



## Nondiscriminatory Evaluation: Towards Inclusive Teaching and Learning

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.13984477

**Edwin Manalo**

Western Colleges, Inc., Naic, Cavite, Philippines

### Abstract:

The study determined the presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for LSEN. The respondents of the study were teachers of a public school. The method used in this study was descriptive research design. The method of gathering data was a survey questionnaire. Statistical treatments used were percentage, mean, standard deviation and Mann Whitney U-Test. The findings of the study revealed that majority of the participants are in the age bracket of 30 to 34, 35 to 39 and 40 to 44 age years old, females, and have been serving for less than five years. Most of the participants were evaluating and testing the presence and frequency of use to a very large extent by administering the test in the LSEN's vernacular. The profile of the participants has a significant difference to the presence and frequency of use of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN which implies that null hypotheses are rejected which means that testing and evaluating the LSEN conducting principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation is effective.

*Keywords:* non-discriminatory evaluation, inclusive teaching and learning

### Introduction:

Evaluation plays a pivotal role in the teaching-learning process, serving as a crucial mechanism for both educators and students to assess and improve educational outcomes. It is a continuous process, not limited to periodic exercises, enabling the formation of judgments regarding students' achievements and progress (Chigeru, 2020, as cited in Ifeoma, 2022).

In classrooms, evaluation informs instructional decisions, identifies areas of improvement, and ensures that educational goals are met. Moreover, evaluation supports teachers in refining their methodologies, fostering students' growth, and shaping effective classroom practices.

As Kizlik (2020, as cited in Yambi, 2020) suggests, evaluation encompasses various components, including the articulation of educational goals, analysis of relevant data, and management-based decision-making. These elements highlight the integral role evaluation plays in tracking both individual and program-level progress.

Effective evaluation involves a dynamic process, as noted by Weir and Roberts (2018) and Howard and Donaghue (2021), where diverse tools and student-teacher collaboration are utilized to reflect authentic learning experiences.

This study aims to explore how teachers apply different evaluation strategies to improve learning outcomes and decision-making within the educational setting. Guided by Cronbach's (1963) early concepts of formative evaluation, which emphasize course improvement through continuous feedback, the research also acknowledges the evolving roles of summative and diagnostic assessments. By examining evaluation from multiple dimensions—self-referenced, criterion-referenced, and norm-referenced (Teachmint, 2022)—the study aims to contribute insights into how comprehensive evaluation practices can enhance the quality of education and foster better learning experiences.

### Literature Review:

Evaluation serves as an indispensable part of educational practice, helping educators and learners measure progress and guide teaching strategies. Chigeru (2020, as cited in Ifeoma, 2022) defines evaluation as a systematic process for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to assess the achievement of instructional objectives.

Kizlik (2020, as cited in Yambi, 2020) elaborates on this by highlighting five core components essential to effective evaluation: defining educational goals, gathering relevant data, ensuring meaningful learning, interpreting information, and facilitating classroom management decisions. These components underscore that evaluation, when properly implemented, becomes a tool not only for assessment but also for educational improvement.



Well-managed programs with robust evaluation frameworks are essential for producing meaningful results, which in turn inform decision-making processes at both classroom and institutional levels (Howard & Donaghue, 2021).

Weir and Roberts (2018) further emphasize that evaluation must be ongoing and varied to accurately capture students' learning trajectories. Relying solely on formal assessments risks limiting students' learning potential, while collaborative and authentic evaluation practices encourage active student participation and self-monitoring. Such practices enable students to take ownership of their learning journey, as teachers guide them toward achieving individual and program-level objectives.

Cronbach's (1963) concept of formative evaluation, further explored by Philipps (2018), highlights the importance of using feedback to continuously improve courses and teaching methods. Formative evaluation, conducted throughout the academic year, allows educators to monitor students' progress and address their weaknesses in real time.

This proactive approach not only supports academic growth but also helps teachers tailor their instructional methods to meet students' needs more effectively. In contrast, summative evaluations, which are typically conducted at the end of a course or academic year, provide a comprehensive assessment of students' performance and determine their readiness for the next stage of education (Teachmint, 2022).

Another key evaluation method is diagnostic assessment, which focuses on identifying students' learning difficulties and providing targeted interventions (Yambi, 2020). Like formative assessments, diagnostic evaluations aim to address students' weaknesses; however, they offer deeper insights into specific learning challenges that may require specialized teaching strategies. By combining these different types of evaluation—formative, summative, and diagnostic—educators can create a more inclusive and adaptive learning environment, ensuring that students receive the necessary support to succeed.

