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Chapter 1: Introduction

Kathryn Wilson

Graduate students from Western Michigan University’s Evaluating Products, Personnel, and Policy class, within the Evaluation, Measurement and Research Department (EMR) conducted a research study on 11 countries and the state District of Columbia, of the USA. The accumulation of this research is presented here and for the most part includes the structure and purpose of teacher evaluations, their historic development and background of the teacher evaluation system. The current application of these evaluations and how the teachers evaluate are used, as well as the methods, sources and instruments utilized by these countries/state and any future known plans for the development or reform of the teacher evaluation system. To provide for uniformity in these 12 papers, structure of the original documents, and grammar for non-English first students were checked for inconsistencies and where necessary minor changes were made, no change was made however in student paper content. Chapter 2 through 14 will discuss each of the countries evaluation procedures in further detail.

The overview of the structure of teacher evaluation varies greatly between the countries studied. Australia utilizes 7 standards to achieve the required teaching knowledge; professional knowledge, professional practice and professional engagement and are placed in 4 career stages of graduate, proficient, highly accomplished and lead. Austria rarely uses teacher evaluations except in rare or extenuating circumstances and rarely are these formative evaluations. Chile’s central government requires mandatory evaluations, completed by the districts, for entering the teaching field, but do not require or utilize any qualifying exam, and no further evaluations are required. Egypt looks at three factors; the ability to provide a large number of teachers, provide teachers with appropriate sustainable training, and the need of an evaluation system for all levels in order to identify what students have learned, and consequently their evaluation is based on outcomes.

Finland has no formal evaluation structure, but instead allows the schools at local level to evaluate their teachers. These evaluations are individualized rather than standardized. The people hold the educational authorities and political leaders accountable for quality educators and education. France has a complex system and varies its structure of evaluations by level of class with primary teachers inspected by the government rather than peers of school administration. Secondary teachers are evaluated by government officials, peers and school officials, and inspections are done for both private and public institutions alike, for the purposes of termination, improvement and promotions. Greece has a highly-centralized governmental system for its 240 districts within 115 regions, and uses a top down administration in its teacher evaluations. Ireland only inspects the teachers at primary level, for their new or probationary period, or when a problem is not solved by the school for complaints on any teachers.

Mexico has a universal teaching evaluation; however, they are slow in their application. They utilize a horizontal promotional structure to help allow for pay adjustments and to keep teacher retention. New Zealand, allow the schools to do their own teacher evaluations, but compare findings to the New Zealand government standards of what accomplished teachers
look like. Palestine utilize both a summative and formative evaluation, which is completed through the school principal and a government supervisor. All evaluations are posted on the government websites and teachers may address the results if displeased. All teachers are appraised, and if a new teacher is not deemed ready the probation period is extended. Washington, District of Columbia (D.C.), USA, uses the structure of the IMPACT evaluation model with a set of 9 “commandments” that all teachers must conform to.

The overview of the purpose of teacher evaluation share similarities on the goals they want to achieve. Eight countries look for ways to improving the teachers; Australia, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, Mexico, New Zealand, and D.C., USA, through developmental programs, most utilizing this through formative evaluations. Summative evaluations are done for nine countries: Australia, Austria (occasionally), Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, New Zealand, Palestine, and D.C., USA, to help with decisions on tenure, advancement or termination. Austria looks toward self-evaluations. Finland, Palestine, and D.C., USA utilize teacher feedback to help with their teacher development. Greece uses evaluations to primarily assess the progress of their students as well as their educators. Ireland uses evaluations only for completion of probation and for underperformance issues of instructors, and Palestine also includes evaluation for determining probation requirements.

The historic development and background of the teacher evaluation system have progressed through trial and error of their government, slowly over time, though most countries, taking into account financial, and political constraints along the way, some have chosen to require mandatory evaluations, while others did not. This has been consistent with all countries; however, a few other issues have complicated the progression for a few countries, such as Palestine, whose evaluation and educational systems were chaotic due to invasions and wars and the evaluation procedures were not established until 1994. Australia, decided to look to the government system for maintaining their evaluations, after outside systems failed. The reverse happened to Greece, and New Zealand who turned to self-evaluation by schools when they chose to lighten the governmental load and allow the process of evaluation to be done by local bodies. Finland appears to have made the greatest strides with equity, quality and still maintain a reasonable cost.

The current application of teacher evaluations varies greatly, although there are some similarities within the applications. Australia has no national requirements for uniformity, and only some states or territories use them. They have a large problem when dealing with below par teachers, as well as a lack of showing appropriate recognition for those who are quality teachers. Austria has no evaluation schedule and evaluations only occur at extenuating circumstances, and then only for summative purposes. There are no evaluations used for managing performance or professional development. Chile uses their evaluations for opportunities of social recognition of teacher’s skills and commitment, they assess their instructors every 4 years or more often when poor performance is reported. Egypt, focuses heavily on evaluating their students who are preparing to be teachers, to assure quality prior to them getting their teaching degree and eliminate later problems. Finland appraises against a national core curriculum and an individual school development plan. All teachers must hold a
master’s degree and must have passed an assessment for the profession, prior to teaching. School effectiveness is paramount rather than teacher effectiveness, so that all teachers strive to be part of the whole unit. They believe that this encourages self-assessment and professional growth.

France evaluates teachers once every 3 years in the primary level and every 4 to 5 years in secondary. Variances occur when inspector’s availability, and occur more often when teachers request an evaluation in order to advance their career, but seniority greatly impacts these advancements. Greece uses both internal and external evaluators for their evaluations. For formative purposes, it identifies teacher strengths and weakness for professional development needs and allows feedback. Summative evaluation is used to insure teachers are supporting the students through performance, and is allowed for career advancements, rewards and bonuses, paid time off and tenure decisions. Ireland only uses formal evaluations at the end of probationary teaching, or for teachers who have had complaints registered against them. However, there is a whole school evaluation yearly and this includes the quality of teaching as a portion to include the teachers into the school unit, as a whole.

Palestine uses both a summative and formative evaluation, which are done by both the school principal and a government supervisor, the results from these are posted on their website. The summative evaluation is done once a year, and the formative evaluation is done twice a year. Mexico utilizes a national standardized test for student achievement and this information has resulted in a new teacher evaluation and standardized exams for teachers, as well as providing continued education of teachers, although none of these have been utilized consistently. D.C., USA varies greatly, by the amount of reviews or evaluations given to teachers, based on their level of performance, and whether they are a new teacher or struggling teacher. These teachers are reviewed at least five time a year, verses an established teacher who are only reviewed one or two times a year.

The methods, sources and instrumentation also vary by countries. Australia has no teacher input in state government mandated standards, but use a qualification framework. Austria uses a set standard, when an evaluation is used by the inspector, however there is no set method or standard for self-evaluations. Chile has numerous standardized forms for each level of self, school and national levels. A weighted scale for knowledge of teachers and a portfolio is used. Monetary rewards of one month extra salary can be achieved for up to 10 years for those who achieve an outstanding, or competent rating, but not for basic or unsatisfactory.

Egypt uses a 5-domain standard for planning, learning strategies, classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, feedback strategies and professionalism. Finland uses a group based, reflective and participatory evaluations for professional accountability. A framework of evaluation for guidance is used, but there is no set regulation or procedures. France evaluates primary teachers, who receive a mark out of 20 points, where secondary teachers get two marks; the first by the administration of the schools and the second by the government inspectors. Final assessment contain mostly remarks and criticism and recommendation for improvement.
Greece has no systematic applications for school or teacher evaluation by government within schools, however, many instruments and data sources exist. Self-evaluation is to occur on a yearly basis for teachers in Greece. Ireland is part of the whole school evaluation and papers are sent to the school before the meeting to insure the completion. Mexico uses an assessment for teacher improvements by a variety of 15 forms, using multiple choice tests which are dependent on subject and level taught, with a focus on the main reference for teaching and the knowledge of the subject area. New Zealand appraisal system varies across the country, with appraisal data collected for classroom observations, interviews and dialog between the teacher and the evaluator, surveys, self-appraisal and the teacher portfolio. All of these are then compared with their national standards, job descriptions, code of conduct, school development plans or projects and the internal school regulations.

Palestine has structured uniform tools for both the principal to complete and by another supervisor to use when evaluating the teacher. The supervisor who is used for the formative evaluation is different than the one for the summative evaluation. And in D.C., USA a school administrator or master educator visits the classroom for about 30 min. to observe the teacher against the 9-commandments, to ensure all are performed during their evaluation. All data that is taken is incorporated into one evaluation, for both a formative and summative evaluation. Student assessment data is also incorporated as well as the school community data which is included, these assessments may or may not be standardized, as this varies.

The use of teacher evaluation findings also varies by country. In Australia, all evaluations are reported through the student’s proficiency. Austria, utilize their evaluations when teachers want to advance to an administration position, gain states of civil servant, or to address wide spread parent complaints after a student’s performance. They do not use the evaluations to support an outstanding teacher, which is a major complaint by the teachers. Chile use the findings to ensure quality performance of the teachers, these findings are given to the teachers, municipal educational authorities and the Education Commission of the government. Students and parents are not included in any gathered data for the evaluation.

Egypt, strongly believe that most education and evaluation should be done prior to the student graduating from the learning institutions, they use standards to complete the evaluations. A curriculum specialist also visits once a year and the teachers are visited once a semester to ensure there is no problems. The strictness varies on the length of service of the teacher and newer teachers receive a much more stringent evaluation. Finland uses their evaluations to produce an ongoing individualized teacher development program. Unlike the other countries, they concentrate on continual positive reinforcements, rather than using reprimands.

France uses their evaluations primarily for formative assessments, to improve teaching practice and insure that the government model of teaching is being met. Greece, use the evaluation findings differently by each level of the teacher. New or probationary teachers who do well may lead to permanent contracts, where continuing teachers use their evaluations to form developmental plans or rewards for the teachers. Tenured teacher’s evaluations are used mostly for promotions, career advancement, or to increase their salary. All evaluations will be used to construct new programs for teacher training modules. Ireland’s evaluations are sent to
probationary teachers; however, they are not used for formal or summative purposes. A report may be requested by the school administrator on the competency of any teacher to be returned to the monitoring government agency, the results are then used to support teacher improvements. A copy of the report is sent to said teacher.

Mexico, uses their evaluations more often than in the past, direct feedback now can occur with the teachers on their practices, and the evaluations may be used for promotions and salary increases; although most of this comes as a result of student testing and achievement. Many of the evaluation protocols have been delayed since the 2013 ruling. Appraisals are to be every 4-years with a written exam. Failure three times in a row constitutes removal. There is no structured formative or summative evaluations currently used.

Palestine, posts their evaluation results for all teachers on their government website and is accessible to all the teachers. If the results are not acceptable a teacher may fill out another form to object to the findings and a committee of three supervisors will investigate the complaint. Finally, the D.C., USA evaluations are reviewed to determine their IMPACT score and to determine if they need improvement, and if so what their plan of action will be. A school-based instruction coach may be used to support and encourage struggling teachers with feedback and guidance. This often includes discussions with school principals and the attending professional development programs, via live or by video. If extra help is deemed necessary, a teacher may be scheduled to shadow a proficient teacher in the district to help the teacher improve their practices.

The **Future plans for the development or reform of teacher evaluation systems** are not known for Austria, or for Mexico, with Mexico currently having further problems implementing their existing model. Australia reports needing more research done for teacher evaluation, primarily in setting the structure and purpose, accountability, improved effectiveness and for staffing and retention of teachers. Chile has a new initiative under review since 2012, which will provide a new multilevel career structure and new salary scale for each level of initial, prepared, advanced and expert teachers. Egypt and France are concerned on how seniority is approached. Egypt, is under review to ensure that uniformity, no matter what seniority level a teacher holds and to provide more constructive feedback. While France, had suggested a discontinuance of the current system and a replacement by a new one which would decrease the importance placed on seniority and place importance on designing a new criterion.

Greece has shown a need to reform their evaluations from the short-term fixes, which have been continually used, and created due to a continual change of political officers. (Author’s note: The District of Columbia in the U.S. shares this problem, with a new change of political leaders, how this will affect the educational evaluation of teachers remains to be seen.) Ireland has a new model in review to include experienced teachers helping the new probationary teachers, however no other evaluation changes are known. New Zealand has established a task force to update their teacher appraisal system. Palestine, continually reviews and updates their evaluations and forms when needed, as such this creates a continual process of review. Finally, D.C., USA also has continual modification ongoing.
Conclusion

Although countries vary in the process of teacher evaluations there is a consistency in the desire to provide quality teachers to their students. How effectively this is achieved and how much bureaucracy and cultural interference is involved varies greatly.

Many of the countries share a philosophy that long-standing teachers, with or without the formal status of tenure, should be given more freedom of teaching, with much less evaluation, supervision or corrective steps required, unless infringements are deemed significant.

While this is a shared practice in many countries, this practice is coming under great scrutiny and may need to be revised, so that all teachers, no matter their time of service, are evaluated and treated equally in their teaching practices and in how their success or infringements are responded to. How this will play out in the future will need to be carefully monitored.

The type of evaluation also varies greatly on whether equal time and monetary sources are given in the formative or summative evaluations. Many countries appear to place the majority of their resources to the outcomes that teachers provide through student testing and grades and on the process in which the teacher achieves this goal. They however, may not place as much emphasis on the other aspects of professional behavior and value added components, such as teacher practices and professional contributions and collaboration.

Detailed information for each of the 12 countries and the District of Columbia will now be explored.
Chapter 2: Australia
Karika Ann Parker

"What we do have in place currently are systems that make it quite difficult to monitor and support teachers that are not quite fitting the bill."

– Dianne Giblin, president of FPCA of NSW

Introduction

This paper examines the Grattin Institutes research findings against the established purpose and structure of teacher evaluations, as outlined by Hinchey, et, al. (2010) in order to address the need for a comprehensive review of the Australian Teacher Evaluation. According to Professor Gary Miron (2016), Australia has a dual system school choice system within systems; as a result, many children are being left behind, especially the poor, due to Australia’s school choice options.

In Australia, there are 3 school structures of their school system, which is the primary and the compulsory education of students. The primary begins at the age of 6 and is completed at the age of 15. The government and non-governmental primary school has 6 years, and is the junior secondary age levels of 6 to 12. Compulsory is from age 12 to 16, and for four years’ students enter a multi-purpose high school government or non-government co-education comprehensive education.

At the completion of this the students receive a junior secondary certificate/diploma of education (Year 10 certificate). Next is the senior secondary; students are there for 2 years, age 16 to 18 and at the conclusion they receive a senior secondary certificate of education (Year 12 Certificate).

The primary and secondary education in Australia is delivered through both government and non-government providers. The major responsibility for educating students in Australia is directed and overseen by the State and Territory. In addition, students that attend non-governmental school receive financial support to meet their educational outcomes. Students usually commence their secondary schooling when aged 12 or 13, reaching year 12 at age 17 or 18.

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers is comprised of seven Standards which outline what teachers should know and be able to do. The Standards are interconnected, interdependent and overlapping. The Standards are grouped into three domains of teaching: Professional Knowledge, Professional Practice and Professional Engagement. In practice, teaching draws on aspects of all three domains. Within each Standard, focus areas provide further illustration of teaching knowledge, practice and professional engagement. These are then separated into ‘descriptors’ at four professional career stages: Graduate, Proficient, Highly Accomplished and Lead.
Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

According to P.H. Hinchey (2010), teacher evaluation research should employ the following for policymakers; an assessment system that targets both continual improvement of the teaching staff and timely dismissal of teachers who cannot or will not improve.

Hinchey (2010) offers that,

Teacher evaluation should involve all key stakeholders, employ a single assessment tool, and gather evidence from multiple sources. Combine strategies so that the weakness of any single tool is offset by the strengths of another.

Criteria for assessing performance, artifacts or other factors are credible and are well understood by teachers and assessors. Provide high-quality, ongoing training for assessors and routinely calibrates their efforts to ensure consistent application of criteria. Engage in high-quality research on existing tools and programs to inform the design of assessment systems. Lastly, commit sufficient resources to produce both high-quality, and productive assessments.

According to professor, Gary Miron (2016), support structures are needed for teachers. This should include training for evaluators, mentors for teachers, support from outside agency subject master experts, and curriculum coordinators in math and science, should also be involved in the support process. One of the main reasons for developing standards for beginning teachers is to bring greater clarity and focus to the outcomes expected of teacher education programs, while encouraging innovation in their delivery. Similarly, standards that seek to capture what highly accomplished teachers and school leaders know and do, should aim to give clearer direction to a teacher's professional learning over the long term, while not prescribing particular styles of teaching.

Historic Development and Background of the Teacher Evaluation System

According to Hinchey (2010), teaching has historically been perceived as women’s work. Teaching has suffered from both low status and low pay. Yet, there has been growing support for recognizing teachers as skilled professionals uniquely qualified to assess their colleagues, as do professionals in other fields. Calls for a more collaborative assessment process with more emphasis on professional development have fueled interest in—and often union support for—involving teachers in assessment (p. 80). There is, however, scant empirical research on peer review, which can take many different forms (p. 13).

The historical backdrop is attributed to A.G. Austin (1999), in Australian Education 1788-1900. It was the beginning of the 1900s where the majority of Australian schools were outside of the government system. However, the government did allocate money for student’s education along with salary for teachers, school buildings and textbooks. Austin, notes that the Australian government had strict guidelines as to the curriculum, teachers' and students' behavior and what activities could or could not be performed on the school grounds, all things
which would make them disagreeable to other people. Rules governed how children were to enter the room, bow to the teacher, sit down on the benches, sit when reading what was on the blackboard, sit when writing, how to hold their pens, the position of their writing pads, and which hand was to be used for writing, as well as which hand was used to point to the words being copied. Austin offers that, most learning was by rote.

Students learned to repeat their tables, learn lists of dates and capital cities of the world, and memorize poems though parrot fashion. Play was also deemed to be character building, because it assisted with discipline, duty and instruction in the virtues of self-denial, self-restraint and obedience. However, the general observation was that the children were running, jumping and shouting in a confused manner, and not learning anything. Austin, further adds that, a student at the age of 13 could apply to become a teacher.

This method of training teachers proved unsuccessful because the students, who stayed at school and learned from the teacher, did not have contact with other teachers and their methods. In some cases, in the city, 15-year-old girls were put in charge, although provisionally, of a class of 100 students, not much younger than themselves. School inspectors and masters did not understand why these young girls could not control the class. In Tasmania, Queensland and Western Australia training colleges did not exist until the twentieth century, and higher education was exclusive to the wealthier classes. In the proceeding decade of the 1890, there was a need for skilled workers provoking suppliers to demand that technical education in schools be improved.

As most leaders, including British visitors and distinguished politicians complained, Australia set up a commission to investigate the increasingly diminished teacher training programs and student learning outcomes. Would-be teachers now had to complete secondary education and then attend training college (Powerup, 2016).

