, otizm spektrum bozukluğu, bedensel yetersizlik, öğrenme güçlüğü ve çoklu yetersizlik tanıları olduğunu ifade etmişlerdir. Katılımcılardan sadece birinin lisans öğrenimi sırasında ÇY’den etkilenmiş çocukların eğitimiyle ilgili ders aldığı ve bir katılımcının da körsağı (görme/işitme yetersizliği) olan çocukların eğitimiyle ilgili bir ders aldığı bilgisine ulaşılmıştır. Bunların dışındaki katılımcılar çoklu yetersizliği hakkında bilgileri özel eğitim dersleri içerisinde almıştır.

Araştırmanın planlanması ve veri toplama araçlarının geliştirilmesi sonrasında Gazi Üniversitesi Ölçme Değerlendirme Etik Kurulundan gerekli onay ve izinler alınmıştır (Tarih: 01.04.2021, Sayı: 77082166-604.01.02-64589). Gerekli etik kurul izni alındıktan sonra mayıs ve haziran aylarında araştırmaya gönüllü olan katılımcılarla uygun oldukları günler üzerinden randevu alınmıştır. Katılımcılara araştırma hakkında bilgi verilmiş ve araştırma bilgisinin yer aldığı gönüllü onam formu imzalatılmıştır. Görüşmeler birinci yazar tarafından Zoom uygulamasında uzaktan/online gerçekleştirilmiştir. Öğretmenlere görüşme sırasında görüşmelerin kayıt altına alınacağı söylenerek onayları alınmıştır. Görüşme öncesinde katılımcılarla kısa bir sohbet yapılmıştır. Katılımcılar görüşmeye hazır olduklarında görüşme süreci başlatılmıştır.

Verilerin analizi bilgisayar destekli nitel veri analizi programı olan Nvivo 12 Plus programıyla yapılmıştır. Ses kayıtlarının dökümü katılımcılar ile görüşme süreci tamamlandıktan sonra yapılmıştır. En kısa görüşme 20.14 dk., en uzun görüşme 44.46 dk. sürmüştür. Ortalama görüşme süresi 28.05 dk. sürmüştür. Verilerin analizi sonucunda oluşturulan sınıfta en sık çalışılan alanlar, değerlendirme yöntemleri, değerlendirmede iş birliği, değerlendirmede güçlük yaşanan alanlar, değerlendirmeye yönelik öneriler temaları sırasıyla ilgili araştırma sorularıyla birlikte verilmiştir. Öğretmenlerle yapılan görüşmeler sonucunda farklı değerlendirme yöntemlerinin kullanıldığı ve bu değerlendirme yöntemlerini etkileyen birtakım faktörlerin olduğu görülmektedir. Öğretim öncesinde, sırasında ve sonrasında aile görüşmeleri, öğrenci gözlemi, kontrol listeleri, önceki kurumdan bilgi alma ve portfolyo oluşturma yöntemlerinin sıklıkla kullanıldığı belirlenmiştir. ÇY olan öğrencilerin gelişimsel özellikleri bakımından bu yöntemlerin en pratik ve öğretim için destekleyici yöntemler olduğu görülmektedir (Downing & Peckham-Hardin, 2007).

3. BULGULAR, TARTIŞMA ve SONUÇLAR

Araştırma bulguları kapsamında öğretmenlerin en sık karşılaştıkları sorunların uzmanlarla ve ailelerle iş birliğinin kurulamaması, çocukların değerlendirme için fiziksel olarak hazır olmaması, değerlendirme materyalinin yetersiz olması, mesleki gelişim yetersizliği, okulda uzman yetersizliği olduğu görülmektedir. Çalışmada ulaşılan bulgular kapsamında hem öğretimler sırasında hem de değerlendirmelerde iş birliğinin gerekliliği ve önemi vurgulanmaktadır. ÇY olan çocuklarla eğitim ortamını paylaşacak öğretmenlerin iş birliği konusunda desteklenmesi dikkate değer bulunmaktadır (İştan & Dayı, 2021). Sonuç olarak; bu çalışmada ÇY olan çocuklarla çalışan yedi özel eğitim öğretmenin kullandıkları değerlendirme yöntemleri, değerlendirmede iş birliği, değerlendirmede güçlük yaşanan alanlar, değerlendirmeye yönelik önerileri hakkındaki görüşleri incelenmiştir. İyi bir değerlendirme gerek süreç gerekse öğrenciler hakkında sağlıklı kararlara ulaşabilmek iyi bir değerlendirme sürecini gerektirmektedir. Öğrenci gelişimlerinin bu süreç içerisinde sürekli izlenerek yapılacak öğretimlerle ilgili uygun kararlar alınmalıdır. Özel eğitim alanında yapılan değerlendirmelerin amacı özel gereksinimli çocuğun ve ailesinin öncelikli ihtiyaçlarına yönelik hizmetlerin belirlenmesini içermektedir. Bu nedenle değerlendirme süreçlerinin kaliteli bir şekilde yapılması için öğretmenlerin, ailelerin ve çocukların ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesine yönelik yapılacak çalışmaların sayısının artırılması gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışmada ÇY'li olan çocuklarla çalışan özel eğitim öğretmenlerinden elde edilen görüşlerden yola çıkarak birtakım öneriler sunulmaktadır. Öğretim öncesinde ve sonrasında aile görüşmelerinin değerlendirmeye kattığı önem göz önüne alındığında öğrencilerin eğitim sürecine ailenin katılması gerekmektedir. Hem öğretmenlere çocukları hakkında ayrıntılı bilgi sağlayan bir kaynak konumunda olmaları hem de kendi çocuklarının gelişimsel takibini yapabilmeleri amacıyla aile ile öğretmen iş birliği içinde olmalıdır. Bu noktada öğretmen ailenin sürece nasıl dahil olabileceğini açıkça ifade etmeli ve ailenin neler yapabileceğini açıklamalıdır. Aile ve öğretmenlerin iş birliği içinde olmasının yanı sıra öğretmenler ve çocukla ilgilenen diğer uzmanlar arasında da iş birliğinin kurulması önem taşımaktadır. İlgili öğrenci hakkında bilgi alışverişinin sağlanması öğretim sürecinin daha etkili bir şekilde ilerlemesini sağlayabilir. Öğrenci gözlemlerinin de değerlendirme sürecine katılarak planlı bir şekilde kayıt altına alınması gerekmektedir. Kayıt altına alınan verilerin değerlendirme sürecinde amaca yönelik olarak kullanılması sağlanabilir. Ayrıca çocuk hakkında veri toplamaya yönelik sistematik değerlendirme yöntemlerinden ziyade alternatif değerlendirme yöntemleri tercih edilmelidir. Her çocuğun gelişimsel ve öğrenme özellikleri farklılık göstermektedir ve çocuğa en uygun değerlendirme yönteminin seçilmesi bu kapsamda önem taşımaktadır. Bununla birlikte özel eğitim öğretmenlerine de hizmet öncesi ve sonrası eğitimlerle alternatif değerlendirme yöntemleri ile değerlendirme yapabilme becerileri kazandırılması önem taşımaktadır.

CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHERS

The contribution rate of the 1st author to the research is 50%, and the contribution rate of the 2nd author to the research is 50%.

Author 1: Determination of the method, research design, validity and reliability studies, data analysis, reporting, writing the introduction, conclusion parts.

Author 2: Determination of the method, research design, writing the introduction, conclusion parts.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest in the research.