One of the challenges in educational evaluation lies in the adaptation of tools to local contexts. Oakland (2019, as cited in Hayes et al., 2018) emphasizes the importance of using culturally relevant assessment instruments, especially in countries with diverse student populations. The reliance on Western-developed tools can lead to misidentification and misdiagnosis, particularly when these tools are not translated into local languages or adapted to cultural expectations (Aro & Ahonen, 2021, as cited in Hayes, 2021).

This issue highlights the need for standardized evaluation practices that are responsive to the linguistic and cultural needs of students. Without such adaptation, the accuracy and validity of assessments are compromised, affecting students' educational outcomes and placement decisions (Al-Natour et al., 2018, as cited in Hayes, 2018).

The significance of culturally adapted evaluation tools extends to special education. As noted by Rivera and Tilcsik (2023), students with disabilities, especially those from marginalized backgrounds, often face additional challenges in accessing educational resources. In their study, Rivera and Tilcsik found that school principals were less responsive to prospective parents of disabled students, particularly when these parents were from minority groups. Such findings underscore the importance of equity in educational evaluation, as systemic biases in assessment practices can further marginalize vulnerable student populations.

Evaluation is an essential aspect of the teaching-learning process that supports decision-making, fosters student growth, and enhances educational programs. Formative, summative, and diagnostic evaluations provide complementary insights that help educators tailor instruction to meet students' needs.

However, the effectiveness of evaluation depends on the availability of culturally relevant tools and standardized practices, particularly for diverse learners and students with disabilities. As educational institutions strive to improve evaluation frameworks, it is critical to adopt inclusive and adaptive strategies that reflect the unique needs of students and foster meaningful learning experiences.

### **Methodology:**

The researcher used descriptive-comparative research design. Descriptive design is suitable wherever the subjects vary among themselves and one is interested to know the extent to which different conditions and situations are obtained among these subjects. The word survey signifies the gathering of data regarding the present conditions. A survey is useful in: (1) providing the value of facts; and (2) focusing attention on the most important things to be reported. In this study, it was utilized to assess the presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the test of LSEN teachers. It also used comparative research method to determine the significant difference in their assessment when grouped accordingly.

The method of gathering data is a survey questionnaire which is a product of a thorough reading of related literature and studies. After the construction, the questionnaire was validated by the experts and piloted to



respondents who are not included in the survey and the researcher's colleagues and he asked the help of her former professors in the graduate school in the revision of the survey. Moreover, the last step in the validation is proposal defense where the comments and suggestions of the panel were included in the revision.

The population of the study were the teachers of Achievers Heart of Knowledge Montessori Inc. The locale was chosen because the researcher observed the need to improve the integration of these principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the LSENS teachers' tests.

The respondents were the teachers, taken purposively, in total enumeration. After the gathering of data and asking permission from the different offices, the gathered data were subjected to statistical treatment of data.

**Results:**

- 1. What is the profile of teacher-participants in terms of sex, age, educational attainment and length of service?**

**Table 1  
Profile of the teacher-participants**

<b>PROFILE (N=15)</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Age</b>		
30-34 years old	5	33
35-39 years old	5	33
40-44 years old	5	33
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	5	33
Female	10	c
<b>Length of Service</b>		
Below 5 yrs	7	47
5-9 yrs	6	40
10-14 yrs	2	13

It is shown in table 1 that out of 15 participants, five or 33 percent were all in the age bracket of 30 to 34, 35 to 39 and 40 to 44 age years old. There were females (67%) than males (33%). Thus, majority of the participants have been serving for less than five years (47%), others five to nine years (40%) and few of them 10 to 14 years (13%).

Similar to the study of Salvan and Hambre (2020) there are more female than male teachers, 50 percent of them are within 27-32 years old and have been teaching for 22-26 years.