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

The current Australian teacher evaluation processes largely reflects perceived ends of education, current reforms, ideological and political factors. The use of teacher evaluation finding by the Grattan Institutes report entitled, What Teachers Want: Better Teacher Management document’s teacher development and evaluation practices was noted as the worst in the world, as it relates to teacher evaluation finding. Interestingly, the parents of children in the Australian school system were not surprise by its findings. Their findings place Australia 19th out of 23 countries in teacher evaluation and development. According to Dianne Giblin (2016), president of the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of NSW, teachers that are ineffective and problematic, are also distinctly identified, and are met with an administrative system that has no ready solution.

The report also documented, the vast majority of Australian public school teachers agreed, that poor-performing colleagues were not dealt with adequately. According to Dianne Giblin (2016), where teachers were below par, the problem was often not addressed or shifted elsewhere, “If a teacher is deemed underperforming, there are very difficult processes - very
long-winded processes - in place, which often results in the teacher either moving schools or just continuing to be monitored," She offered that, "What we would be calling for is a review of those systems to ensure that for parents, there is a quality teacher in front of their child every day."

The Grattan Institute reported a student with an excellent teacher can achieve in six months what would take a full year with a less effective one. It also found 91 percent of teachers surveyed did not believe effective teachers received adequate recognition, while 93 percent said their school principal did not take steps to address persistently underperforming teachers. Nearly 80 percent of teachers in Australian public schools said poorly performing teachers would not be sacked, the report says. According to Giblin (2016), if a situation arose where a teacher was underperforming, it would not be up to the school principal to withhold a pay rise, a spokesman for the school stated. "The Department (of Education) has a performance improvement program that it has in place for principals and also teachers."

According to the Australia Teacher Performance Matrix, Inspectors come in to mentor and evaluate the curriculum and meet with teachers. For this paper, the comparison of Hinchey’s recommendation to the Australia Professional Learning Matrix model is a way to see if the Australia school systems meet her proposed criterion for evaluating teachers (see Table 1).

Table 1. Australia’s School System Professional Learning Matrix
Darling-Hammond (2011), recommends, in the American teacher evaluation system, that good systems must be designed so that teachers are not penalized for teaching the students who have the greatest educational needs. Rather, they should explicitly seek to provide incentives that recognize and reward teachers who work with challenging students. Therefore, to understand how teachers influence student learning, more information about teachers’ practices and context are needed, than value-added measures can provide. Student learning evidence needs to be multi-faceted and accompanied by an analysis of the teacher’s students and teaching context. It must be integrated with evidence about teachers’ practice, and its use should be focused on improving teaching.

**Criteria for an effective teacher evaluation system.**

1. Teacher evaluation should be based on professional teaching standards and should be sophisticated enough to assess teaching quality across the continuum of development from novice to expert teacher.

2. Evaluations should include multi-faceted evidence of teacher practice, student learning, and professional contributions that are considered in an integrated fashion, in relation to one another and to the teaching context. Any assessments used to make judgments about students’ progress should be appropriate for the specific curriculum and students the teacher teaches.

3. Evaluators should be knowledgeable about instruction and well trained in the evaluation system, including the process of how to give productive feedback and how to support ongoing learning for teachers. As often as possible, and always at critical decision-making junctures (e.g., tenure or renewal), the evaluation team should include experts in the specific teaching field.

4. Evaluation should be accompanied by useful feedback, and connected to professional development opportunities that are relevant to teachers’ goals and needs, including both formal learning opportunities and peer collaboration, observation, and coaching.

5. The evaluation system should value and encourage teacher collaboration, both in the standards and criteria that are used to assess teachers’ work, and in the way results are used to shape professional learning opportunities.

6. Expert teachers should be part of the assistance and review process for new teachers and for teachers needing extra assistance. They can provide the additional subject-specific expertise and person-power needed to ensure that intensive and effective assistance is offered and that decisions about tenure and continuation are well grounded.

7. Panels of teachers and administrators should oversee the evaluation process to ensure that it is thorough and of high quality, as well as fair and reliable. Such panels have been shown to facilitate more timely and well-grounded personnel decisions that avoid grievances and litigation. Teachers and school leaders should be involved in developing, implementing, and monitoring the system to ensure that it reflects good teaching well,
that it operates effectively, that it is tied to useful learning opportunities for teachers, and that it produces valid results.

In Australia, there are no national requirements for the teaching profession. However, State and Territories have responsibilities over the university that train teachers. The federal government is the main source of funding for those institutions of higher education. The programs that are offered at the university are designed to prepare teachers early childhood education/teaching programs. Australian universities offer a Bachelors of Education in Early Childhood Education or a Bachelor of Early Childhood Education both require 4 years of full-time study. On the other hand, students who have already completed a 3-year Bachelor degree in a discipline other than education may complete a 1 or 2-year Graduate Diploma of Education in Early Childhood Education.

There are also some programs which prepare teachers to teach at both primary and secondary school. For example, the Bachelor of Education for Upper Primary/Lower Secondary, and Bachelor of Education for Primary and Secondary. Upon completion of their studies students look to their government and non-governmental entities to employ them, because it is the authorities in each State and Territories that facilitates the hiring process, according to the Australian government (2002).

Methods, Sources and Instruments

According to Iverson (2004), the task of writing standards is a challenging one for the teaching profession and for researchers. The teaching profession in Australia has been dominated by state government employing authorities, so that teachers were not accustomed to claiming for themselves the responsibility for developing profession-wide standards. But that situation has been changing in recent years. For researchers, the task of writing standards calls for them to identify the implications of their research for practice. Ideally, standards are like bridges between research and practice. They describe what current research implies teachers need to know, and be able to do, in order to provide quality opportunities for students to learn. Members of the Teaching and Leadership Program (ACER, 2016) have been at the forefront of standards development work for several years (p. 11).

Australia has a history of teacher’s qualification standards. The Qualifications Framework was developed in the early 1990s building on previous qualifications standards. According to Australian Qualifications Framework, established in 2000, links between the education and training sectors have been strengthened, partially through the introduction of the Australian Qualifications Framework (aqf.edu), which is a unified system of twelve national qualifications in schools, vocational education and training (Technical and Further Education Colleges and private providers), and the higher education sector (mainly universities). This framework links together all these qualifications and is a highly visible, quality-assured national system of scholastic acknowledgement, which promotes lifelong learning and a unified and diverse education and training system.
The Professional Learning Matrix is the method, source, and instrument used to guide the data collection conducting teacher evaluation, according to the Australian Professional Standards for Teacher Focus Areas. (See Table 1).

This paper also examined the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) response for Australia lower secondary level for, Teacher Appraisal and School Leader Appraisal, in two areas: 1) Existence of teacher appraisal which is listed as L=legislated. The following are implemented: Policy implementation or practice (not legislated), and its Breadth is countrywide, Completed probation, Yes; Regular Appraisal, Yes, Teacher registration, Yes, Appraisal for promotions is listed M=data not available, and Reward schemes, No. 2) In examining School Leader Appraisal, listed as Policy implementation or practice (if not legislated), its Breadth is countrywide, and the Percentages of school leaders appraised is M=data not available. (See Table 2 and 3).

Table 2. OECD Report for Teacher Appraisal and School Leader Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Teacher appraisal</th>
<th>School leader appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of teacher appraisal</td>
<td>Policy implementation or practice (if not legislated)</td>
<td>Types of teacher appraisal covered by policy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of teacher appraisal</td>
<td>Breadth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Country wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. OECD Report for Teacher Appraisal Rewards and Response to Underperformance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Appraisal rewards may involve</th>
<th>Responses to underperformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of school leader appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal informs school leader professional development activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal affects career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-off financial bonus</td>
<td>Salary increment for a fixed period of time</td>
<td>Further appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increment for a fixed period of time</td>
<td>Permanent salary increment</td>
<td>Compulsory training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent bonus for school budget</td>
<td>Financial bonus incentivates professional development opportunities</td>
<td>Deferral of promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Extra professional development opportunities</td>
<td>Salary increment withheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Permanent contract not granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Failure to pass probation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: No school leader appraisal, but have similar practices</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: Data are not applicable because the category does not apply</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings (How is the Information/Findings Shared and Used?)

According to the OECD:

Australia has **positive indicators in equity**. Among countries that are high performers in PISA 2009, Australia has a smaller-than-average proportion of students below proficiency Level 2, although these results have not improved since 2000, either in relation to other countries or to Australia’s own performance in previous assessments. The impact of socio-economic background on performance at age 15 is similar to the OECD average (see Figure 3). Boys scored 37 points less than girls in reading (compared to the OECD average of 39 points), but significantly outperformed girls in mathematics.

**Fair and inclusive policies** contribute to an equitable education system. Australia has comprehensive school until age 16. About 81% of children are enrolled in early childhood education in the year before school (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012), and government subsidies are available, as fee reimbursements. Australia is one of several high-performing OECD countries, including the Nordic countries and Canada, which does not have student tracking until the age of 16. It also limits its use of vertical and horizontal differentiation within schools. In addition, Australia’s grade repetition rate is 8.4%, below the OECD average of 13%. Australia has a high degree of **school choice** which, if not well targeted, can contribute to segregation of students. Around 96% of students attend a school that competes for enrolments with at least one other school. Evidence shows that school choice, along with other factors, may undermine equity in the education system by segregating students into schools based on their socio-economic background. It is important to ensure that there are mechanisms to mitigate this negative effect.
Future Plans

The Grattin study has examined the Australian Teacher Evaluation system and concluded that additional research is necessary to better understand the structure and purpose of teacher evaluation in its schools; specific to accountability, improved effectiveness and informed school administrators about decisions related to the staffing and retention of teachers.
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Chapter 3: Austria
Benjamin L. Oakley

Introduction

Teacher evaluation systems provide a framework for managing the performance of instructors. These systems vary widely among educational institutions around the world. The majority of nation-states do not have a standardized system of teacher evaluation that is implemented in the majority of elementary and secondary schools within their political boarders (OECD, 2012). For example, within the United States there are no federal standards for teacher evaluation and in most cases, no standards exist at the state level. Instead, the teacher evaluation systems implemented in public schools are created by local education agencies. As the field of education shifts towards research-based practices, these circumstances are starting to change, with states such as Texas using statewide systems of teacher evaluation.

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

Based upon Teacher Effectiveness Research (TER), Ellett et al., (1996) identify three things to consider when developing a comprehensive teacher evaluation system: 1) the evaluation purpose, 2) the evaluation criteria, and 3) sources for collecting relevant data. Darling-Hammond et al., (2012) provide a list of important criteria for creating an effective evaluation system:

1) Teaching evaluation should be based upon professional teaching standards.
2) Evaluation should include multifaceted evidence of teacher practice, student learning, and professional contributions.
3) Evaluators should be knowledgeable about instruction and well trained in evaluation systems.
4) Evaluations should be accompanied by useful feedback, and connected to professional development opportunities.
5) The evaluation system should value and encourage teacher collaboration.
6) Expert teachers should be part of the assessment and review process.
7) Panels of teachers and administrators should oversee the process.

These criteria can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher evaluation system. This report will examine the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation system used in Austria. The report includes a brief description of the historical background of teacher evaluation in Austria, a description of the current teacher evaluation system in Austria and an evaluation of the current teacher evaluation system based upon the 7 criteria listed above. Teacher evaluation in Austria does not meet most of the criteria of an effective teacher evaluation system, making it an area of opportunity for improving elementary and secondary education. This report makes six recommendations for improving the quality of the teacher evaluation system in Austria. These six recommendations are intended to improve the overall quality of education available to young people in Austria and thereby improve the quality of life for citizens and increase Austria’s level of global market competitiveness.
Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

Although Austria has started to focus more on evaluation of educational institutions over the past decade, few progressive changes to teacher evaluation systems have been implemented. Teacher evaluations in Austria take place under extenuating circumstances, occur rarely, are high stakes, and almost never formative.

Historical Background of Teacher Evaluation in Austria

Over the past 15 years, several factors have compelled Austria to reconsider the way school systems are evaluated. In a report prepared for The Austrian Ministry for Education, Specht & Sobanski (2012) mention what became a growing concern among educational experts and politicians about problematically low academic performance of Austrian students, measured by PISA, TIMSS, and PIRL, compared to other students internationally. As a result of this concern, Austria started to become more focused on obtaining information about the strengths and weaknesses of their education system using data pertaining to structures, processes and outcomes. Specht & Sobanski (2012) write that this shift was perpetuated in 2007 when a new Federal Minister of Education came to office and began promoting a more evidenced based educational policy.

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

There are currently three forms of teacher evaluation in Austria, which include 1) Self-evaluations conducted by the teacher, 2) Evaluations conducted internally by the headmaster/mistress, and 3) Evaluations conducted by an external third party, referred to as an “Inspector” (OECD, 2012). These three types of evaluation are not conducted on a schedule, but instead only take place under extenuating circumstances. The purpose of these evaluations is almost exclusively summative and are not used to manage performance or to conduct well aligned professional development. Universal criteria for self-evaluation, and evaluation conducted internally by headmasters or mistresses is nonexistent. However, evaluation criteria used by Inspectors is universal.

According to the OECD (2012) Austrian teachers are responsible for conducting their own evaluation, but without prescribed methods or standards. These evaluations are voluntary and nonbinding. Test results are given to teachers so that they use this data to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching methods. However, this process affects few teachers because students do not take standardized tests in most subjects. There is no indication that teachers are trained on how to conduct a multifaceted, formative, self-evaluation, based upon a wide variety of data sources that can be used to improve performance.

For several reasons, Headmasters/Mistresses rarely conduct teacher evaluations. There is no indication in OECD reports that formative evaluations ever take place. Internally conducted summative evaluations only occur under extenuating circumstances such as when a teacher wants to advance to an administrative position, when the teachers wants to gain the status of civil servant, or to resolve wide spread parent complaints regarding teacher performance.
Another one of the reasons evaluations rarely take place, cited in the by the 2012 OECD report, is that the concept of “teacher autonomy” heavily influences the practice of administrators. Regular evaluations are seen as a violation of teachers’ right to privacy. In addition, the report mentions that in most cases school level administrators are not well trained in teacher evaluation methods. It is also widely acknowledged that Headmasters/Mistresses are not given an adequate amount of time and resources to regularly conduct observations in the classroom. Inadequate training, lack of standardized process, scarce support staff, insufficient time, and a limited amount of data, all contribute to few summative evaluations taking place on a regular basis within Austrian schools.

The OECD report (2012) recognizes a “rethinking of the Inspector’s role towards pedagogical support”, Inspectors usually only conduct evaluations when the teacher is seeking a promotion to headmaster/mistress, apply for status as a civil servant, or to resolve parent complaints. The OECD report (2012) states that the evaluations that take place under these circumstances appear to be “transparent, predictable, fair, and based on a coherent framework consistently applied by properly trained specialist, the inspectors.” The report also acknowledges that scarcely are teachers forced to accept negative sanctions such as transfer, dismissal, or obligatory professional development. The public in Austria regards teachers as particularly privileged professionals. Simultaneously the report states that outstanding teacher performance is rarely recognized.

The majority of Austrian teachers report that they have not been evaluated by a Headmaster/Mistress or Inspector over the past five years, according to OECD briefing note for Austria. Over half of the teachers surveyed do not believe their school leaders use effective methods for determining whether teachers are performing well or badly and over 85% percent of Austrian teachers do not believe they would be recognized for improving the quality of their teaching or implementing progressive teaching techniques. In addition, teachers agreed that evaluation did not affect their pay or opportunities for career advancement.

Based upon the criteria presented by Darling-Hammond et al., (2012), Austria does not have an effective teacher evaluation system in place. This lack of an effective teacher evaluation process is an area of opportunity for the Austrian education system. Austria’s education system was evaluated based upon each of the criteria provided by Darling-Mammond et al., (2012), for the purpose of this report.

The first criteria states that “Teaching evaluation should be based upon professional teaching standards. Self-evaluations conducted by teachers in Austria are not based upon standardized teaching practices. Headmasters may have some knowledge of standardized teaching practices, but no universal system for teacher evaluation is consistently used by school leaders. External evaluations conducted by Inspectors are based upon professional standards according to OECD reports. However, it should be noted that only summative evaluations are conducted by inspectors.

The second criteria states, “Evaluation should include multifaceted evidence of teacher practice, student learning, and professional contributions.” Self-evaluations may meet this
criterion in some cases, but there is no indication that it meets this criterion consistently. Since internal evaluators lack standardized practices and criteria for teacher evaluation, it does not seem that evaluations conducted by headmaster/mistress meet this criterion either. Evaluations conducted by inspectors may meet this criterion in part, but it does not seem that the summative evaluations conducted by Inspectors necessarily lead to recognition of professional contributions by teachers.

The third criteria states, “Evaluators should be knowledgeable about instruction and well trained in evaluation systems.” Neither Austrian school leaders nor teachers are well trained in the practice of teacher evaluations. However, according to the OECD, and survey data pertaining to the opinion of Austrian educators, Inspectors are well trained in evaluation systems.

The fourth criteria states, “Evaluations should be accompanied by useful feedback, and connected to professional development opportunities.” There is no indication that self-evaluation, internal evaluation, external evaluation are in anyway connected to useful feedback and opportunities for professional development in the case of the Austrian school system. This appears due in part to the absence of formative evaluation practices that could be used to meet this 4th criteria.

The fifth criteria states, “The evaluation system should value and encourage teacher collaboration.” There is no indication that the teacher evaluation system used in Austria in any way encourages teacher collaboration. As the OECD report mentions, teacher autonomy is a particularly salient aspect of the culture of education in Austria. Extensive research indicates the advantages of teacher collaboration for improving the quality of instruction and professional development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012).

The sixth criteria states, “Expert teachers should be part of the assistance and review process”, and seventh states, “Panels of teachers and administrators should oversee the process.” There is no indication that either of these criteria are met by Austria’s teacher evaluation system.

Teacher Evaluation Findings

By reviewing the criteria for teacher evaluations (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012). We can speculate how their information and findings may be shared or used currently. As it stands, teaching evaluation based upon professional teaching standards are as follows:

Self-Evaluation is not based upon professional standardized teaching practices. Internal Evaluation conducted by the headmaster/mistress may also be “based upon” professional standards, but again there is no universal system for teacher evaluation which is consistently used by school leaders. External evaluation is conducted by an Inspector, but they use professional teaching standards to evaluate teachers only in summative evaluations.

Evaluation which should include multifaceted evidence of teacher practice, student learning, and professional contributions, may perhaps be done, for self-evaluation, but there is
no particular way these evaluations are conducted. Internal Evaluation conducted by headmaster/mistress are rarely conducted and seem to be based upon a limited set of data about teacher performance. External evaluation conducted by an Inspector has unavailable detailed information, but OECD indicates that external evaluations meet this criterion somewhat. There is no indication of an evaluation recognizing the professional contributions of the teachers.