- 2. What is the assessment of the teacher-respondents on presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN?**

**Table 2  
Presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN**

	<b>STATEMENT</b>	<b>PRESENCE</b>	<b>FREQUENCY OF USE</b>
--	------------------	-----------------	-------------------------



	<b>In conducting evaluation and testing for the LSEN...</b>	<b>MEAN</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>	<b>MEAN</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
1	Test must be administered in the LSEN's vernacular.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
2	Test must be appropriate for the LSEN's age and suspected disability.	3.93	0.26	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
3	More than one test must be used in determining the disability and need for services.	3.80	0.41	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
4	All areas of suspected disability must be assessed.	3.80	0.56	To a Very Large Extent	3.47	0.99	To a Very Large Extent
5	All decisions about eligibility for LSEN and related services must be made by a team, not a single individual.	3.80	0.41	To a Very Large Extent	3.40	0.83	To a Very Large Extent
6	To be eligible for LSEN and related services, LSEs must meet specific criteria.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	3.93	0.26	To a Very Large Extent
7	Evaluation is for the purpose of intervention.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
8	Evaluation considers authentic and alternative procedures	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	3.87	0.35	To a Very Large Extent
9	Evaluation includes opportunity for learning	3.93	0.26	To a Very Large Extent	3.93	0.26	To a Very Large Extent
10	Evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
11	The learning ecology is also evaluated.	3.80	0.56	To a Very Large Extent	3.60	0.91	To a Very Large Extent
12	Evaluation shall avoid actions or conditions that would permit or encourage individuals or groups to receive scores that misrepresent their actual levels of attainment.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
13	Evaluation shall avoid any conditions that might invalidate the results.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
14	Results shall guide decision-making on the most suitable educational programming for the child.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
15	Results of evaluation and testing helps the school plan and develop instruction that's	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent



	appropriate to the child's special needs						
16	Results of evaluation and testing provide detailed information that helps the development of an Individualized Education Program (EPI)	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
17	Results of evaluation and testing present the child's present levels of performance at school and his or her academic and developmental needs.	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent	4.00	0.00	To a Very Large Extent
	<b>OVERALL MEAN</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>0.15</b>	To a Very Large Extent	<b>3.89</b>	<b>0.21</b>	To a Very Large Extent

Range:

- 4.00-3.25      *To a Very Large Extent*
- 3.24-2.50      *Very Large Extent*
- 2.49-1.75      *Limited Extent*
- 1.75-1.00      *No Extent*

Table 2 presents the following presence and frequency of use in evaluating and testing the LSEN in chronological order based on the highest to least mean average score obtained.

In terms of presence the LSEN were evaluated and tested to a very large extent the: Test must be administered in the LSEN's vernacular (4.00), to be eligible for LSEN and related services, LSENs must meet specific criteria (4.00), evaluation is for the purpose of intervention (4.00), evaluation considers authentic and alternative procedures (4.00), evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors (4.00), evaluation shall avoid actions or conditions that would permit or encourage individuals or groups to receive scores that misrepresent their actual levels of attainment (4.00), evaluation shall avoid any conditions that might invalidate the results (4.00), results shall guide decision-making on the most suitable educational programming for the child (4.00), results of evaluation and testing helps the school plan and develop instruction that's appropriate to the child's special needs (4.00), results of evaluation and testing provide detailed information that helps the development of an Individualized Education Program (IEP) (4.00), results of evaluation and testing present the child's present levels of performance at school and his or her academic and developmental needs (4.00), test must be appropriate for the LSEN's age and suspected disability (3.93), evaluation includes opportunity for learning (3.93), more than one test must be used in determining the disability and need for services (3.80), all areas of suspected disability must be assessed (3.80), all decisions about eligibility for LSEN and related services must be made by a team, not a single individual (3.80), and the learning ecology is also evaluated (3.80). Likewise, in the frequency of usage the following statements were manifested into a very large extent such as: Test must be administered in the LSEN's vernacular (4.00), to be eligible for LSEN and related services, LSENs must meet specific criteria (4.00), evaluation is for the purpose of intervention (4.00), evaluation shall avoid any conditions that might invalidate the results (4.00), results of evaluation and testing provide detailed information that helps the development of an Individualized Education Program (EPI) (4.00), test must be appropriate for the LSEN's age and suspected disability (4.00), evaluation includes opportunity for learning (4.00), more than one test must be used in determining the disability and need for services (4.00), all areas of suspected disability must be assessed (4.00), all decisions about eligibility for LSEN and related services must be made by a team, not a single individual (4.00), the learning ecology is also evaluated (4.00), evaluation shall avoid actions or conditions that would permit or encourage individuals or groups to receive scores that misrepresent their actual levels of attainment (3.93), results of evaluation and testing helps the school plan and develop instruction that's appropriate to the child's special needs (3.93), results shall guide decision-making on the most suitable educational programming for the child (3.87), results of evaluation and testing present the child's present levels of performance at school and his or her academic and developmental needs (3.60), evaluation considers authentic and alternative procedures (3.47), and evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors (3.40).

This implies that majority of the participants were evaluating and testing the presence and frequency of use to a very large extent by administering the test in the LSEN's vernacular. Thus, the least priority presents that in terms



of presence the learning ecology is also evaluated and in terms of frequency of use evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors.

It can be supported by the study conducted by Dahar and Yousuf (2022) who concluded that Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) in inclusive setting is an appropriate learning technique for primary students having learning disabilities who need broad support. Recommendations are that parents must be developed friendly environment for their children and build friendly relationship. Importance should be given on the development of such curriculum which would be effective in inclusive setting.

**3. Is there any significant difference between profile and assessment of the teacher-respondents on presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN?**

**Table 3**  
**Significant difference between profile and assessment of the teacher-participants on presence of the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN**

PROFILE	N	EV	SD	U-TEST	P-VALUE	REMARKS	
<b>PRESENCE</b>							
Age	15	232.50	23.16	-4.84	1.33E-06	Reject Ho	Significant
Sex	15	232.50	22.81	-4.91	9.11E-07	Reject Ho	Significant
Length of Service	15	232.50	23.07	-4.85	1.21E-06	Reject Ho	Significant
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>232.5</b>	<b>23.02</b>	<b>-4.866</b>	<b>1.1498E-06</b>	Reject Ho	Significant
<b>FREQUENCY OF USE</b>							
Age	15	232.50	23.27	-4.81	1.49E-06	Reject Ho	Significant
Sex	15	232.50	23.27	-4.81	1.49E-06	Reject Ho	Significant
Length of Service	15	232.50	23.53	-4.76	1.94E-06	Reject Ho	Significant
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>232.5</b>	<b>23.36</b>	<b>-4.795</b>	<b>1.6414E-06</b>	Reject Ho	Significant

Table 3 reveals that profile of the participants has a significant difference to the presence and frequency of use of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN after obtaining the total Mann Whitney U test score of -4.866 for presence with a probability value of 1.1498E-06 and -4.795 for frequency of use with a probability value of 1.6414E-06. Therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected for presence and frequency use at .05 level of significance which means that testing and evaluating the LSEN conducting principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation is effective.

The findings of Allam and Martin (2021) revealed that his study revealed that the classrooms for children with learning disabilities in Division of Ilagan at large have poor learning environment to support the SPED such as lack of budget, curriculum guide, Instructional Materials (IMs) and even school facilities. It could be concluded that placement of learners with special needs in an inclusive classroom with ordinary learners is not enough with no proper support. Learners with disability did not receive all the necessary support and services for accessing the curriculum facilities; and stakeholders' supports is very minimal to support the needs of the students enrolled in SPED classes. On the other hand, issues and problems were solved technically to sustain the positive working environment among school heads, teachers and stakeholders. The Department of Education Training and Development in collaboration with regional in-service officers should organize continuous professional development opportunities on inclusion strategies of learners with SPED needs. The implementers of the SPED programs shall strictly adhere to the policies, and the strong support of the stakeholders shall be encouraged by formulating active organization spearheaded by the school head.

**Discussion:**

It is shown in table 1 that out of 15 participants, five or 33 percent were all in the age bracket of 30 to 34, 35 to 39 and 40 to 44 age years old. There were females (67%) than males (33%). Thus, majority of the participants have been serving for less than five years (47%), others five to nine years (40%) and few of them 10 to 14 years (13%).

In terms of presence the LSEN were evaluated and tested to a very large extent the: Test must be administered in the LSEN's vernacular (4.00), to be eligible for LSEN and related services, LSENs must meet specific criteria (4.00),