Evaluators should be knowledgeable about instruction and well trained in evaluation systems, however when self-evaluation is considered teachers are not well trained to conduct self-evaluations. Internal evaluation conducted by the headmaster/mistress indicate that Headmaster are apprehensive about playing the role of instructional leader since they are not well trained in the practice of teacher evaluation. However, reports indicate that external evaluations conducted by the inspectors seem to be better since they are well trained in the practice of teacher evaluation.

Evaluations should be accompanied by useful feedback, and connected to professional development opportunities, however there is no evidence or reporting on self-evaluations. Internal evaluation, that are conducted by the headmaster/mistress, do appear to have criteria which seems to apply, primarily to formative evaluation. However, there is no formative evaluations are conducted by an internal leader. External Evaluation Conducted by Inspector are conducted only for summative evaluations, so the evaluation system does not meet this criterion.

The evaluation system should value and encourage teacher collaboration, however there is no indication that a self-evaluation system encourages collaboration. There is also no indication that an internal evaluation is conducted by a headmaster/mistress to promotes collaboration, nor is there any indication that a system exists to promote collaboration by an external evaluation by an Inspector.

The criterion has not been met showing that expert teachers are part of the assistance and review process for self-evaluation, nor through internal evaluations conducted by a headmaster/mistress, or through an external evaluation conducted by an inspector.

There is also no criterion met for panels of teachers and administrators to oversee the process with self-evaluation. Nor is there criterion met for Internal or external evaluators.

**Future Plans**

According to OECD Indicators, Austria’s elementary and secondary education system has many opportunities for improvement, most of which are indirectly linked to having an effective teacher evaluation system in place. To the country’s credit, Austria’s spending on tertiary education is one of the highest within the European Union. The employment rate for those with post-secondary education in Austria is over 30% higher than for those without post-secondary education, indicating the effectiveness of higher spending on post-secondary programs. However, graduation rates, rate of enrollment in higher education programs and literacy rates are all below EU averages. Level of social mobility linked to education in Austria is also particularly low, especially for women. And last, the average age of teachers in Austria is
increasing, with few younger people going into the profession. These indicators imply that it would behoove Austria to improve their teacher evaluation system in order to increase the quality of elementary and secondary education.
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Chapter 4: Chile

Fanny J. Hernandez de Alvarez

Introduction

Chile is a democratic republic located in southern South America. The World Bank classified its economy as an upper-middle income economy and is among Latin America’s fastest growing economies. However, there are indications that salaries of teachers are low when compared to salaries of other professionals. According to statistics from Futuro Laboral, five years after graduation, a teaching career is the worst paid among professional careers, particularly for pre-primary and primary education (Meller and Brunner, 2010).

According to the Ministry of Education of Chile, there are four types of school providers: Municipal Schools, Private subsidised schools, Private non-subsidised Schools, and Schools with the delegated administration. In the 1980s, an education reform entailed the decentralization of public school management responsibilities to municipalities including the teaching workforce. As Gysling, J. said (2016), public schools became the responsibility of local authorities and teachers were no longer directly employed by the central state; the creation of private schools was encouraged and public (municipal) and private schools financed through a demand voucher.

Chile is a member of OCDE, United Nations, IEA and UNESCO. Therefore, Chile has participated in international education testing such as PISA, TIMSS, and ICCS, which are promoting by this organizations. Chile has been singled out as pioneering national assessments in Latin America (Kellaghab & Greaney, 2001, Meckes & Carrasco, 2010). About its teacher evaluation system, according to OCDE (2015) evaluated 82% of teachers of all levels.

Structure of the Teacher Evaluation System

According to the Ministry of Education of Chile, initial teacher education is a requirement to enter the teaching profession. The law detailed the prerequisites for entering the teaching profession which are: (1) having teacher education qualifications from an institution recognized by the State, being qualified in vocational subjects by an accredited institution, or having an equivalent degree from a foreign institution; (2) not having a criminal record; (3) being in good state of health for teaching; (4) qualifying for the exercise of public duties; and (5) having complied with the military recruitment and deployment Law. Following graduation, to work as a teacher, there is no need to take a qualifying examination.

In the municipal sector, for beginning teachers, there is no compulsory probation period associated with an induction program. There is a unique career scale in which teaching is organized on a single salary scale and not promotion opportunities. In private schools’ owners organize their own teachers’ career structures.

Chile teacher evaluation is mandatory periodic. Teacher evaluation procedures are determined by the central government and its education authorities. The Centre for Pedagogical Training, Experimentation and Research (CPEIP), within the Ministry of Education, coordinates
the whole teacher evaluation system including the definition of objectives, validation of instruments, and the dissemination of results. The Docentemas team of the Measurement Centre of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile under the supervision of the CPEIP, provide advice and manages the system. In addition, a consultative committee monitors and provides guidance on the process and it’s composed of academics and representatives from the Teachers’ Union, the Chilean Association of Municipalities and the Ministry of Education.

According to the Minister of Education of Chile, the Measurement Centre of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile has been contracted to implement the process: production and revision of instruments, selection and preparation of evaluators and scores, and analysis of evidence gathered from each evaluation process. In every district, there is a committee that organizes the application evaluation process. Therefore, the application process itself is decentralized. The district gather and process the evidence and then sends it to the central processing unit at the University (see Appendix 1).

**Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

The teacher evaluation system seeks improvement of teaching and learning outcomes. Avalos Assael (2006) said that the Chile teacher evaluation system is designed to stimulate teachers to further their improvement through the learning of their strengths and weaknesses. This system provides an opportunity for teachers to reflect on their practice, which aimed at improving teacher’s practice, by obtaining feedback as formative evaluation. This assessment covers all classroom teachers with at least one year of professional practice in municipal schools, as well as those in schools with delegated administration.

On one hand, the Chile teacher evaluation system is formative to a moderate level, to provide feedback to teachers. Thus, it includes a section on career advancement, those with poor results on two consecutive regular appraisals should leave the system. On the other hand, summative purposes are a lower level. According to Isore (2009), “in its summative form, evaluation firstly responds to the needs of assuring that teaching directed towards student achievement. It also provides opportunities for social recognition of teacher’s skills and commitment to work”.

The defined assessment criteria were established by the Ministry of Education producing a set of standards based on the work done earlier for the initial teacher education standards and on Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (Avalos & Assael, 2006). The framework for competent teaching formulated includes four teaching domains (planning, learning environment, professionalism and education strategies for the learning of all students) and twenty criteria/standards. The criteria are linked to four levels of quality/performance: ‘unsatisfactory’, ‘basic’, ‘competent’ and ‘excellent’ (see Appendix 2).

**Historic Development of Teacher Evaluation**

Chile teacher evaluation system, according to the Ministry of Education of Chile, has a law to mandatory appraise teachers, which was enacted in August 2004. Before that, there was an extended period of discussion and negotiations to implement the teacher evaluation model.
At first, teachers rejected the implementation of the evaluation system. Finally, in 2003, after seven years of discussions, the teacher performance evaluation system was established. It was defined by a tripartite agreement between the Ministry of Education, the Chilean Association of Municipalities (ACM) and the Teachers’ Association which consists of a formal system of external teacher evaluation in the municipal school sector (Avalos & Assael, 2006).

In 2003, Chile defined the Good Teaching Framework, which is the standards for the teaching profession (Santiago, P., et al., OCDE, 2013, pg. 9). Also in the same year, Docentemás as is called the teacher performance evaluation system, was established as an agreement between the Ministry of Education, the Chilean Association of Municipalities and the Teachers’ Association (Santiago, et al., OCDE, 2013, pg. 9).

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

In Chile, according to the Ministry of Education, the application of the evaluation system consists of assessed teachers every four years, unless their previous assessment identified poor performance. The assessment refers to performance in the particular year in which the evaluation occurs.

Teachers are rated into four distinct performance levels: Outstanding, Competent, Basic and Unsatisfactory.

Teachers who are rated Outstanding or Competent are eligible to apply voluntarily to the Variable Individual Performance Allowance program (AVDI) which is accessible only to municipal teachers.

Teachers who are rated Basic requires a new evaluation two years later. Also, they are required to participate in Professional Development Plans (PSP), designed and implemented for them by municipalities which address the development opportunities identified in the evaluation.

Teachers who are rated Unsatisfactory are also required to participate in targeted Professional Development Plans (PSP), developed by municipal authorities. This rating also entails a new evaluation the following year. If a second consecutive unsatisfactory rating is given to the teacher, he or she is removed from the teaching position (see Appendix 3).

According to the Ministry of Education of Chile, the reward programs are not mandatory, but instead is voluntary. This system involves some evaluation, which is explained as follow by Santiago, et al. (2013):

Programs for the Variable Individual Performance Allowance (municipal sector only), AVDI test, which requires an extra national standardized test to assess the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers. The teacher performance evaluation and the AVDI test, are the bases to confer monetary rewards. A teacher granted an AVDI reward, receives an extra annual amount of between 5% and 25% of his or her annual national minimum basic salary, paid in four instalments. Also, if the teacher is employed in a school with a high concentration
of priority students, the reward is increased by 30%. The duration of the AVDI reward varies between two and four years depending on when the AVDI test is taken.

Program for the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance (AEP), is a voluntary annual program to recognize the pedagogical excellence of teachers and reward them. It covers teacher for the entirely subsidized school sector. Teachers who succeed in their application to the AEP are provided with a monetary reward (Excellent Teacher Allowance). The AEP is based on two instruments: a test to assess the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher (weight of 30%); and a portfolio (weight of 70%). The AEP is designed around the GTF and the national curricular framework.

The objective of the AEP is to strengthen the quality of education through the recognition of their pedagogical excellence of classroom teachers. The monetary reward is equivalent to an extra monthly salary per year for ten years. To keep the reward, accredited teachers must be practicing classroom teachers and be rated as “Outstanding” or “Competent” during the corresponding period.

National System for Performance Evaluation (SNED), also includes private schools which autonomously organize their performance teacher evaluation systems. The annual number of applicants is relatively small, and most applicants were teachers based in the subsidized private sector.

Methods, Sources, and Instrumentation of Data Collection

The instruments and information sources used in assessing the performance of a teacher is explained according to what the Ministry of Education of Chile said: Self-evaluation, Peer evaluation interview, Third-party reference report, and the Teacher performance portfolio.

In addition to the instruments, the teacher also fills out a questionnaire providing background information and requesting the teacher’s views of the teacher evaluation process. Teachers are evaluated against the standards of the Good Teaching Framework which are used as a reference.

Self-evaluation consists of a structured questionnaire organized according to the four domains of the Good Teaching Framework (GTF). Its objective is to generate teachers’ reflection on their practice and encourage teachers to review the GTF. Teachers rate themselves using a guide with a protocol provided to them.

Peer evaluator interview. A peer evaluator is a trained and accredited classroom teacher by the CPEIP, which is at the same education level and within the same area. The interviews consist of a structured and pre-established standardized set of questions for about an hour. The questions cover domains and criteria in the GTF. The teachers receive a writing individual report used to provide feedback to teachers.

Third-party reference report is answered by the school director and the head of the Technical-Pedagogical Unit of the school, consist of a structured questionnaire, covering a range of domains of the teacher’s professional activity (according to the GTF). The information
gathered through the reference report is also used for the feedback to be received in writing by
the teachers as they complete the evaluation process.

Teacher performance portfolio. The portfolio is evidence of the teacher pedagogical
practices design by the teachers. The portfolio is prepared for a given educational level and area
of teaching expertise (as defined by the Curriculum and Assessment Unit within the Ministry of
Education). The portfolio consists of two separate modules.

*Set of two pedagogical materials:* In module 1, the teacher provides writing materials
which are required to plan and implement an 8-hour teaching unit, to design an end of term
assessment for the unit of instruction, and to responding questions about teaching practices
(including a reflection on achievements). There are three components within Module 1, which
consists of a description of an 8-hour learning unit (Component 1), and the associated
assessment strategy (Component 2), as well as a reflection about pedagogical practices
(Component 3), which consists of observation on the teacher about his or her educational
practices in the previous school year (see Appendix 4).

In module 2, two components are utilized; a Video recording of a class, which consists
of a 40-minute recording of a regular class, together with the completion of a questionnaire
about the class. This activity seeks to assess a range of aspects of the teacher’s work: capacity
to develop a lesson with a good start, development and closure; the quality of the interaction
promoted among the students (questions asked, activities proposed and feedback); capacity to
keep a proper working environment; and quality of the explanations and the didactic strategies.
The teacher is rated across eight dimensions: Organization of the elements of the learning unit,
Analysis of class activities, Quality of the assessment of the learning unit, Reflection about
assessment results, Reflection about pedagogical practices, Classroom environment, Structure
of the class, and Pedagogical Interaction (see Appendix 5). The weights of each assessment
instrument for the final evaluation is listed below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Weights of assessment instruments for the final evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third-party reference report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer evaluator interview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher performance portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher performance portfolio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

In Chile, according to Avalos & Assael (20060 “the findings from teacher evaluation do
not include a link between teacher’s performance and student results”. As a consequence of the
union of teachers’ strong opposition, the system emphasized and differentiated teacher’s level of performance. In the process of the teacher evaluation system, neither students nor parents are surveyed. According to Avalos, B., & Assael, J. (2006) “the system has both summative and formative elements instead of being primarily dedicated to one of the purposes, as the result of the negotiation process from multiple stakeholders’ interests into account”.

The findings of the teacher evaluation system, as the Ministry of Education of Chile explain, are used to contribute to ensuring teachers quality performance. Feedback from the results are provided in writing to a range of groups this includes: Individual teachers, Municipal Evaluation Commissions, Individual schools, Municipal education authorities, Statistical yearbook of teacher evaluation, and Research from the results of teacher evaluation. The type of report given to these six groups is explained below:

Individual teachers, receive an individual Evaluation Report. The report has four sections: (i) portfolio results: ratings and a description of strengths and weaknesses across the eight dimensions assessed by the portfolio, (ii) integrated results for peer evaluator interview and third-party reference report with ratings and a short paragraph across the four domains of the GTF; (iii) ratings of self-evaluation, and (iv) overall evaluation rating awarded by the Municipal Evaluation Commission with an explanation.

Municipal Evaluation Commission, receives a report on each of the teachers evaluated in the municipality.

Individual schools, receive a short report with descriptive statistics on the evaluation results of: (i) teachers at the school, (ii) teachers at the respective municipality; and (iii) teachers at the national level. Schools also receive the overall rating for each of the teachers at the school.

Municipal education authorities, receive the same descriptive statistics with results for each of the schools within the municipality and results at both the national and municipal level. Also, they receive the overall rating from each evaluate teacher within the municipality.

Statistical Yearbook of teacher evaluation, presents and compiles the results of the assessment of teachers by descriptions of the population evaluated in the context and sociodemographic characteristics of teachers.

Research from the results of teacher evaluation, which focus after teaching practices.

Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System

In 2012 according to Santiago, P., et al. (2013) (OCDE), a significant initiative of the Chilean government initiated a draft of a new proposing career structure for the teacher. The draft law was submitted to Parliament in March 2012 and is currently undergoing discussions. The draft law proposes changes in the organization of the teaching profession: a new multilevel career structure, with a salary scale for each career level. It will cover new teachers and, on a voluntary basis, current teachers. Four career levels are proposed: Initial, Prepared, Advanced and Expert. The multilevel career structure is associated with a certification system that will
evaluate teacher knowledge and abilities through an examination. The results of the evaluation will also be used in teacher selection processes as well as teachers’ access to positions with greater responsibilities within schools. Also, programs such INICIA are propose to promote the initial teacher education through the improvement of the training provided by teacher institutions.
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Appendix 1:

REGULATION ON EVALUATION TEACHING.

CHILE'S GOVERNMENT MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

MAHV / PML / CEBI / RGL / JSD / sma

LEGAL DEPARTMENT. APPROVES REGULATION ON EVALUATION TEACHING.

SANTIAGO, 30. AGO.2004.- No. 192.

CONSIDERING:

That Article 70 of Decree-Law No. 1 of 1996, the Ministry of Education sets consolidated, coordinated and systematized text Law No. 19,070 adopted by the Teachers' Statute Professionals Education and laws. It establishes the complement system evaluation of education professionals’ functions they perform in classroom teaching, formative in nature, aimed at improving the work pedagogical educators and promote them continuing professional development, created by the letter

d) Article 12 of Law No. 19,933;
That also Law No. 19,961 established rules governing the assessment of such professionals’ education, modifying and complementing the Article 70 indicated;

That assessment system provided by law aims to strengthen the profession teaching, fostering recognition of the strengths and overcoming the weaknesses of teachers, with

In order to achieve better learning of their students and students, for which the creation of states professional development plans that will benefit teachers that are evaluated basic and unsatisfactory performance; which it is necessary for the implementation of system, regulate the manner of selection and appointment of peer evaluators, their disqualifications, incompatibilities and obligations, the Communal Commissions Evaluation procedures, timing, deadlines and other technical aspects of the teacher evaluation standards for the results of the evaluation, and reevaluation if the unsatisfactory outcome, as also plans professional development that teachers must undergo basic results and unsatisfactory and procedures that enable professionals education exercise their right to appeal regarding the results of their evaluation;

VIEWED:

The provisions of the Laws, Nos. 18,956 that restructuring the Ministry of Education, 19,933 and 19,961; Decree with Force of Law No. 11996 the Ministry of Education and Articles 32 No. 8 and 35 of the Constitution Policy of the Republic of Chile,

DECREE:

To approve the following regulation Article 70
Decree with Force of Law No. 1 of 1996, the Ministry of Education established the Teacher Evaluation System for education professionals in the sector municipal.

GENERAL DISPOSITION

SECTION 1: For the purposes of these rules shall apply:

a) "Teacher Evaluation" assessment system professional’s education who work in classroom teaching functions, character training, aimed at improving the pedagogical work of educators and promote their continuing professional development as set out in Article 70 of Decree- Law No. 1 of 1996, the Ministry of Education, with performance levels corresponding to outstanding, competent, basic or unsatisfactory.

b) "Teachers": education professionals who exercise in the classroom according to the letter. a) of Article 6 of Decree with Force of Law No. 1 1996 Education establishments in the municipal sector, managed either directly by municipalities or municipal corporations, and they are have been administered by municipal corporations private education, according to the rules established in the Decree-Law No. 1-3063, Ministry of Interior, 1980.

c) "peer reviewers ": The classroom teachers of the same school level, industry curriculum, and methods of teaching evaluated, which it bears the responsibility for implementing the interview teachers, inform and participate in the Community Assessment Commission.

d) "Community Assessment Commission" collegial entity that operates at the level Local, composed of all the peer reviewers of a commune and Head of Municipal Administration Department of Education, or the Director Municipal Corporation of Education where applicable, and having the responsibility to locally apply the evaluation system.

e) "Domains, Evaluation Criteria and Descriptors" shall mean such the contents of the document entitled Framework for Good Teaching, prepared and approved by the Ministry of Education.

f) "Evaluation Instruments" shall mean such self - assessment, Teaching Portfolio Performance, Interview teacher evaluated Reference Report Third, according to what is stated in the title second of these regulations.

g) "Plans of Professional": Set of training teachers, designed and executed in accordance with this regulation, aimed at help overcome weaknesses professional evidencing the level teachers with basic or unsatisfactory performance.