evaluation is for the purpose of intervention (4.00), evaluation considers authentic and alternative procedures (4.00), evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors (4.00), evaluation shall avoid actions or conditions that would permit or encourage individuals or groups to receive scores that misrepresent their actual levels of attainment (4.00), evaluation shall avoid any conditions that might invalidate the results (4.00), results shall guide decision-making on the most suitable educational programming for the child (4.00), results of evaluation and testing helps the school plan and develop instruction that's appropriate to the child's special needs (4.00), results of evaluation and testing provide detailed information that helps the development of an Individualized Education Program (EPI) (4.00), results of evaluation and testing present the child's present levels of performance at school and his or her academic and developmental needs (4.00), test must be appropriate for the LSEN's age and suspected disability (3.93), evaluation includes opportunity for learning (3.93), more than one test must be used in determining the disability and need for services (3.80), all areas of suspected disability must be assessed (3.80), all decisions about eligibility for LSEN and related services must be made by a team, not a single individual (3.80), and the learning ecology is also evaluated (3.80). Likewise, in the frequency of usage the following statements were manifested into a very large extent such as: Test must be administered in the LSEN's vernacular (4.00), to be eligible for LSEN and related services, LSENs must meet specific criteria (4.00), evaluation is for the purpose of intervention (4.00), evaluation shall avoid any conditions that might invalidate the results (4.00), results of evaluation and testing provide detailed information that helps the development of an Individualized Education Program (EPI) (4.00), test must be appropriate for the LSEN's age and suspected disability (4.00), evaluation includes opportunity for learning (4.00), more than one test must be used in determining the disability and need for services (4.00), all areas of suspected disability must be assessed (4.00), all decisions about eligibility for LSEN and related services must be made by a team, not a single individual (4.00), the learning ecology is also evaluated (4.00), evaluation shall avoid actions or conditions that would permit or encourage individuals or groups to receive scores that misrepresent their actual levels of attainment (3.93), results of evaluation and testing helps the school plan and develop instruction that's appropriate to the child's special needs (3.93), results shall guide decision-making on the most suitable educational programming for the child (3.87), results of evaluation and testing present the child's present levels of performance at school and his or her academic and developmental needs (3.60), evaluation considers authentic and alternative procedures (3.47), and evaluation considers educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors (3.40).

Table 3 reveals that profile of the participants has a significant difference to the presence and frequency of use of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN after obtaining the total Mann Whitney U test score of -4.866 for presence with a probability value of 1.1498E-06 and -4.795 for frequency of use with a probability value of 1.6414E-06. Therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected for presence and frequency use at .05 level of significance which means that testing and evaluating the LSEN conducting principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation is effective.

The following conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the study: Majority of the participants are in the age bracket of 30 to 34, 35 to 39 and 40 to 44 age years old, females, and have been serving for less than five years. Most of the participants were evaluating and testing the presence and frequency of use to a very large extent by administering the test in the LSEN's vernacular. The profile of the participants has a significant difference to the presence and frequency of use of nondiscriminatory evaluation in the conduct of evaluation and testing for the LSEN which implies that null hypotheses are rejected which means that testing and evaluating the LSEN conducting principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation is effective.

The following recommendations were proposed based on the conclusions and findings of the study: The teachers may consider to conduct the learning ecology and evaluation of educationally relevant cultural and linguistic factors to engage learners to learning holistic approach. It is also recommended that school management may continue to monitor and strengthen the nondiscriminatory testing materials to promote equality, just and fairness in the school.

### **Conclusion:**

This study explored the profile of teacher-participants, the extent to which they apply the principles of nondiscriminatory evaluation in testing learners with special educational needs (LSEN), and the relationship between teacher profiles and their assessment practices.

The participants, predominantly female (67%), were evenly distributed across the 30–44 age range, with most teachers having less than five years of teaching experience (47%). These findings align with previous studies showing a higher representation of women in the teaching profession and highlight the relatively limited experience among many teachers in this sample.

The results indicate that teachers implement nondiscriminatory evaluation principles to a very large extent, ensuring that tests are appropriate to the LSEN's vernacular, age, and disability. Moreover, multiple tests are used to assess suspected disabilities, decisions are made collaboratively, and evaluation results inform individualized



education plans (IEPs) and instructional strategies. These findings highlight a strong adherence to inclusive evaluation practices aimed at providing effective educational support for LSEN students.

The statistical analysis revealed a significant relationship between teacher profiles (age, sex, and length of service) and the extent to which they apply nondiscriminatory evaluation principles. The study suggests that teachers' demographic factors influence how they conduct and utilize evaluation practices for LSENS.

The findings demonstrate that the teacher-participants are committed to applying inclusive and nondiscriminatory assessment practices. However, the study emphasizes the importance of continuous professional development to further enhance teachers' competencies in this area. Schools and policymakers should also ensure adequate resources and support for special education programs to sustain these positive practices. Future studies could explore other variables influencing teachers' application of these principles, such as training backgrounds or school environments, to provide deeper insights into fostering inclusive education.