SECTION 2: Teachers notifications referred to in this regulation

They must be made personally or by registered letter sent to the home educational establishment in which the teacher performs. In the first case, they will understand practiced by
the physical delivery of the document made by an official Department of Municipal Administration or Education Corporation Municipal education, if necessary. In the second case, they will be understood practiced counting the third day in his office in the post office.

SECTION 3: The people involved in teacher evaluation should keep confidential the information generated by the assessment process teachers, without prejudice to their right to access those records that they personally affect.

TITLE I

TEACHER EVALUATION

SECTION 4: They will be evaluated all classroom teachers in the field of public education, it ie those teachers serving in Education Basic, General Secondary Education Training, Early Childhood Education, Special Education or Differential, Adult Education, Training Media Differentiated Teaching Humanistic-Scientific and specialties Media Professional Technical Education.

The evaluation of each teacher will take place every four years, except for those education professionals that are an assessed level of performance Unsatisfactory, who shall apply as stated in Article 10 of this Regulation.

All teachers are evaluated exercising the minimum hours established by the Curricular framework for the sector and subsector or mode corresponding to evaluate over a given period. In the case that teachers perform their work in more than one sector and subsector or mode, and one of them meets some hours less than 60% of the total of contracted hours, they should be assessed in that sector and subsector or mode.

Otherwise, decision teacher will indicate which of the sectors, subsectors, or modalities want to be evaluated during that period. This decision should manifest writing to the Head of Municipal Administration of Education or then Director of the respective Municipal Education Corporation and within the time limits appropriate, and in no case, can mean being left out of the evaluation process.

SECTION 5: Self - assessment and the development of the portfolio is an activity personal. It is the responsibility of each teacher to ensure that the information delivery as evidence of their professional performance effectively corresponds to the activities developed as part of their role in classroom teaching.

The submission of false information, copied or processed by third parties determine that the teacher assessment is challenged, the teacher must repeat a year evaluation.

Next, without prejudice to the sanctions provided for in Article 72 letter b) of DFL No. 1, 1996, Education, which sets the consolidated, coordinated and systematized of Law 19,070, which approved the Statute of Education Professionals and the laws that supplement and amend. It will be the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP) qualify whether or not for the objection.

ARTICLE 6: They will be exempted from participating in the evaluation process a given year:
a) Peer reviewers of this annual process, which should mandatorily evaluate in the process the following year, and

b) Teachers during their first year of practice in an educational establishment, it being understood that in its undersigned first work contract or designated, if necessary.

ARTICLE 7: It may request to suspend the teacher for evaluation immediately following year, in the cases listed below:

a) For reasons of force majeure;

b) When the teacher has been transferred from the establishment or course, with after 30 April of year evaluation date;

c) For leave without pay than three months, granted by the holder, and which affects the process of developing the evidence evaluation. In any case, the teacher cannot bring this ground in the next year and

d) For being the teacher conducting training activities outside the national territory, authorized by the holder during the period making evaluation evidence.

The grounds must be duly accredited to the Head of Department Municipal Administration of Education or the Director of the Education Corporation Respective Municipal, who resolved. For the purposes of the appeal provided for in Article 46 of these regulations, these grounds must be filed before the start of the evaluation process corresponding or when verified it.

ARTICLE 8: The evaluation was conducted on the basis domains, criteria and descriptors set out in the Framework for Good Teaching approved by the Ministry of Education, by applying the instruments defined by the Center for Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP).

ARTICLE 9: The final result of the evaluation of a teacher corresponds to one of the following performance levels: Featured, Proficient, Basic or Unsatisfactory. These levels are defined as follows:

a) Outstanding Performance: Indicates a professional performance that is clear, consistent and projects on what is expected for the whole of the indicators evaluated. Usually, it manifested by a wide range of behaviors regarding what is being evaluated or by wealth teaching that is added to compliance with the indicators.

b) Competent performance: Indicates a professional performance that meets regularly all the indicators evaluated. Meets the requirements to practice the role of teachers professionally. Even though not exceptional, it is a good performance.

c) Basic performance: Indicates a professional performance that meets certain irregularity all the indicators evaluated regularly or Most of these.
d) Unsatisfactory performance: Indicates a performance that presents clear weaknesses for all the indicators evaluated and affecting the teaching work significantly.

ARTICLE 10: If a teacher resulting evaluated with performance unsatisfactory must undergo a reevaluation in the year following that of the Delivery of the evidence that resulted in unsatisfactory condition. If the second evaluation again the result is unsatisfactory, the teacher will leave the ongoing responsibility to work during the year in its improvement plan teaching professional with a tutor, the employer must bear the expense representing the replacement of teachers in the classroom, and will be submitted for a third annual assessment consecutively. To maintain the unsatisfactory performance will no longer belong to the educational endowment.

ARTICLE 11: Professional development actions to be carried out teachers with unsatisfactory level shall begin during the first half of the following year they were evaluated and must be executed in at least 50% of schedule at the start of the new annual assessment to be carried out.
The Head of Municipal Administration of Education or the Director of the Education Respective Municipal Corporation should a written record of those teachers with primary level or unsatisfactory performance not avail themselves a professional development plan, communicating Improvement Center, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP).

TITLE II
ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

ARTICLE 12: Assessment tools to be used in each evaluation are established by Resolution No. 3333 of April 14, 2005, the Ministry of Education, that is:
   a) NCSA;
   b) Teaching Portfolio Performance;
   c) Interview teachers evaluated;

ARTICLE 13: The assessment tools should relate to the domains, criteria and descriptors set out in the Framework for Good Teaching, approved by the Ministry of Education.

ARTICLE 14: The information source is the same teacher should meet through self - assessment and portfolio.

Self - main evaluation function will be that teachers evaluate their own practice from a pedagogical pattern previously determined by the Center Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP). The portfolio has the function of collecting, through standardized products by Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) verifiable evidence on best practices of teacher performance evaluated. You will see written products, in which the teacher must report various aspects of their professional work, and a
visual record of performance, that corresponds to a class of 40 minutes. This record will be performed by a technician trained and opportunity shall be agreed upon with the teacher.

ARTICLE 15: The interview will be implemented and evaluated by the evaluation pair in an environment to ensure the achievement of the objective, by a pattern especially designed for that purpose by the Centre, Training and Experimentation Educational Research (CPEIP).

ARTICLE 16: The third reference reports will be issued by the Pedagogical Technical Director and Head of the establishment, where appropriate. They will use a structured pattern specially designed by the Center Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP). In those establishments where none exists such charges, this report will be issued by the supervisor of teacher and evaluated by the Pedagogical Technical Manager when there is communal.

ARTICLE 17: Assessment tools have the following weights:

a) The portfolio will be weighted 60% and in the case of the second and third evaluation of teachers with reduced level, its weighting will be one 80%.

b) Self- assessment will be weighted 10% and in the case of the second and third evaluation of teachers with poor level, its weighting will be one 5%.

c) The interview will be weighted 20% and in the case of the second and third evaluation of teachers with unsatisfactory level, a risk weight 10%, and

d) Reports third are weighted by 10% and in the case of the second and third evaluation of teachers with unsatisfactory level, their weighting it will be 5%.

TITLE III
COUPLE EVALUATORS

ARTICLE 18: Peer evaluators will be selected and prepared for performing its function by the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP), which establish the basis for this selection, determining it the number of peer reviewers required for the process of the respective year. The process nomination will be voluntary.

Improvement Center, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) inform the requirements and the process during the second quarter of each year, application for peer evaluator through a mass media and national circulation.

Those interested should submit the records and documents requested by the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) to Head of Municipal Administration Department of Education or the Director of the Education Respective Municipal Corporation.
Those teachers that are shortlisted by the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) must attend two-day training, which corresponds to the final stage of the selection process Evaluator par.

The Ministry of Education by order appoint the peer reviewers and payroll informs the Head of Department of Municipal Education Administration or the Director of the Municipal Corporation Respective Education.

ARTICLE 19: Peer evaluators must meet the following requirements:

a) being a classroom teacher in exercise, at least, five years of experience in the classroom in the formal school system;

b) Belong to the same school level, sector and type of curriculum teaching that corresponds evaluated;

c) It not has been sanctioned in administrative proceedings in the last four years;

d) Have teacher evaluation whose performance levels have been highlighted competent, or be entitled to receive teacher Assigned Teaching Excellence, or be faculty member of the Teachers Network teachers;

e) Having completed and approved training to perform such function, to be conducted by the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP), as set in the previous article.

ARTICLE 20: Peer evaluators will be subject to the following disqualifications:

a) Evaluate a teacher in the same establishment, and

b) Evaluate your spouse, children, adopted children or relatives to the third degree of consanguinity and second degree of affinity inclusive.

ARTICLE 21: The following are incompatible with the role of the evaluator couple following:

a) The coordination functions to perform system - level evaluation communally during the same period of evaluation and

b) The teacher who meets educational directives or technical functions in the same educational establishment.

ARTICLE 22: Peer evaluators can fulfill its role in the commune where they serve as classroom teachers or in different districts to their endowment.

If no peer reviewers of the same grade level in a given commune, modality and curricular sector, the Head of Municipal Administration Education or the Director of the Municipal Education Corporation commune respectively, may have peer evaluators from another commune integrated payroll of Article 18, which should be reported to the Center Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP).
ARTICLE 23: They are duties and functions of the following evaluator par:

a) Interacting with the Head of Municipal Administration Education or the Director of the Municipal Corporation of Education respective municipality for the development of their tasks;

b) Apply and report the interview the teacher evaluation, and participate in the Community Evaluation Commission interviewed teachers;

c) Move to interview the teacher evaluation to its establishment educational or, exceptionally, the enclosure defined by the Head of Municipal Administration Department of Education or the Director of the Municipal Corporation of Education of the respective municipality;

d) Sign the document setting out its administrative responsibilities, especially regarding the reserved management tools evaluation of information obtained during interviews, as well as the results of teachers evaluated.

ARTICLE 24: The pair will receive the Municipality evaluator with which relates the Professor evaluated a specific payment by the given function, based on the load I work and, in particular, the number of interviews you have made and their participation in the Community Evaluation Commission, once the evaluation process is completed.

ARTICLE 25: The role of peer evaluator is not of permanent character. It is exercised during the year corresponding to their selection and training.

ARTICLE 26: Holder, the managers of the educational establishment and Head of Municipal Administration Department of Education or the Director of the Municipal Education Corporation shall provide the necessary conditions for the adequate performance evaluation function pair.

TITLE IV

COMMUNITY OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

ARTICLE 27: It is for the Community Evaluation Commission the responsibility to locally implement the teacher evaluation system.

ARTICLE 28: The Community Assessment Committee shall be composed of:

a) The Head of Municipal Administration Department of Education or the Director of the respective Municipal Education Corporation, and

b) Peer reviewers to the letter of Article 1 and 18 referred to in this regulation.

ARTICLE 29: The functions of the Community Assessment Commission following:
a) To acknowledge and approve the reports of results to terms Letter e) of article 35 of these rules, consider the information evaluated the context of teaching and rule on their level of end performance, for which may ratify the performance level indicated in reporting results or modify the final evaluation of a teacher especially if founded by agreement, as the quorum established in Article 40 of this regulation.

b) Know and resolve resource replacement.

For this purpose, the members mentioned in letter a) of Article 28 of this regulation will only have the right to speak.

ARTICLE 30: Communal Evaluation Commission shall constitute an assistance, at least, the absolute majority of peer reviewers designated for the commune, must meet and review all reports results teacher’s evaluation of their commune within the deadline set by the Center Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP).

ARTICLE 31: Each Community Assessment Commission, to start their operation, shall appoint from among its members a secretary who shall raise minutes of each meeting, which shall be signed by all members of the commission.

TITLE V

COORDINATION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM EVALUATION IN THE COMMUNAL AREA

ARTICLE 32: Coordination of teacher evaluation system in the field community will be in charge of the Communal Evaluation Commission.

ARTICLE 33: The functions of communal coordination of evaluation receive and give information to the various local actors involved in the process; receive, distribute, store and ship assessment tools; support planning the various stages and actors involved, monitoring proper development; Convene and ensure the optimal functioning of the Community Commission Evaluation; and deliver the Individual Evaluation Reports. In addition, community assessment coordination will be responsible for registering and materials and protect information conducted along the process.

TITLE VI

THE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

ARTICLE 34: It will be the Ministry of Education, through the Centre Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP), perform the technical coordination for the proper implementation of evaluation processes and determine their calendaring later than June 30 of each year.

For the purposes, aforementioned Center, Training and Experimentation Educational Research (CPEIP) will be advised by a technical committee, made up of three representatives of the trade association of teachers more representation in the country, three academic higher education appointed by the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research and three
representatives appointed by the National Association of Municipalities more representativeness of the country.

ARTICLE 35: For functions that the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) should develop in the system teacher evaluation will include technical advice from independent entities academic higher education with expertise in the area of teacher training and evaluation of professional performance at national level. Particularly that technical assistance will assist in:

a) The development and validation of tools and evaluation methodologies, and the respective evaluation guidelines, according to the guidelines set by the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP). Assessment tools and their guidelines correction must be approved by the Ministry of Education, through Perfecting thereof;

b) Training of peer evaluators, selects and train Reviewers teacher’s portfolios;

c) The analysis of the evidence of a process guaranteeing portfolios objective and fair correction;

d) The implementation of the evaluation in the communes, providing support communal management system coordination and evaluation Communal Evaluation Committees;

e) Processing information from the various instruments for each teacher evaluated by issuing reports results for Evaluation Committees; Y

f) The maintenance and development of systems consultation, support and information teachers and the various actors involved in the process.

ARTICLE 36: The assessment system will be implemented in a decentralized manner and according to the annual calendar fixed by the Center, Training, and Experimentation Educational Research (CPEIP), corresponding to the Communal Commissions Evaluation the performance appraisal of the teachers respective endowment community.

ARTICLE 37: Teachers to be evaluated will have a deadline for development of portfolio performance that will last for ten weeks minimum and maximum twelve weeks, counted from the date of delivery material for the manufacture of such instruments to teachers, which should have elapsed checked at least sixteen weeks from the start of the school year and any case, not beyond the start of the second semester.

The self-assessment should be developed and delivered within the first five weeks the first period specified in the preceding paragraph.

ARTICLE 38: The portfolio will be reviewed by designated and trained teachers by the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP), which must be classroom teachers and gird themselves for these effects to methodological instructions issued by the same Training Centre.
ARTICLE 39: La final evaluation of each teacher will be conducted by the peer evaluators to integrate the Community Assessment and contained in an Individual Evaluation Report for each professional education, which should found on the reporting of results. The pair evaluator who conducted the interview that evaluates teachers cannot concur with their vote to their final assessment.

ARTICLE 40: The approval of the evaluation will require a simple majority. To introduce an amendment to the level of performance indicated in the report results of a teacher will require the approval of two thirds of the Evaluators couple present at the respective meeting of the Community Commission Evaluation. Such observations or amendments must be substantiated and be recorded at the end of the evaluated teacher report.

ARTICLE 41: Notification of Individual Evaluation Report will be made in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 2 of this regulation.

TITLE VII
REPORTS OF RESULTS

ARTICLE 42: Teacher evaluation process the following will be issued reports results:
   a) Individual Evaluation Report;
   b) Report Results for Management Teams Establishments education;
   c) Reports Results for the Municipal holder and the Municipality respective.

For purposes of the preceding letter b) shall mean management team the educational establishment made up of professionals mentioned in the Articles 7 and 8 of Decree with Force of Law No. 1 of 1996, the Ministry of Education.

ARTICLE 43: Individual Evaluation Report must be signed by the Community Assessment and contain the results of the assessment teaching.

This report shall provide the highest level of disaggregation of information generating system of teacher evaluation, looking at the representation graphic profile teacher performance, taking the instruments used, the qualitative basis of these results, expressed in strengths and weaknesses performance evaluated, plus the final recommendations as may be necessary, in order to properly orient teachers in their professional development.

ARTICLE 44: The Report Results for Equipment Management Educational establishments will contain the results of the assessment classroom teachers in each educational establishment. It will be provided by the Centre Improvement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP), and indicating the level of performance achieved by each teacher assessed, plus a report added where the main strengths and weaknesses identified are represented by the teachers.

ARTICLE 45: The Report Results for the Municipal holder and Municipality will describe the results obtained by teachers of their endowment, having contained the following:
a) The list of teachers evaluated in the commune sorted by establishments, with the identification data and the level of performance obtained in the evaluation;

b) The list of teachers with assessment challenged as established by the second paragraph of Article 5 of these regulations, which are in the situation provided for in Article 6 thereof and teachers whose evaluation It has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of these rules;

c) The summary table community that synthesizes the results in statistical form for all teachers evaluated, accompanied by a chart with the percentage distribution thereof at the four evaluation categories;

d) The report aggregate portfolio results with a description of this instrument features and aspects more important than evaluates, followed by a reporting aggregate of the main strengths and weaknesses of teachers evaluated and graphical representations the results of each establishment of the municipality.

In any case, the use of the information shall comply with the provisions of Article 3 of these rules.

TITLE VIII
OF THE RESOURCES

ARTICLE 46: Against the outcome of teacher evaluation only proceed the the administrative appeal, which may be brought, among others, for the following reasons:

a) Have been evaluated yet found the teacher exempted from this process by any of the grounds of Article 6, or be covered by any of the grounds set out in Article 7 of these regulations.

b) Have been evaluated by an unqualified or incompetent pair evaluator.

c) Have been omitted from the final evaluation of the weight of any of the instruments mentioned in Title II of this regulation, or have transgressed the formal requirements required by this regulation for the application of these instruments.

d) Not have been strictly complied with the provisions in Articles 38, 39, 40 and paragraph 2 of Article 43 of this regulation.

e) be made by various members of the Commission to those established in theArticle 28 of this regulation.

The administrative appeal must be filed within 5 working days from the notification referred to in Article 2 of this regulation and should file with the Head of Municipal Administration of Education or the director of the Corporation from Education Municipal in his case, who must leave written proof of receipt. This resource may be in the official form designed by the Center, Training and Experimentation Educational Research (CPEIP).
In the case of the grounds for suspension of Article 7 of these regulations, these they must have alleged before the start of the evaluation process or appropriate verified the causal time.

The Community Assessment Commission must rule on the appeal before mentioned prior technical report evacuated by the Centre, Training and Experimentation Educational Research (CPEIP).

ARTICLE 47: The resolution accepting or rejecting the rule appeal lodged shall be issued within thirty days and the teacher notified to the applicant as provided for in Article 2 of this regulations and against it no further recourse, without prejudice to the right of professional education of resorting to administrative and judicial bodies apply.

TITLE IX PLANS professional advancement

ARTICLE 48: Education professionals that are evaluated the level of basic or unsatisfactory performance must undergo Plans Exceeding Professional disposal in accordance with the provisions of this Regulation.

ARTICLE 49: Plans of Professional will have a character training and must be translated into action learning and relearning respect the skills, knowledge, abilities, domains and criteria set out in Framework for Good Teaching approved by the Ministry of Education and from the professional development needs arising from reports results that refer to Article 42 of this Regulation.

ARTICLE 50: The Ministry of Education will transfer to municipalities and Municipal corporations running professional development plans referred to the law the financial resources to fund them, according to the number of teachers evaluated, with basic and unsatisfactory level.

To transfer funds to municipalities or municipal corporations, the Ministry of Education, through the Centre for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP), under the provisions of Article 13 of Law No. 18,956 and Article 12 of Decree-Law No. 1 of 1996, the Ministry of Education. You may enter into agreements with municipalities, municipal corporations or Associations of Municipalities which clearly detail the amounts to be transferred and the actions associated with such amounts.

ARTICLE 51: Municipalities and Municipal Corporations may spend resources transferred only in the activities contained and indicated in the design of the Plan of Professional commune, which it must be submitted to the Center Refinement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) in the month April each year for approval. Municipalities and Municipal Corporations must pay documented account and details of the expenses incurred to finance Exceeding Plans Professional of his commune, spending to the above being limited. The expense report must be submitted to the Training Centre, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) in November each year, spending can observe it and ask for any changes that are necessary.
ARTICLE 52: In order to ensure that the actions of professional development meet the condition of being adequate, relevant, timely and effective, the Centre Improvement, Experimentation and Pedagogical Research (CPEIP) administer directly or through regional ministries and Provincial Departments of Education verification procedures of mentioned conditions, which will be consulted the views of teacher’s beneficiaries.

ARTICLE 53: In the event that the actions of professional development of commune receive poor evaluation, referring to the effectiveness, relevance, and adequacy of the plan, the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP) require, as a condition for approval of design for the year next, that it be endorsed by a qualified in the field of vocational training of teachers in service.

ARTICLE 54: Professional development plans correspond to:

   a) tutorials or advice provided by qualified professionals, as appropriate;

   b) Participation in courses, workshops or seminars organized by entities academic or training;

   c) Recommended reading for which material should be provided bibliographical or guidance to access information available on the Internet; Y

   d) Observations made by prominent class teachers or other professionals qualified.

ARTICLE 55: Teachers participating in the actions Plans Professional overcoming not entitled to receive the allocation of Improvement Article 49 of DFL No. 1 of Education, 1996, for such participation.

ARTICLE 56: The Center from Improvement, Experimentation and Educational Research (CPEIP) will be responsible for providing guidance leading techniques to ensure the care of teachers who have obtained a basic or unsatisfactory outcome and relevance of community designs Plans Overcoming Professional.

In addition, it makes available the materials communes of Learning Support for teachers with unsatisfactory performance level. This material will be of character complementary to the activities of professional development of communes.

TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENT

TRANSIENT ARTICLE: During the first five years of this regulation when there are not enough applicants who meet each and every one of the requirements of Article 19 of this Regulation to perform as evaluator pair, the Center for Improvement, Experimentation and Research Pedagogic (CPEIP) can select as such teachers not fulfilling with the requirement of point d) of the article indicated above have demonstrated sufficient qualification for the role. Give yourself, Let it be known and published.

LAGOS ESCOBAR RICARDO
REPUBLIC PRESIDENT
Sergio Bitar
CHACRA MINISTER OF EDUCATION
What transcribes to you for your knowledge.

Greets you,

MONTT PEDRO LEIVA
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Office Parts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Official diary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Contraloría</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Gabinete Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary -Gabinete</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-DIPLAP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal -Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-CPEIP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional -Secretaries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-IT Consulting Legal Regional</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial -Departamentos</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: 

Presentation of criteria by domains

**CRITERIA FOR DOMAINS**

A1. It dominates the contents of the disciplines taught and frame national curriculum.

A2. Learn about the features, knowledge and experience of their students.

A3. It dominates the teaching of the disciplines taught.

A4. It organizes the objectives and content consistent with the curriculum framework and the characteristics of their students.

A5. The assessment strategies are consistent with the objectives learning, discipline, teaching, curriculum framework National and allows all students to demonstrate what they have learned.

Preparation of Teaching

B1. It establishes a climate of acceptance relations, equality, trust, solidarity and respect.

B2. Expresses high expectations about the possibilities of learning and development of all students.

B3. Establishes and maintains consistent standards of living in the classroom.

B4. It establishes an organized working environment and has spaces and resources in terms of learning.

C1. Communicates with clear and precise learning objectives.

C2. The teaching strategies are challenging, coherent and meaningful for the students.

C3. The class content is treated with conceptual rigor and it is understandable for students.

C4. Optimizes time available for teaching.

C5. It promotes the development of thought.

C6. Evaluates and monitors the process of understanding and appreciation of content by students.

D1. The teacher systematically reflects on their practice.

D2. Build a professional team and relationships with colleagues.

D3. Assumes responsibilities in guiding their students.

D4. Fosters collaborative relationships and respect for parents and parents.

D5. Manages updated information about their profession, the system education, and existing policies.
Appendix 3:


Teachers evaluated: MARIA ELENA GONZALEZ REYES
RUT: 11111111-0
Assessed (a): Second Cycle - Language and Communication
Establishment: SCHOOL SUMMITS OF CHILE
Commune: Santiago
Final score: Proficient Performance

Dear (a) Teacher:

We invite you to review this report and use it as a tool for reflection and feedback in the challenging task of educating you to face every day.

In light of the report data, reflect on their practices, considering both achieved as those aspects not achieved. Remember to recognize their educational successes, understand and value is as important as identifying the errors, analyze them critically and manage to amend opportunities.

It is important to note that the evaluation system includes four instruments that deliver further information about teacher performance. It is expected that there are both similarities as differences, reflecting a variety of perspectives, sources and actors included in the evaluation.

1. RESULTS OF PORTFOLIO

From the tasks, you gave in your portfolio, different dimensions were assessed pedagogical practice that emerges from the Framework for Good Teaching. Then you can review the strengths and weaknesses observed in each.

At the end of this section, you will find a table and a chart detailing performance levels assigned to its Portfolio in each dimension and aspect evaluated.

1 Regulation on Teacher evaluation assigned the following weight to each instrument for the final result:

Self - Assessment = 10% = 60% Portfolio, Interview for Par = 20% and Reports Evaluation Reference Third = 10%, except for those teachers whose results in the previous assessment is Unsatisfactory; then, the weight of the Portfolio is 80% and the other instruments reduce their weight by half.

Teacher: MARIA ELENA GONZALEZ REYES

Dimension 1: Organization unit

From the description of the teaching unit sent in Task 1, how was assessed that you work the objectives and content of the curriculum so that students acquire the skills, knowledge and competencies of the subject.
What aspects evaluated? What is observed my performance? Evaluated?
The objectives of both classes’ skills identified as Formulating objectives the contents that students should develop and are consistent with the objective of the unit. Relationship between activities and some lessons were not worked or conducted activities. Objectives that they are not related to the proposed learning. Your unit classes are arranged in a logical sequence and gradual. The unit begins with activities that favor students approach significantly to what they will work and ends with activities that allow them to consolidate learning.

Dimension 2: Analysis of classes

In this dimension, we evaluated their ability to think critically and systematically about the developing strategies with their students to encourage them to learn. For it was deemed presented in Task 2 (reflection from the unit) and in Task 6 (a professional Earning from of class).

What aspects evaluated? What is observed my performance?
Reflecting on their effective pedagogical decisions and little effective, the analysis is incomplete or surface (e.g.

Analysis Unit was done
the effects mentioned but not explained). Consider that perform a deeper analysis will let you decide with greater record what actions to keep and which need to be modified.

Analysis of the characteristics students
Discusses how affected the learning of their students, having made a unit based on the interests, knowledge previous or other characteristics of them.

A class analysis
From the selected class, it fails to perform an analysis sufficiently full of strategies used that allow extract learning to improve his practice pedagogical.

Dimension 3: Quality of Evaluation

In your portfolio, you presented an evaluation unit (Task 3). It was the observed capacity to gather information about the learning achieved by their students, considering the objectives.

What aspects evaluated? What is observed my performance?
Evaluation and pattern correction used
The evaluation applied to students, some questions or tasks are confusing or pattern of correction presents some inaccuracies or wrong answers.
the relationship between and objective evaluation The evaluation addresses only some of the objectives sought or measure includes activities that are not related to those objectives.

Dimension 4: Reflection from the results of students

In Task 4 (analysis of assessment results) and Task 5 (feedback to a student), is evaluated their ability to reflect on the learning of their students and guide them to continue to improve.

What aspects
What is observed my performance? Evaluated?
Partially analyzed the results of their students in the evaluation. Consider that in analyzing the results, should recognize which of their pedagogical actions that influenced student’s, students to meet or fail to learning.

To feedback, your student will clearly express what their feedback to achievements and no achievements in the assessment, and effective action poses student to overcome these difficulties, enabling it to improve its performance.

Dimension 5: classroom environment for learning

From the recorded class (Task 7) was evaluated its ability to maintain a work environment suitable for learning, where respect is promoted, participation and collaboration among its students.

What aspects evaluated? What is observed my performance?

Work environment
His class has a work environment that promotes learning for their students perform manages activities They are proposing them and respect the rules of coexistence.
Gets its students to participate equitably in

Promotion participation students
different instances of the class and encourages mutual cooperation in learning function; for example encourages students to contribute to the work of their peers, supportive and explain including, etc.

Accompanying the activities
Accompany properly the work of their students;
provides instructions to facilitate the development of tasks and meets the requirements of students while performing their activities.

Dimension 6: Class Structure

Another aspect observed in the recording of his class was how organized activities to facilitate the student learning.

What is observed my performance? Evaluated?
When class begins, although prior knowledge retakes, no

**Quality Start**
It encourages students to make connections between what they know and what they learn.

**Quality closure**
The closure of its kind has certain weaknesses because it fails students consolidate learning worked for example, only mentions some of them, without deepening or systemize.

**Contribution of activities achieving the objectives**
Activities during the recorded address class all proposed objectives, confirming adequate time distribution.

**Dimension 7: Pedagogic Interaction**
In the recorded class, it shows how you interact with your students and how it promotes learning content and skills required of their subject through questions, He is performing explanations and feedback.

**What aspects evaluated?**
What is observed my performance?

**Explanations developed**
Make explanations that promote students establish meaningful relationships with their experiences. For example, explaining a concept, using deepens prior knowledge. In the case of explaining a method or skill, ensures that students understand how more appropriate to do so.

**Quality questions raised the students**
The questions raised in class give a little chance so that students develop higher skills thinking, such as analyze, interpret, justify, and make a hypothesis, among others. In general, questions tend to them memorize, repeat or paraphrase the information provided.

**Quality feedback**
During the recorded class, its feedback to students is enough to learn from their own performance. For that, it is necessary that frequently you ask them, for example, supplement their responses, and analyze the steps followed to reach a result or identify the reason for their success or failure.

**Curricular emphasis subject or area**
Presents certain weaknesses for implement strategies methodological favoring the development of competition communicative of their students, according to the guidelines curricular force. Consider that favors development this competition when, for example, asks
students to analyze the various elements of a communicative situation such as the context, purpose, structures, meanings, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Aspect evaluated</th>
<th>Achievement level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1:</td>
<td>Formulating objectives</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization unit</td>
<td>Relationship between activities and objectives</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit sequence</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2:</td>
<td>Analysis Unit made</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis classes</td>
<td>Analysis of the characteristics of students</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A class analysis</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3:</td>
<td>Evaluation and correction pattern used</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality evaluation</td>
<td>Link between evaluation and objectives</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 4:</td>
<td>Accountability for student results</td>
<td>Basic Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection from the</td>
<td>Feedback to a student</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results of the students</td>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 5:</td>
<td>Promoting student participation for the knowledge</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>Accompanying activities</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Start</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution of activities to achieve the objectives</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed explanations</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 6:</td>
<td>Quality closure</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure class</td>
<td>Contribution of activities to achieve the objectives</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed explanations</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 7:</td>
<td>Quality of the questions posed to students</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction pedagogical</td>
<td>Quality of feedback</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curricular emphasis of the subject or area</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on weighting of dimensions and indicators [www.docentemas.cl/ponderacion]
Chart results by dimension and final level in Portfolio.


Note that the overall result in the Portfolio corresponds to the Basic level (B_3), regardless of the final result in the assessment or other instruments, which indicate that there are weaknesses in their teaching practices and the need to improve.

The data reported in bars above this line show performance that demonstrated achievement or strengths, and it is evaluated as proficient or outstanding. Instead, the bars below the line are those who obtained a Basic or Unsatisfactory result. Two bars always reach the midpoint of the corresponding third. For example, if your result was B_3 in one dimension, the bar will reach half of that third.

This portfolio report can help you in this evaluation task. It is also advisable to ask for the support of management of its establishment. Professional development of every teacher is not only a personal goal, but a common goal for a committed school community and with the learning of their students.

2. RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEW AND REPORTS PAR ASSESSOR REFERENCE TO THIRD PARTIES

The following table integrates the results of the interview by the Evaluation and Par or Reference Reports Third, for each domain Framework for Good Teaching:

INTERVIEW PAR ASSESSOR AND REPORT (S) OF REFERENCE OF THIRD

Domain A: Preparation of teaching
Domain B: Creating an enabling environment for learning
Domain C: Teaching for learning for all students
Domain D: Professional Responsibilities

Performance levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then the appropriate performance reported in accordance detailed specific aspects evaluated in each domain:

In the Domain A: Preparation of teaching, issued reports indicate that complies adequately raising the Framework for Good Teaching, as it demonstrates to know the experiences and characteristics of their students, as well as those of the community where you insert the establishment. He also knows the most recurrent difficulties presented by students to learn some content and knows how to integrate all this information in the preparation of their classes. It also organizes activities and an adequate curriculum coverage, addressing content and skills from different perspectives and choosing materials and resources that favor meeting learning
objectives. Reports also indicate that use strategies appropriate to content and working skills, evaluation allowing all students they can demonstrate what they have learned.

In the Domain B: Creating an enabling environment for learning, results

Interview for Par and Report (s) of Reference Third Party Evaluator indicate that complies adequately raising the Framework for Good Teaching, as it shows a style of work carried motivate students to learn, to actively engage in activities, feeling welcomed and respected by both the teacher and by their peers. Also, shows confidence in the prospects of development of its students, presenting learning situations challenging the incentives to think and communicate their ideas to others. It also indicates a fail the resources of the establishment on the basis of learning. Finally, the information reported shows that establish and maintains clear and consistent rules of coexistence in the classroom, addressing of formatively disruptions arising from classes. In addition, according to its directors and / or Evaluator Par, practice realizes outstanding expertise in this domain.

In the Domain C: Teaching for learning for all students, according to data collected, adequately meets raising the Framework for Good Teaching, as it uses meaningful and challenging for student’s methodological strategies; promotes development in them thinking and encourages use their mistakes as learning opportunities. I also know reports that optimize the use of time during classes and monitors the work of his students, adapting or reformulating schedules depending on the results of learning observed.

In the Domain D: Professional Responsibility, issued reports indicate that complies adequately raising the Framework for Good Teaching, as it seeks instances for professionally updated individually and collaboratively with other teachers, shows an attitude open to suggestions on teaching practices and reformulates when required. The Reports also indicate that understands the importance of meeting the goals and policies establishment it works brings in the review of the programs that are running and He is concerned to comply with the rules of administrative operation. It also states that It promotes a positive assessment of parents and guardians, keeps them informed of the difficulties and progress of their students and fosters collaborative relationships with them.

3. RESULTS OF SELF - ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

The table below shows the results of the assessment you did on your own performance, in relation to the four domains of the Framework for Good Teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS OF SELF - ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain A: Preparation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain B: Creating an enabling environment for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain C: Teaching for learning for all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain D: Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I: Unsatisfactory  B Basic  C Proficient  D: Outstanding
4. TRAINING ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Given the results of the various instruments we invite you to analyze your practice from of the following questions and share them with your management team:

What are my two main strengths? How I can keep working them? How I can You use them to collaborate with my colleagues?

What are my two main weaknesses? What actions will perform to improve them? To Whom, I can turn to?

To analyze their practice and design activities to enrich or improve it, will be useful examples Docentemás are available on the website www.docentemas.cl/portafolio

At the end of this report, it includes one of them. You can find examples of other dimensions, subjects, and educational levels:

5. FINAL RESULT EVALUATION

Processing information from the four evaluation instruments delivered, as a result, level performance proficiency.

The Community Assessment Commission has taken note of the report of results notices these results as well as the history of context provided by the Self - Assessment Interview Par for Evaluator and / or Third Party Background Reports.

Under this background, and in accordance with the legal provisions contained in the Act and Teacher Evaluation Regulation, the Commission ratifies the final result of the evaluation, by unanimously.

Recommendations Community Evaluation Commission:

Dear Maria Elena congratulates him and suggests reviewing and analyzing aspects in different dimensions. She was evaluated, in which still presents certain shortcomings and / or weaknesses in which we are sure you will be able to overcome.

Consequently, the end result of GONZALEZ REYES MARIA ELENA corresponds to level COMPETENT performance.

Under the final result in the assessment, you can apply for the Variable Allocation Individual Performance (AVDI). To do this, you must register and pay test corresponding to their level and subject of disciplinary learning and teaching methods. For more information on AVDI, we recommend visiting the website www.avdi.mineduc.cl

Subscribed Assessment Report the undersigned, members of the Community Commission Evaluation:
How to better understand my report?
How to improve weaknesses in my practice?

To understand its earnings, often require teacher’s examples concrete and specific, enabling them to identify the type of weaknesses of their performance.

To this end, the Docentemás website there are examples that illustrate common weaknesses observed in the dimensions and indicators evaluated in the Portfolio. In addition, alternative practices are discussed most appropriate or effective in such situations.

Then we invite you to meet one of those examples, referring to poor performance in the Quality assessment dimension, specifically in the evaluation and correction pattern used.