#### References:

- Allam, F. C., & Martin, M. M. (2021). *Issues and challenges in special education: A qualitative analysis from teacher's perspective*. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*, 10(1), 37-49. <https://doi.org/10.37134/saecj.vol10.1.4.2021>
- Bastart, J., Rohmar, O., & Popa, M. (2021). Legitimizing Discrimination Against Students with Disability in School: The Role of Justifications of Discriminatory Behavior. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 34(1), 1-11. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.357>
- Cano, A. (2016). The Role Of A School Psychologist: Non-Discriminatory Assessment Of English Language Learners. Master's Thesis, California State University. Retrieved from: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/57f8f337532140357e5003c7c99b62f4/1?pq-origsite=qscholar&cbl=18750>
- Dahar, M. & Yousuf, I. (2022). Academic achievement of students with and without learning disabilities in inclusive education. <https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/15039>
- Fibbi, R., Midtbøen, A., & Simon, P. (2021). Concepts of Discrimination. *Migration and Discrimination*, 13-20. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67281-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67281-2_2)
- Halvan, V.J., & Hambre, M. (2020). *Teachers' demographic profile on the learners' performance using K-12 earth and space module*. [https://jespnet.com/journals/Vol\\_7\\_No\\_4\\_December\\_2020/14.pdf](https://jespnet.com/journals/Vol_7_No_4_December_2020/14.pdf)
- Hayes, A, Dombrowski, E., Shefcyk, J., and Bulat, E. (2018). *Learning Disabilities Screening and Evaluation Guide for Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. RTI Press Publication No. OP-0052-1804. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI Press. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2018.op.0052.1804>
- Ifeoma, E. (2022). The Role of Evaluation in Teaching and Learning Process in Education. *International Journal of Advanced Academic and Educational Research* 13(5), 120 - 129. Retrieved from: <https://arcnjournals.org/images/2726145223713511.pdf>
- Inclusion, IEP, and Special Needs Law Educator's Resource Guide (2010). <https://dcmp.org/guides/TID7881.pdf> (PACITE NALANG PO NG MAAYOS)
- Kittrell, A. (2017). *Responsibilities of General and Special Education Teachers Serving Students With Learning Disabilities*. Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University. Retrieved from: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6018&context=dissertations>
- Lawrie, G., Marquis, E., Fuller, E., Newman, T., Qui, M., Nomikoudis, M., Roelofs, F., & van Dam, L. (2017). Moving towards inclusive learning and teaching: A synthesis of recent literature. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 5(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.5.1.3>
- Leijen, A., Arcidiacono, F. & Baucal, A. (2019). The Dilemma of Inclusive Education: Inclusion for Some or Inclusion for All. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633066>





Lo, L. (n.d.) English Language Learners with Disabilities: What School Professionals Need to Know and Do. *ICI Webpub System*. Retrieved from: <https://publications.ici.umn.edu/impact/26-1/english-language-learners-with-disabilities-what-school-professionals-need-to-know-and-do>

Lynch, M. (2023). Nondiscriminatory Education: Everything You Need To Know. *The Edvocate*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theedadvocate.org/nondiscriminatory-education-everything-you-need-to-know/>

Mantey, E. (2017). Discrimination against children with disabilities in mainstream schools in Southern Ghana: Challenges and perspectives from stakeholders. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 54, 18–25. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.02.001>

Oliva, C. (2021). Special Education. In: Goldstein, S., Naglieri, J.A. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Child Behavior and Development*. Springer, Boston, Massachusetts. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79061-9\\_2754](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79061-9_2754)

Philipps, D. (2018). The many functions of evaluation in education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(46). Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3811>

Raguidin, P., Custodio, Z., & Bulusan, F. (2021). Engaging, Affirming, Nurturing Inclusive Environment: A Grounded Theory Study in the Philippine Context. *IAFOR Journal of Education: Inclusive Education*, 9(1). Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1291741.pdf>

Renner, R. (2018). What Is Meant by Non-Discriminatory Evaluation? *The Classroom*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theclassroom.com/testing-assessment-education-5128.html>

Rivera, L., & Tilcsik, A. (2023). Not in My Schoolyard: Disability Discrimination in Educational Access. *American Sociological Review*, 88(2), 284–321. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00031224221150433>

Teachmint (2022). Types of Evaluation in Education. Retrieved from: <https://blog.teachmint.com/types-of-evaluation-in-education/>

Yambi, T. (2020). Assessment And Evaluation In Education. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342918149\\_ASSESSMENT\\_AND\\_EVALUATION\\_IN\\_EDUCATION](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342918149_ASSESSMENT_AND_EVALUATION_IN_EDUCATION)