Teacher: MARIA ELENA GONZALEZ REYES
Appendix 4

Evaluation system
Teachers Professional Performance portfolio 2015
Class Recorded tab
Second Cycle Basic Education

Instructions for Completing Sheet Class Recorded:

- Keep this record in your computer, named "tab" followed by your RUT without dots or dí verifier Gito (follow the example of 25 PAGE your Portfolio Manual), and work on that version or n.
- Develop "Task 7. Class recorded" corresponding to MODULE 2, following the instructions in your manual Portfolio.
- M to respect the margins and do not modify the size ñ or boxes.
- The boxes indicate the space m to the maximum that you can use to answer each question, so it is not necessary that your answers using all available space.
- Enter your RUT and subject at the top of the first sheet.

When you have completed the Recorded Sheet Class, upload it to the platform Docentemas. To do this, go to the website www.docentemas.cl/plataforma step by step and follow the instructions found there.

Subject: MODULE 2: CLASS RECORDED:
Task 7. Class recorded Class Recorded tab.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Course and lyrics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of students present in class:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Learning Objective or Content Mandatory minimum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Objective (s) worked (s) in the class:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record or the goals addressed in the recorded class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Describe or Implement or recorded in its class requirement for specific subject is winged on 30 PAGE 31 of its Portfolio Manual:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. If occurred during class or some situation or n to interfiri or seriously in the development of this, please menci or nela:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Indicate whether the recorded class students present or exempted students (only Educacion music, English and Portuguese or Religion):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

My report results

Weighting instruments and aspects evaluated in Portfolio

To calculate the overall result of the teaching, the instruments are weighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>(*) Weighing regimen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview for Evaluator Par</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References Third Party</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) For teachers who have obtained an Unsatisfactory result in its latest assessment, the portfolio is weighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The portfolio is weighted</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Reports Third</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will I be evaluated?

Portfolio

It allows presenting evidence that accounts for their best pedagogic practice.

Self-assessment Pauta

Let you know how you assess and evaluate their own professional performance to reflect based on selection criteria of the Framework for Good Teaching.

Interview for Par Evaluator

Enlightens aspects of their teaching practice and the context of his work as a teacher.

Third Party Reference Report

It can incorporate the evaluation of the Director or Head of UTP on various aspects of their teaching.

Reports Results and Consequences

Performance levels

Performance levels stipulated in the Regulations on Teacher Evaluation correspond to the following:
Outstanding:

It indicates a professional performance that stands out clearly and consistently about what is expected in the evaluated indicator. Usually, it manifested by a broad repertoire of behaviors on what is being evaluated, or the pedagogical richness that adds to the fulfillment of the indicator.

Competent:

Indicates adequate professional performance. Meets required practicing the role of teachers professionally. Even though not exceptional, it is a good performance.

Basic:

It indicates a professional performance that meets expectations in the evaluated indicator, but with some irregularity (occasionally).

Unsatisfactory:

It indicates performance that has clear weaknesses in the assessed indicator and these significantly affect the teaching work.

Evaluation and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Yearbook 2014 Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Research from the results of the Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Experiences international</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive of the population evaluated 2014</td>
<td>What activities do teachers Basic Level 1 for teaching reading and writing? Approaches to teaching practices.</td>
<td>Successful managers, as agents support principals with greater difficulties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of a study of Galdames et al. (2010). That explores the teacher’s representations about how you learn to read and write, from the analysis of videos of teachers who participated in the Teacher Evaluation in 2008. Based on an English experience, the role of directors is analyzed as sources of support for their peers from other schools and reflect on this type of collaboration in the Chilean context.
Chapter 5: Egypt

Wessam Abdelaziz

Introduction

Improving the quality of education is significantly related to a multitude of factors such as, the learning environment, school management, curriculum, and quality of teaching. All of this requires a major financial and political effort in order to push the changing forces in the educational system to work collaboratively, regardless of any personal conflicts, towards the major goal of raising the level of student learning. According to Carnoy (2007), whenever this concept of student learning is mentioned, the first thing that comes up to mind is the teacher’s quality, which always needs upgrading in the pre-service and in-service training of teachers. In addition, a new strategy is needed for recruiting the teachers who then can be trained to raise the level of student learning to meet expectations. Clearly, meeting the expectation that all students will learn to high standards, will require a transformation in the ways in which the education system attracts, prepares, supports, and develops good teachers. An aspect of this transformation is developing a means to evaluate and recognize teacher effectiveness throughout their career, for the purposes of licensing, hiring, and granting tenure to provide the needed professional development (Hammond and Prince, 2007, p. 3).

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

According to the National Report done by the ministry of education on the development of education in Egypt, the success of restructuring educational systems depends on the three factors: 1) the ability to provide a large number of teachers, 2) provide them with the appropriate sustainable training, and 3) the need for evaluation systems for all levels, which allow the identification of what students have learned. Therefore, the scope of this paper focuses on teacher evaluation in elementary, preparatory and secondary public school system in Egypt.

Evaluation Purposes of Evaluation

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive and detailed description of the teacher evaluation system in Egypt through the lens of its goals and policy. The policy section entails a background of how the standards of teacher evaluation were developed and how it is currently applied in the school system.

The idea of teacher evaluation is based on a full understanding of what the teacher’s role is and identifying clear guidelines or framework of what is expected from him or her. By doing so, the administration and the school management would have a criterion to judge against and give evaluative decisions on the teacher’s performance. This performance is more of the outcome of this mix between the teacher’s content knowledge of the area of his/her expertise and a set of skills that enable him/her to deliver this knowledge to the students. In fact, understanding the role of the teacher in and outside of classroom and knowing what is expected,
enable teachers to evaluate themselves and reflect upon their own practices. This self-reflection not only motivates teachers to seek other sources to improve their performance, but also helps the administration plan professional development workshops that meet teachers’ needs.

The purpose of teacher evaluation can be categorized into two main goals: developmental and administrative. First, an evaluation is conducted to know the teacher’s points of strength and weaknesses. Knowing that helps school and the association of school teachers offer professional development workshops to work on the weaknesses and emphasize the strengths. Second, evaluation is conducted for higher stack decisions related to promotion, transfer to a larger or smaller district, recognition, or firing.

**Background of Pre-Service Teacher Preparation**

Egypt is considered in the forefront of Arab countries that started looking into reforming its educational system. The Egyptian ministry of Education realized that good teachers, who are well prepared academically, are the foundation of this reform. The rational of the government was to establish academic institutes with experts in field of education in order to improve the quality of teaching, upgrade the skills of teachers and expose them to alternative methods of education, new trends, and new technologies.

The process of preparing good teachers in Egypt went through many stages of change. In 1872, Dar Al-Uloom was established as the first institute for the preparation of Arabic language teachers. It was mostly focused on the subject matter, more than how to teach it. As a reaction to that, in 1888, The Teacher’s Central School was then established. This school made sure to include academic curriculum in the content area, in addition to providing a specific curriculum focused on teaching methods and techniques.

1925 was the year that witnessed the establishment of The Educational Institute for teachers, which is considered the first research center in the Middle East that served as the research hub for topics related to enhancing the quality of teaching, such as teacher training, teaching methods, students’ learning styles, and classroom environment along with many other topics to prepare teachers for the classrooms. Since then, many other institutions and colleges were established to prepare teachers for different school levels and different subject matters. Currently, preparation takes place at universities in 15 colleges of education.

**Current Application of Teacher Evaluation**

The government believes that future teachers, who are still in college should receive the necessary education to become competent classroom leaders, should experience and get a sense through experience of how teacher evaluation is conducted. In the 3rd and 4th year in college, all the students, who are working on a degree to become teachers, regardless of their chosen level of education and across all subjects, are required to teach their subject matter in a school that is closest to their physical addresses. Students who are working on a degree to become primary
school teachers are assigned to a primary school, whereas the other students working on a degree to become lower and upper secondary school teachers are assigned to a lower secondary school in the 3rd year and an upper secondary school in the 4th year.

All of them are required to teach certain number of hours each year to fulfill this requirement. They are responsible for planning their lesson plans and communicating with the lead teacher of the class to make sure they are aligning with the yearly plan of the teacher. Each student is also required to teach, at least, one class period in the presence of one of the district’s supervisors who serves as both a mentor and an evaluator. In other words, each supervisor is responsible for training and guiding the future teachers during the first half of this internship. After that, the supervisor plans a multiple class visits to fill out a generic report about the performance of the student-teacher and gives a final judgment of his/her performance, see Appendix A. Also, another generic report is filled out by the school principle or vice-principle in regard to professionalism; in terms of attendance, behavior, and commitment to the profession’s values, see Appendix B.

All the indicators from these two reports are weighted and summed to get an overall judgement on the performance of teachers using a 5 point Likert scale from poor to excellent. The grade that student-teachers receive at the end of this training counts as a class on their final transcript and they cannot graduate until they fulfil this requirement with a minimum of a satisfactory grade. The intent of the ministry of education is to force those future-teachers, through practice and application, to utilize what they learned in the first two years of their education in college. Thus, allowing the student to get a sense of what they will be dealing with when they are in-service teachers.

Methods, Sources and Instruments

Since there are some high-stake decisions that are made based on the results of this evaluation, there is a policy with national standards in place to ensure reliability and avoid subjectivity.

Evaluation Policy and Procedure: The policy of teacher evaluation includes the process of how to evaluate teachers by providing six steps:

1- Determining the standards on which teachers will be evaluated
2- Informing teachers with these standards and making sure it is clear
3- Measuring the teacher’s performance
4- Comparing the teacher’s performance with the standards
5- Sharing and discussing the evaluation results and findings with the teacher
6- Taking the appropriate decision and going over any recommendations

The first step of determining the standards went through a process of changes and improvements. It takes a lot of work and collaboration in order to determine what the standards are to evaluate teachers. The following section explores those standards.
According to the Egyptian Ministry of Education’s national standards that were announce in 2003, there are five domains that the teacher evaluation is based on. These five domains are: Planning, Learning strategies and Classroom management, Knowledge of subject matter, Feedback strategies, and Professionalism.

The first domain is to assess the planning phase, where the supervisor or the evaluator would assess whether the teacher planned his lesson based on the educational needs of the students in that grade. Those educational needs are well spelled out in the yearly plan that the curriculum coordinators send to all teachers, to make sure that teachers plan their lessons to meet these needs. Also, the evaluator assesses whether the teacher plans for greater targets and not for detailed information or small objectives. It is very important that students understand what the big picture is and the details come at a later stage. Many teachers use learning targets to improve student understanding of the purpose of a lesson or unit of study and to focus assessment.

In the second domain, the evaluator assesses the learning strategies to meet students’ needs, and if the teacher facilitates effective learning experience by providing an environment that guarantees equity. This requires the teacher to utilize diverse motivation methods, because not all the students are the same on what encourages them to learn and be engaged. Additionally, this domain requires the evaluator to rate the teacher’s ability and skill in involving students in solving problems, and in critical and creative thinking. The last part of this domain is related to classroom management where the teacher is evaluated on how effective s/he is in managing learning time and in limiting time wasted by keeping the students on task.

The third domain is to assess and evaluate the knowledge of subject matter, where the teacher’s awareness of the basics and nature of the subject. Not only being aware or familiar with the basics, but also being able to deliver and produce knowledge from the student allows them to distinguish one teacher from another. More experienced and trained teachers fully know methods of research in the subject and are able to integrate his/her subject with other subjects.

The fourth domain is the use of different types of feedback by encouraging students to do self-evaluation and to utilize this feedback to overcome the students’ weaknesses.

The last domain is teacher’s professionalism, where the evaluator looks for ethics in the profession and makes sure that the teacher is satisfying the ministry’s professional development requirement. With all these different domains, the ministry of education had to delegate the evaluation process to a legal entity called “The Professional Academy for Teachers”. The professional academy for teachers is a body that was legalized and given some authority by the ministry of education. The team of this professional academy is consisted of experts chosen by the ministry of education in order to design, plan, monitor, and evaluate professional development activities for teachers. It reports and follows all the educational regulations provided by the ministry of education. Therefore, it is considered as an agency that assists the
ministry in implementing the national strategic plan for pre-university reform. Moreover, it is that entity that takes responsibility for the second step of the evaluation process, which is informing teachers of the standards and making sure it is clear to them. It does so by providing professional development through enhancing professional aspects of teachers.

After determining the standards and making sure it is clear to all teachers, now comes the hardest question of how to measure their performance in order to compare it to the standards. Both of these steps cannot be accurately and successfully conducted without proper measurement tools. What is meant by proper is a tool that is both reliable and valid. In other words, the information collected on the teacher performance should yield the same or similar results if used by other evaluators in the same context in the same time. Also, a tool should be feasible and measure the skill that it was designed for and not any other skill. In order to get to that level of precision, the professional academy for teachers formed a team of senior teachers from each subject and experts from the schools of education to design teacher evaluation forms based on the national standards. This team came up with two forms that are currently used in the Egyptian schools to evaluate teachers. The first form uses a 5 point Likert scale, where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent (see Appendix A). It is designed for the immediate supervisor or curriculum specialist to measure the first 4 domains mentioned earlier, which are planning, learning strategies and classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, and feedback strategies.

### Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

The curriculum specialist plans an unannounced visit to the school at least once a year and fill out this form. Also, the immediate supervisor arranges and plans a visit with the teacher to fill out the same form and that happens once every semester. The visits to a senior teacher is totally different from the visit to a newer teacher. Where culture plays a factor in filling out the form; it could be offensive if the supervisor corrects a senior teacher or leaves any negative feedback because they are often close in age. On the other hand, supervisors are stricter with newer and younger teachers. Therefore, sharing results is different. It is a more formal event with new teachers and very casual with senior teachers. The second form uses the same scale but it is designed for the school principle (see Appendix B). This form is rather short, in comparison to the first one, and it only measures the last domain, which is the teacher’s professionalism. The school principle often delegates or shares this task with the vice president and they only do it once a year and rarely with senior teachers. Although, they often fill out the form for senior teachers in their offices, without visiting the classroom. Teachers can view the results of these tests using a special code given to them by the academy on their website.

According to the Egyptian ministry of education (2007), to get the advantages of the teachers’ cadre, they must obtain a license for practicing in the teaching profession. This licensing requirement enables the ministry to filter out in-service teachers, who did not receive academic or educational training in the pre-service. This cadre states that job promotion will follow six professional levels that represent job track: assistant teacher, teacher, master teacher, master Teacher (A), expert teacher, and senior teacher. Also, the cadre links between the skills,
performance and the promotion process. The requirements for promotion include a valid license of practicing the teaching profession, the teacher's passing certain professional tests, in addition to his/her level of performance as evidenced in his/her professional achievement record. In addition to these two forms, a recent bill (Cadre) was passed, that requires all teachers to take certain tests in order to grant them licenses and validity certificates for practicing in the teaching profession. The teacher's participation in professional development programs, whether at the school level within the school-centered reform program or courses held at the school district, regional, or ministry levels, is necessary for career promotion. Therefore, decisions related to promotions and pay level are made based on these tests along with the feedback from both forms mentioned earlier.

**Future Plans for Development**

There are many discussions and controversies on whether these measures are enough to evaluate teachers to ensure a better quality of education. Recently, some voices from teachers and experts have been calling for a more objective way of evaluating teachers. They are asking for more forms that are more aligned with the standards and more rigorous to be used to measure their performance. These new tools should be utilized to evaluate ALL teachers regardless of their seniority level to ensure equality and objectivity and removing prior cultural restriction. That would require more supervision on the evaluation process from the teacher professional academy. Moreover, discussing the evaluation findings with the teachers should not only target the negative points, but also emphasize the points of strength and provide more constructive feedback for continuous improvement and progress. The academy realized the importance and need of formal training school principals, vice-principals, supervisors, and curriculum specialists on how to conduct an effective evaluation. Finally, the academy is considering, not only evaluating teachers in class, but also outside of the classroom in terms of his/her role as an advisor, openness, and other extra-curricular activities being prepared and done outside of class.

In conclusion, this paper presented a detailed description of the teacher evaluation system in Egypt by presenting the purpose and policy of this system. It seems clear that the government is keen on making sure that there is an effective evaluation system in place while improving the conditions of the teachers academically and financially by passing the Cadre bill and establishing many branches of the professional academy of teachers. This leads the teaching profession to gain the required professional, technical and community prestige needed to raise the quality of the educational product.
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 أحمد حسين اللقاني ، على أحمد الجميل: معجم المصطلحات التربوية المعروفة في المناهج وطرق التدريس ، ط 2 ، القاهرة ، عالم الكتب ، 1992.
 السيد إسماعيل وهبي : " اتجاهات معاصرة في تقويم أداء المعلم " ، المؤتمر العلمي الرابع عشر للجمعية المصرية للمناهج وطرق التدريس ، المجلد.
 الفكر التربوي الحديث ، د سعيد اسماعيل ، سلسلة عالم المعرفة ، الكويت
 المعايير القومية للتعليم في مصر ، المجلد الأول والثاني ، نخبة من أساتذة الجامعة.
 تقويم أداء المعلم ، مركز تعليم الكبار والتعليم المستمر ، الجزء 2 ، الجامعة الأمريكية بالقاهرة.
 دور المعلم في عصر الإنترنت ، أفنان نظير ، جامعة القدس المفتوحة ، عمان بالاردن.
 شاكر محمد فتحى : " منظومة أداء المعلم ونماذج تقييمها " ، المركز القومي للبحوث التربوية والتنمية ، شعبة التخطيط التربوي ، 1991.
 راشد حماد الدوسرى : " مبادئ تقييم الأداء الصفى " ، مجلة كلية التربية ، جامعة طنطا ، العدد 1002 ، 1982.
 نظريات التعلم ، دراسة مقارنة ، ترجمة د علي حسين حاج ، سلسلة عالم المعرفة ، الكويت.
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Appendix A

**Evaluation form to be completed by curriculum specialist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number:</th>
<th>School Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Gender: Male □ Female □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job track applied for:</td>
<td>Current Job track:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>School level:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Score</th>
<th>Teacher Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Planning**
- Determine the educational needs of the student. (1)
- Plan for greater targets not for detailed information and small objectives (2)
- Design suitable educational activities (3)
- Build upon and takes into consideration students’ background experiences (4)
- Plan and prepare different feedback techniques (5)

**Learning Strategies & Classroom Management**
- Managing learning time effectively and limiting time wasted. (Time on task) (6)
- Demonstrate effective classroom management techniques (7)
- Provide an environment to guarantee equity in terms of acquisition, achievement, or other special needs (8)
- Engage and encourage students to create their learning environment in class (9)
- Effective and appropriate use of extra sources to help conveying the concepts and achieving the goal (10)
- Encourage learning by doing (11)
- Encourage critical thinking by posing questions to challenge them (12)
- Ability to use a variety of teaching styles to engage students with different learning styles (13)
- Improve social skills by integrating group-work and pair-work activities (14)
- Give students opportunities to link what they learn in class to real-life issues and topics (15)
- Involve students in solving problems and in critical and creative thinking (16)
- Provide students with opportunities to practice all of the higher-order thinking and critical thinking skills. (17)

**Feedback**
- Give constructive and precise feedback to the students (18)
- Give students the chance for self-evaluation (19)
- Use a variety of appropriate techniques of feedback (20)

| 100 points | Total |

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialist name: ...................................................
School seal: ..........................................................

Signature: .................................
Appendix B

**Evaluation form to be completed by principal or vice-principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance score</th>
<th>Teacher Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appropriate professional attire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interact with colleagues in a professional manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actively engaging students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Active participation in classroom activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compliance with the profession and school values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate and engage students to solve environmental problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always participating in teacher professional development workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On time and punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always keen on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate, Professionally, with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: Seal Name of the Principal:
Chapter 6: Finland

Erica Newland

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

Finland’s education system was once poorly ranked. The nation’s education system was plagued by inequities and defunct practices. In present time; however, the country of Finland is an international education leader and ranks first among all of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) nations on the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), an international test for 15-year-olds in language, math, and science literacy (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Finland’s successful overhaul of their national education system is credited to a myriad of reforms including their teacher evaluation process.

Today, Finland does not have a national, formal system of school administration and teacher assessment; however, successful teacher evaluation procedures take place at the local level and primarily at the discretion of school administration. Routine meetings and discussions between teachers and school leaders are practiced widely throughout schools. The main focus of these meetings is not always specific to teacher performance or evaluation, but to also continue professional development and support teacher wellbeing and growth. Education providers at the local level do have a legal duty to evaluate the education they provide, but this evaluation is designed through individualized assessment methods at each local school (OECD, 2015).

While Finland does not have a formal teacher evaluation system, education authorities and political leaders are held accountable for making decisions and implementing policies by Finnish society. Pasi Sahlberg, an expert on school reform explains that this structure has:

“created a practice of reciprocal, intelligent accountability in education system management where schools are increasingly accountable for learning outcomes and education authorities are held accountable to schools for making expected outcomes possible. Intelligent accountability in the Finnish education context preserves and enhances trust among teachers, students, school leaders and education authorities in the accountability processes and involves them in the process, offering them a strong sense of professional responsibility and initiative.” (Sahlberg, 2007, pg. 155).

The trust that exists between teachers, administration, parents and students is important to the structure of Finnish teacher evaluation practices in allowing for teacher freedom to address the needs of their students and maintain a supportive network of fellow teachers and school staff to assess the needs of their students.

The Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The purpose of teacher education in Finland is to provide peer feedback, ongoing professional development and individualized accountability. After the decentralization of the education system, individual teacher orientation practices have transitioned into supported
teacher development opportunities, supporting not only development, but also accountability and professionalism (Salberg, 2007). Finnish teachers understand that they, and their respective schools are responsible for meeting the identified goals and the success of their students. In the Finnish teaching profession, teachers have the opportunity to identify, analyze and address problems on the local level.

Finnish schools in general are structured to accommodate localized evaluation. Finnish schools are smaller, usually with less than 300 students and limited class sizes of approximately 20 students or less. Schools are also equitably funded and student supports are in place across all schools such as free meals, health care, transportation, learning materials and counseling as appropriate (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

**Historic Development and Background of the Teacher Evaluation System**

In the 1970’s the United States was regarded as the international education leader, and Finland was not educationally succeeding. However, since this time, Finland has “created a productive teaching and learning system by expanding access while investing purposefully in ambitious educational goals using strategic approaches to build teaching capacity” (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Sahlberg describes how, since the 1970s, Finland has changed its traditional education system “into a model of a modern, publicly financed education system with widespread equity, good quality, large participation—all of this at reasonable cost.” (Sahlberg, 2009, p. 2.)

In the early 1990’s, Finland faced a major banking crisis leading to a national economic decline. The unemployment rate increased from 4% to 18% and public debt was over 50 percent. To help recover the Finnish economy, the nation put in place a number of economic reforms including a diversified export structure, new business innovation and new knowledge-based industries (Sahlberg, 2007). One area of reform focused on the national education system. Prior to reforms, a substantial achievement gap existed between Finnish students that correlated to socio-economic status. Curriculum reforms starting in 1980 and continuing through the next decades decreased this gap, and by 2006, “Finland’s between-school variance on the PISA science scale was only 5 percent, whereas the average between-school variance in other OECD nations was about 33 percent. (Large between-school variation is generally related to social inequality.” (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Today, Finland has a high percentage of student success. Darling-Hammond reports that over 90 percent of student’s complete compulsory basic education and upper secondary school. Two-thirds of graduating students enroll in universities or polytechnic schools, and more than 50 percent of Finnish adults enroll in adult education. Finland also supports almost all of the costs of all public education. Darling-Hammond further explains that the process of change in Finland has been the opposite of the process in the United States. Finland’s education reforms have shifted from a highly-centralized system that emphasized external testing to a localized system that allows for extensive education of teachers, equitable funds to all institutions and the flexibility in national standards for teachers to design curriculum as they see fit. The reasoning behind such reform stems from the theory that an investment in the capacity of local teachers
and schools to meet the needs of all students, coupled with guidance about educational goals, can bring out the local creativity and expertise to meet common and equitable outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2010). The education reforms put in place by Finland have created a successful education system and revised the teacher evaluation process. Jehlen summarizes the steps the Finnish government took to reform the education system; Finland:

- Eliminated standardized testing;
- Provided social supports for students including a free daily meal and free health care;
- Upgraded the teaching profession. Teachers participate in a three-year graduate school preparation program that is paid for;
- Teachers spend nearly half of their time in school in high-level professional development, collaborative planning, and working with parents (2010).

The above reforms decentralized teacher evaluation and placed almost the entire evaluation responsibility at the local level. The Finnish government determines the national education objectives. The Ministry of Education is responsible for legislation and the National Board of Education outlines educational goals. There is a national, external evaluation component at the national level; however, teacher evaluation is placed at the local level without explicated direction from the national government (Kupiainen Hautamäki, and Karjalainen, 2009).

**Application of Teacher Evaluation**

The national Ministry of Education in Finland plays a minimal role in teacher evaluation. Instead, teacher unions include broad evaluation policies. Teachers are then usually appraised against the national core curriculum and the individual school development plan. As mentioned, Finland eliminated all standardized testing of students, thus such an assessment is not used as a tool for teacher evaluation as can be seen in other countries such as the United States (Walker, 2013).

While Finland does not have standardized testing in education, teacher’s education is standardized. Finnish teachers are required to earn a master’s degree at one of the country’s research universities. Acceptance into the elite teacher education programs is very competitive, and as a consequence, teaching is regarded as an esteemed profession in Finland. Additionally, Finnish education students must pass an assessment before they graduate from the Finnish school of education that demonstrates they have met the objectives and gained the knowledge to teach the teacher education curriculum. Education policies in Finland are broader and concentrate more on school effectiveness than on teacher effectiveness, thus indicating that what schools are expected to do is an effort of everyone in a school rather than teachers working individually, they must work together (Sahlberg, 2013).

The Basic Education Act of 1999 further revised Finland’s evaluation practices, shifting the purpose of evaluation to supporting the “development of education and to improve conditions of learning” (Simola, Rinneb, Varjoa, Pitkänena and Kauko, 2009, p. 170). The Finnish evaluation system uses teacher evaluation centered on self-assessment and encourages
professional growth. In 1995, the Framework for Evaluating Education Outcomes was published by Finland’s National Board of Education to provide guidance to local entities regarding evaluations, but this document is not intended to set procedures, but to use as a reference (Simola et al., 2009).

Finnish teachers have more control over their own teaching design, including their identified methods and materials used. Teachers’ assess their own students on a continuous basis, thus, and by-default, individualized teacher evaluation and assessment takes place on a constant basis. Snider explains that this flexibility and accountability explains why education is a sought after and prestigious profession in Finland (2011).

Methods, Sources, and Instruments

Finland ended the school inspection system to evaluate teachers with their national overhaul, and today “teacher evaluation is more group-based, reflective, and participatory, with the aim of creating professional learning communities among teachers and administrators” (Williams and Engel, 2013, pg. 54). Williams and Engel report that Finland’s teacher evaluation system is based on professional accountability. Through this professional accountability, teachers are held accountable to themselves, their fellow teachers, school administration, students and parents. In years prior to the national educational reform, a school inspection system was in place; however, this was discarded and replaced with a more “consultative and formative process.” School administrators, fellow teachers and other school staff assist each other, drawing from individualized experience to help strengthen methods of teaching. “Organizational accountability exists, but its primary purpose is to coordinate and lead the professional activities of teachers rather than command and control. Poor performance in relation to professional norms violates the trust that is said to characterize the system” (Williams and Engel, 2013, pg. 54).

Finland’s National Board of Education, published the Framework for Evaluating Education Outcomes that offers evaluation guidance to local schools, however this document is not a set of regulations or procedures, but meant to serve as a reference and to be interpreted with discretion (Simola et al., 2009).

As previously stated, the evaluation methods and instruments vary widely throughout local schools. There is not a standardized set of teacher evaluation documents or practices. The selected assessment at the local level is contingent upon the teacher, school, needs of the students and other individualized factors.

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

While the ultimate goal of any teacher evaluation is to improve the practice and to make informed decisions to best meet the overall objectives, the Finnish teacher evaluation system seems to support the ongoing, individualized development of teachers as opposed to a tool of reprimand. Teacher evaluation in the United States uses standardized testing as a decision-making tool in areas such as teacher ranking, salary raises, continued employment as well as
others. The negative impacts of this system are widely documented, and it is argued that evaluated teachers using student scoring does not account for many other assessment influences, such as poverty, special needs, resources and many more. Finland restructured and decentralized their education evaluation system to look like opposite of the United States system in many respects. In doing so, Finland has created a system that places teacher evaluation in the hands of the teachers and local schools. By doing so, teacher evaluation is used most by the teachers themselves.

Local teacher evaluations are used by individualized teachers as a method of ongoing professional development, and by teacher groups to learn and support one another. It is also used by local school administration to improve their individualized school and address local needs of the students. Finnish teacher evaluation is not reported back to a centralized system, but resides completely at the local level.
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Overview of the Structure of Teacher Evaluation

The teacher evaluation structure in France is complex and requires tremendous efforts from teachers, the ministry of education and school leaders. In fact, the evaluation structure differs based on the level of class, in primary and secondary education. Within the primary education level, teachers are evaluated by inspectors from the ministry of education, not by their peers or the principal. Teachers from the secondary education are evaluated by both inspectors and school leaders. The inspector is therefore responsible of evaluating what is taught in class and how it is taught. The principal evaluate teachers based on criteria such as punctuality and attendance, activity and efficiency, authority and ascendency. The principal or school leader role during the inspector inspection is to accompany the inspector during his inspection activities, without participating in the meeting between the inspector and the inspected teacher, which is usually held after the classroom inspection. This meeting is sometimes called “interview”, see appendix 1.

The French Ministry of Education through the General Inspection of Education conducts teachers’ and leaders’ evaluation in both public and private educational institutions. In fact, similarly to the process and practices in public institutions, the ministry of education sends an official note to private institutions regarding the process and practices of using the national education program, the rules regarding the evaluation process and the frequency of those evaluations. Moreover, this note clarifies the role and level of involvement of the government within private institutions’ activities, and the expectations of the government towards those private institutions (Syndicat National Unitaire des Instituteurs Professeurs des Ecoles et Pegc, n.d).

According to the French legislation in vigor, the General Inspection of the National Education conducts and participates in the evaluation of its own personnel, of school leaders, teachers, programs and orientation, either of public or private institutions. The General Inspection of the National Education is also involved in the recruitment, training and the evaluation of activities in school settings. In other words, the career of a teacher in France, either from a public or private institution perspective, is determined by the general inspection of education since it informs decision making regarding termination, improvement, and promotion.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation in France is mainly to improve the teaching practices in order to better serve students (improvement; formative assessment), and to make sure that teachers are effectively doing their jobs of enhancing students learning (accountability; summative assessment) (OECD, 2009). The overall inspection is therefore around these two goals and follow the ministry of education rules or legislation in place in order to provide a better sight of the teaching practices and students’ learning.
Historic Development and Background of the Teacher Evaluation System

Created in 1802 under the reign of Napoleon the 1st, the General Inspection of National Education started with three general inspectors whom the mission was to report the state of primary and secondary schools to the government. To do this, they had to visit schools and inform the government about what is working or not working. Through centuries of history, the mission of the General Inspection of the National Education has changed, including the one of inspectors. Since 1989, the General Inspection of the National Education is not only in charge of evaluating teachers but also the educational system, teaching content, teaching methods, teaching procedures, and the support available for school leaders and teachers, by visiting each year a sample of schools and services across the country. The teachers’ evaluation is conducted by both Regional Pedagogic Inspectors and the inspectors of the national education.

As of now, the scope of teachers’ evaluation has been broadened and they are no more exclusively focused on the sole observation of one particular lesson; they explore and take into account the context of the class, the teaching staff’s teamwork, the student’s outcomes, and the school’s general indicators (Doriath, Montaigu, Poncelet, Richon, 2013). Moreover, inspectors today also evaluate the teacher’s participation in training and/or research activities, in the mentoring of new teachers, etc. The school evaluation (évaluations d’école) is conducted by inspectors at the same time with the teacher’s evaluation. A team of inspectors, one or many, can be designated as primary inspector (s) and others as secondary inspectors. The primary inspector conducts the teacher’s inspection, while the secondary one conducts the school inspection and the results are presented in a meeting with teachers and school leaders.

As a recall, in 2010/2011, a reform of the evaluation system of secondary teachers was undertaken: the marking/grading system was to be suppressed and replaced by a combination of self-assessment and three-yearly “professional interviews” (entretiens professionnels) with the school head. In spite of protests and demonstrations, the decree was promulgated on 7 May 2012, however as the new minister’s first promise, the repeal of the decree was made and occurred on 27 August 2012.

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

In France, teachers are evaluated once every three years in the primary level, and once every four to five years in secondary level, based on a lesson taught in the presence of the inspector or the school leader. The frequency of evaluation depends on the region and the availability of inspectors in that specific area. More often, teachers are the ones who request an evaluation in order to boost their career.

In secondary education, teachers’ evaluation is based on two criteria, one is “pedagogical” (based on 60 points), given by the inspector; and another one “administrative” (based on 40 points), given each year by the school principal, based on the criteria of diligence, regular attendance, authority and performance. Whatever the grade given to a teacher, it has no great impact on the teacher’s career advancement, except in case of a big professional misconduct. It is therefore worth noting that the promotion of teachers depends on the seniority,
not on the grade of evaluation. For new teachers, the inspector and the school leader combine their report into one, based on pedagogical and administrative criteria.

In February 2001, Jack Lang, the ministry of education enforced the policy of the Monteil report (1999) towards a new approach of teachers’ evaluation, specifically on the grading of new teachers. This policy allows inspectors and school leaders to consider challenges of starting a career while evaluating new teachers. This report stated that new teachers will be evaluated only at the end of their second year of teaching. Moreover, a senior teacher must be charged to accompany and support the new teacher throughout the teaching practices in the school. This approach should have also lead the general inspection and school to understand the professional development needs of new teachers.

In general, teachers are the first to request evaluation and they do appreciate the dialogue approach and advice provided to them during and after the inspectors inspected. In fact, teachers in France feel trapped within their profession and need guidance and role modeling, a role that is well played by inspectors and school leaders. Most teachers request the evaluation because they desire career advancement and promotion. Nevertheless, most of them recognize the limits and challenges of the evaluation, as it is conducted today. They therefore suggest frequent inspection, and they want these evaluations to be formative. According to Jacky Simon, the mediator of national education, teachers complain less about evaluation and at some point, they want more of it. The only complaint of teachers is regarding the lack of feedback after the evaluation.

Methods, Sources, and Instruments

The evaluation methods for teachers depends on the level of education they teach. For teachers at the primary level of education, one single mark/grade, out of 20, is determined by the inspector; and for teachers at the secondary level, two marks/grades. The first one is the “administrative mark/grade” out of 40, determined by the principal on criteria such as punctuality and attendance, activity and efficiency, authority and ascendency. The second mark/grade is the “pedagogical mark/grade” out of 60, determined by the inspector.

To collect data for the evaluation purpose, the inspector must visit teachers, during a teaching session and collect data that he/she judges critical to the evaluation process. Moreover, the inspector may also conduct a document analysis of the teacher’s portfolio, and collect other material to ensure all data necessary should lead to a sound evaluation. Sometimes, the inspector may also include the school principal in the evaluation process. The role of the principal in this circumstance is therefore; limited to the class/teaching visit, and if needed the inspector may ask for the principals input in the process.

At the end of the evaluation process, the inspector writes a final individual inspection report addressing the teacher. The report mostly contains remarks and criticisms, but will always provide recommendations regarding areas of improvement and/or in-service training.
Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

The teacher evaluation findings in France are mostly used for formative assessment. In fact, the result of the findings from the classroom visits are used to assess and improve the quality of teaching practice, and may also be used in order to ensure the effectiveness of the implementation of the government’s model of teaching practices. The teacher evaluation findings also allow the school, the ministry of education and other stakeholders to understand the state of the school and to what extent the national program of education is respected and enforced in schools.

The results of the evaluation are therefore crucial because they help assessing the needs of the institution, the application of reforms and the efficiency of the teaching, based on students’ learning outcomes. Even though teachers’ marks/grades may at some point affect their career advancement rates, the link between evaluation and remuneration is weak: progression on the salary scale depends primarily on years of service and seniority. Besides, inspectors cannot raise teachers’ marks/grades outside certain predetermined limits and lowering a teacher’s mark is rarely done, if ever.

Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System

We cannot address the development or reform of the teacher evaluation system in France, without talking about its strengths and weaknesses. As of the strength, this system focuses more on pedagogical and intellectual individual inspection. As weaknesses, the inconsistencies of evaluation are unfair since some teachers are frequently evaluated, while others are not, based on the workload of the inspector. As another weakness, we can note the lack of integration of teacher’s self-assessment in the evaluation process.

The teacher evaluation system in France is quite complex due to the fact that each teacher is given two types of grades, one administrative, which is given annually by the principal based on the evaluation professional skills, attitudes and competencies; and another one pedagogical, given by an inspector after a class visit and a meeting with the evaluand. Nevertheless, inspections are seldom conducted and their impact on the pedagogical grade is not quite clear since the grading mechanism is deeply affected by bureaucratic challenges and limitations used in the name of harmonization. According to Doriath, Montaigu, Poncelet, Richon (2013) in their report entitled “L’évaluation des enseignants”, 25% of teachers have not been inspected for eight or more years.

The aforementioned system is criticized to be formal, expensive and does not help completing effective evaluation. Moreover, this evaluation system is based on the two following main factors: teacher’s seniority and the grade obtained at the teachers’ entrance test. Despite the criticism, the teachers’ unions are being reluctant to changes regarding the evaluation methods since they are involved in its processes. The ministry of education itself has criticized this grading system arguing that it could not be improved. As a solution, the ministry has suggested this system to be discontinued and replaced by a new one.

In fact, the ministry of education suggested two principles in order to solve the issues of the current evaluation system. The first principle is to reduce the importance given on the
seniority and add other criteria such as continuing education and studies accreditation, accumulated teaching experience or other experiential learning. The second principle is to enlarge the pace of career boost towards the evaluation process, evaluating only the most recent years in order to avoid any effect of accumulated previous evaluation, which is one of the main sources of the inconsistency experienced in the current system.

Moreover, it will be crucial to avoid two pitfalls: the first, of assessing each student’s value in order to measure or determine the efficiency of the teacher. The second, is assuming that consistency could result from emphasizing the evaluation on professional standards, of reference setting of teachers’ tasks and required skills, in an attempt to apply purely neutral instruments (Isoré, 2009).

This suggested change is not accepted by teacher’s who are afraid of losing the momentum on the current system. To solve this issue, I strongly believe that a dialogue between the teacher’s union and the ministry of education should be undertaken in order to find consensus on a gradual change of the current evaluation system in France.
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Appendix 1. Evaluation Grid for Trainee Teachers

Official Bulletin No. 13 of March 26, 2015

Note No 11 - Rubric for trainee teachers

Details relating to the use of the evaluation grid

The evaluation grid below, based repository of professional skills of trades professorship and education, is used by different evaluators involved in the process Evaluation of probationers for their tenure. It is therefore mandatory.

The evaluators as appropriate:
- Members of the inspection body (IGEN, first and second degree) or associate professors appointed by the General Inspectorate of Education;
- Establishment of the leaders;
- Those responsible for the administrative authority from the affected school or student falls off establishment of second degree.

It is used in as many copies as there are evaluators.

The grid has the professional skills of the above reference in its shaded area and their declaration in the form of items characterizing the skills expected at the end of the year of course.

If the competency framework evokes the notion of progressivity in the acquisition of skills, items below specifically identify the theoretical and practical knowledge to be acquired during the internship year.

The set of items is intended to be completed. However, in view of the conduct of the trainee, some items may not be. In any case, each item that is the subject of an evaluation is informed by a cross in one of the two columns and is accompanied by comments in particular when the competence has not gained.

Some items of particular concern to leaders.

In case of unfavorable opinion, particular attention should be paid to the drafting of the reasoned opinion or report emphasizing the skills acquired insufficiently repository.
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Name and surname of the student: ___________________________  institution: ___________________________
Recruitment competition: ___________________________  discipline: ___________________________

The declination skills resumes numbering repository
(1) acquired enough: the skill level found allows to consider entering the profession of the trainee teacher.
(2) Insufficiently acquired: the skill level found is not sufficient for entry into the profession in trainee teacher.

CC: Common skills.

Skills related to the consideration of the elements regulatory and institutional environment professional link with the responsibilities attached to his function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sufficiently acquired (1)</th>
<th>Insufficiently acquired (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1 To share the values of the Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter CC2 its action in the context of the principles basic education system and as part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC6. A responsible educator and according to principles ethical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Observe and enforce the principles of equality, neutrality, secularism, equality, tolerance, refusal any discrimination
- Meets the requirements of punctuality, diligence, security and privacy
- Adopt an attitude and an adult positioning
Interpersonal skills, communication and entertainment
favoring transmission, involvement and cooperation within the educational community and its environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Enough acquired (1)</th>
<th>Insufficiently acquired (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC7. Mastering the French language for communication purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC10. Cooperate within a team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC11. Contribute to the work of the educational community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC12. Cooperating with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC13. Cooperate with school partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses clear language and adapted to his (her) interlocutor(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in its measure teamwork implemented by / in the institution / school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a favorable listening and discussions with community members educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Skills to master the subject content and their teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Enough acquired (1)</th>
<th>Insufficiently acquired (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1. Mastering the subject knowledge and their teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2. Mastering the French language in the context of its education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master the subject content and key concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
useful for teaching
Implements appropriate didactic transpositions
Identifies the knowledge and skills to be acquired by
students related programs and repositories

observations:

Educational and pedagogical skills needed to set
implement learning situations and support
various students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enough acquired (1)</th>
<th>Insufficiently acquired (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3. Build, implement and facilitate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching and learning taking into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account the student diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4. Organize and ensure a group of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote learning and socialization of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5. Assess progress and achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3 know the students and the learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC4 Take into account the diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC5 accompany students in their learning path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages the students and the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group, demonstrated vigilance against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inappropriate behavior and knows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate level of authority expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a serene climate and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages and values its students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets the objectives, the means of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving them and gives meaning to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes into account the diversity of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and ensures the adequacy of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their educational proposals level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares upstream sequences and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of a thoughtful progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Skills for the use and control of Communication Information Technology

| CC9. Integrate digital culture elements necessary the exercise of his profession | Enough acquired (1) | Insufficiently acquired (2) |
| Uses digital tools and networks established in the institution / school | □ | □ |
| Distinguished personal and professional uses in practice | □ | □ |
| Is attentive to how students mobilize tool digital | □ | □ |

observations:

Skills of analysis and adaptation of its practice professional taking into account the changes in the profession and work environment.

| CC14. Engage in individual and collective approach Professional Development | Enough acquired (1) | Insufficiently acquired (2) |
| Takes into account the advice given by the Personal coaching and tutors and trainers strives to improve its practice | □ | □ |
| Is able to step back and wear analysis Reflective of its position and its activities | □ | □ |

observations:
Chapter 8: Greece

Jodi Ward

Introduction

The education system in Greece is provided for all children from ages 6-15 and is considered a basic responsibility of the state as per the country’s constitution. Post-compulsory education consists of two tracks which includes a Unified Upper Secondary education or Technical Vocational education. Additionally, in Greece, specialized educational curriculums can be found in schools that concentrate on such areas as Musical, Ecclesiastical and Physical Education.

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

Greek education is part of a highly-centralized government system and is managed by the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs (MERA). The country is divided into 15 administrative regions for education and subdivided into 240 different districts (Persianis, 1998). The MERA operates within a very wide context of both rural and urban areas, with primary school students located in thousands of communities that have been organized into 325 prefectures (Greek administrative jurisdictions).

All policy, policy reform and the enforcement of such items are under the control of MERA whose authority functions in a top down administration, see Appendix 1. Greek government has attempted to address many educational reforms via MERA but has often failed to make true impact on the efficiency, effectiveness and achievement of the education system as a whole. Educational reforms in Greece have been put forth by the Ministry in an effort to systematically strengthen school and assess the progress of students and educators.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation is one of the areas of reform that has been addressed but implementing systematic evaluation has been a challenge. The country of Greece and MERA recognize that monitoring and appraising teachers is a key factor in improving schools and the educational environment for students. However, the structure, continual change in power and economic struggles in Greek government has created many political, financial, and organizational obstacles to reforming education.

Historic Development and Background of Teacher Evaluation

The Ministry of Education has been the sole entity setting the educational agenda since the restoration of democracy in 1974 and as such the Greek education system is one of the most centralized in Europe (OECD, 2011). However, reforms have been largely political and since the 1970s there have been more than 20 Education Ministers. There was a change in Ministers every time there was a change in government elected officials in power. The school and teacher evaluation system, that was implemented during this timeframe and evaluated everyone involved
in education from high level administration down to staff in employment offices, although the primary focus and goal of the policy was to evaluate teachers (Chrysos, 2000), see Table 1.

**Table 1: Organization of Greek Educational System**

![Organisation of educational administration of primary and secondary schools](image)

Between the mid-1970s and 1980 Greece used an evaluation system that included assessments conducted by school inspectors. The intention of the inspector was to support quality teaching in school, but it was not a formal system and many teachers were appointed without evaluation results during this time period. Many teachers and school leaders were appointed or promoted simply upon political agenda. The inspector role was responsible for conducting all aspects of the teacher evaluation; however, it was intermittently implemented or not enforced at all across the school systems. Regulation of evaluation came in the period after the 1980s when the inspector role was restructured and school leadership officials became responsible for school, teacher and self-evaluations. During the 1990s the Greek state developed a more solidified and comprehensive plan to evaluate teachers and school as pressure intensified to improve school effectiveness (Papagueli-Vouliouris, 1999).
In May of 2010, The Ministry of Education passed a law providing a provision regarding the self-evaluations of schools. Self-Evaluation within the school was a way to gain trust within the school, especially with teachers who were skeptical about the value of inspector or external evaluators conducting assessments. The project that was created to implement this law was titled “Evaluation of the Educational Work of Schools: The Process of Self-Evaluation” (OECD, 2011). This MERA initiated reform included assessments of the school system, as a whole, rating achievements of educational action items, attainment of learning outcomes, strengths and weaknesses, conditions of employment of teachers and school directors, and teacher appraisals. While this reform was targeted at evaluating all facets of the school system in a holistic manner, this paper will focus on the issue of teacher evaluation.

**Current Application of Teacher Evaluation**

Evaluation is the primary instrument for assessing the learning environment of schools and promoting teachers’ self-development and instruction quality (Chryos, 2000). The type of evaluation that the Greek education reforms proposed has two primary purposes. The first purpose was used to identify strengths and weaknesses for the intent of determining professional development needs of teachers. This is a formative use of results where there is ongoing feedback that can be used to improve teaching process and identify next steps for supportive professional development opportunities. It is geared toward the performance and overall function of teaching. The other purpose of this evaluation is to ensure that a teacher is supporting the students’ learning environment through optimal performance. Teaching competence as it relates to student learning was assessed via summative evaluation using national benchmarks and test scores. Summative results were used to award performance either by way of career advancement, rewards/bonuses, paid time off, or tenure decisions. Conveying the purposes to educators ahead of being evaluated has not always been communicated effectively and has led to some discontented teachers (Chrysos, 2000). Throughout the process, it is imperative that teachers be able to identify with the goals and values of the teacher evaluation practices and the expectations of them (OECD, 2006).

Greece created two types of evaluators in the hierarchical assessment system, which included an internal evaluator such as principals, directors, employers, inspectors, and consultants as well as an external evaluator or those from BPE-Body of Permanente Evaluators and CESO-committee of Evaluation of School Organizations (Chrysos, 2000). The BPE and CESO work under the political center of Greece and all decisions are influenced in a top down administration led by MERA. Political influence has plagued the Greek education system and evaluation of teachers for many decades. Political criteria, whether at the national or local level have influenced educational policy making and management in the Greek education system (Papagueli-Vouliouris, 1999). Because of this influence, teacher appointments and promotions have often times been based on political criteria or influence more than on an individual’s merit. This has long been a major challenge for the successful implementation of a formal evaluation strategy for teachers in Greece.

Prior to 1982 the role of inspector involved informal or loosely conducted evaluation of teachers. The primary function of the assigned inspector was in an administrative and disciplinary supervision (Papagueli-Vouliouris, 1999). In the 1980s the inspector role was
replaced with school advisor which still continued evaluation in a somewhat informal manner. The advisor’s role, in contrast to that of the inspector, emphasized support and guidance of teachers in their educational function and professional development in their careers. In the 1990s Greece introduced a more contemporary system of education laws, policies and reform using advisors in the school to facilitate the evaluation.

While the legislation in Greece recognizes the importance of teacher evaluation and in some districts, they still exist, the enforcement of use has not been uniformly maintained across the region. For decades’ evaluation, has been an on again off again, process in the Greek education system. According to the 2015 OECD Annex 3 findings the requirement for teacher appraisals to be used at the completion of the two-year initial teacher probation, regular interval evaluation of continuing educator and promotion type evaluations have all been suspended by the Greek government and are now under public scrutiny and deliberation. While evaluation may still occur in schools, the Greek government is not currently mandating these

Methods, Sources and Instruments

The methods by which teachers have been evaluated in Greece include a mix of criteria, instruments and data sources. Instruments used include some of all of the following: student national test scores, classroom observation by an inspector, a peer educator or a school leader, teacher self-evaluation, teaching or classroom portfolio, school self-evaluation, external evaluation, performance indicators or professional surveys (OECD, 2011). The purpose of each is to create accountability and initiate improvements in both student outcomes and teacher performance. However, this has not been systematically applied. The OECD (2011) reported that only 30% of students in Greece attend school where student achievement data is used to monitor teacher practices. The Greece government is one of the OECD countries that is reported as least likely to use student achievement data for either benchmarking or decision making, see Appendix B.

According to OECD Indicators (2015) the system of evaluation in Greece schedules teachers to be evaluated on a regular but periodic schedule. The newly hired teachers are appraised at the end of their introductory 2-year period and are mandatory, before they can be considered for a permanent contract with the school. Veteran teachers are mandated to be appraised in the evaluation system every 4 years (OECD, 2015). The Greek Ministry determines the procedure for teacher appraisal and this data is used for teacher promotion and career advancement. The Observatory of Evaluation of Education Practice (AEE) is the central agency who determines the procedures, except for completion of probation and reward schemes. Both summative and formative data in used in the evaluations of teachers in Greece.

The evaluations of teachers use a rating scale of 0 to 100 and 4 proficiency levels that include excellent, good, adequate or insufficient (OECD, 2015). Evaluation data from the completion of probation, the regular cyclical assessments, and appraisals for promotion are used in several ways. Teachers that are positively evaluated in their performance may be selected for professional development plans, or certification. Positive results can also influence the progress by which a teacher advances at the school or receives an increase in the pay structure. For teachers that are found to be underperforming in the classroom, they are mandated
to participate in training. If a teacher disagrees with the assessment given, they can appeal those findings. Regional Committees of Evaluation of Education Practices (E.A.E.E.) is a government agency that handles all cases in which the teacher is in objection of the assessment results (OECD, 2015).

The Greek school self-evaluation is part of their school inspection assessment and is required as part of their evaluation system and is administered once a year. School self-evaluations are relatively new having been conducted since the 2013-2014 school year. Areas addressed in the self-evaluation that are directly link to teacher performance include school improvement plans, teacher satisfaction, teacher-student relationships, and teacher leadership. Results from the self-evaluation are shared with the school administration, the teachers, and the public (OECD, 2015).

**Use of Evaluation Findings**

As mentioned, teachers are assessed on a rating continuum as well as assigning them a level of proficiency from excellent down to inefficient. These findings are used in differing ways depending on the level of the educator (new/probationary, continuing, or tenured). For new/probationary teachers these findings are used to end the probation and can lead to a permanent teaching contract. Probation periods in Greece last for the initial two years after a teacher is hired. For continuing teachers, these findings can be used for professional development plans or rewards. For those teachers that are up for promotion, the findings can lead to a career advancement and increase in salary.

The Pedagogical Institute has at times used findings from the teacher evaluations and offered programming for teacher training. From 2005 to 2007 over 8,000 newly appointed teachers took advantage of this agency’s programs (Papazoglou, 2004). The goal of the programming was to prepare teachers to better support the learning environment at school and increase their classroom performance for improved student educational attainment. Various subjects were offered in these training programs including classroom management, correcting behavior escalation, modern teaching approaches and use of technology and integrating foreign languages in primary education. The Pedagogical Institute served teachers that sought professional development as well as teachers that were proficiency leveled at inefficient and needed additional support to become more effective educators.

**Future Reform Plans**

The current education system in Greece is in dire need of solid and sustainable reform policies that will include teacher evaluation and improvements of the school learning environment. During the period of 1991-2011 many significant changes were initiated by the Greek government. Multiple policies and laws were passed that focused on training educators, establishing assessment in primary and secondary education, transferring decision making authority to prefectural members of leadership, selection and promotion of educators based on ratings not political agendas, and merging of school committees and decision making powers. Despite all of these educational reforms the system as a whole saw limited impact on education. Not enough was invented or enforced to adequately bring about change or sustainable development (Santi, 2012).
While over the decades’ short term changes have been made in the Greek education system, little has been accomplished over the long term in regards to substantial and ongoing reform. Continuous change in new ruling parties or Education Ministers has deterred real impact. The future of education reform in Greece is uncertain. Until the government can focus on dedicated resources for long term planning, implementation and enforcement of an evaluation culture they will continue to see short term fixes that are insufficient for creating true reform in the education sector.

Several longer-term recommendations have been put forth in an effort to improve the educational environment through evaluation efforts. These include empowering schools and equipping local school leadership to take responsibility in the process of teacher evaluation (Saiti, 2013). If there is not currently a process for internal evaluation, then it is recommended to add one or consider the use of external intervention to implement assessment procedures. Also recommended is to align teacher evaluation with professional development and or linking it to training opportunities. Implement evaluation consequences for both underperformers and those that are achieving or exceeding standards is also needed. Additionally, school should use results from positive evaluations for compensation or career advancement opportunities for teachers (OECD, 2011). While some of these recommendations have been implemented at times, it needs to be implemented and enforced in the entire Greek regional school systems to be effective and fair for all educators.

Conclusion

Greece has struggled for many decades with the creation, implementation, execution and enforcement of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system. While much of this is political in nature, it is imperative for the state to recognize the value of having a strong public education in place regardless of the political party in office. With so many changes in government officials it has been difficult for this country to create meaningful and long term sustainable education reforms. Greece has struggled to successfully adopt education policy and make relevant systematic reform; the contributing factors being an unstable political climate, a recession and severe economic problems.

The discontinuity of both administrative functions and political functions coupled with the frequent change in Greek Education Ministers has led to a country that will continue to suffer with an education system that lacks comprehensive teacher evaluation. The introduction of a self-evaluation for schools was a step in the right direction. However, this is a small piece of a greater strategic scheme that needs to be in place. Further efforts to establish objective criteria, validations and comparable data on student, teacher and school performance are still lacking and have yet to be implemented in Greek education system as a whole (OECD, 2011). Without these parameters and data, it will continue to be difficult to accurately monitor performance at the student, teacher and school levels.

The quick fix approach has its brief merits but not a viable or reliable long term solution. Long term improvement has been difficult to sustain without a strategic plan for evaluation in place. Without investments in time, human capital, public money and support from the Greek government Greece will continue to have a difficult time with sustained change and remain on a
downward spiral that caters to political agendas. The structure of the highly-centralized government, educational management system and its political influences acts as a barrier to improved school performance, hampers the introduction of a full teacher evaluation system and distances Greece from the opportunity of becoming a global competitor in quality education.
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Teacher evaluation frequency table

Chart D7.1. Frequency of various types of teacher and school leader appraisals covered by policy framework (2015)
In general programmes, lower secondary education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Completion of probation</th>
<th>Regular appraisal</th>
<th>Teacher registration</th>
<th>Appraisal for promotion</th>
<th>Reward schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mandatory periodic</td>
<td>Mandatory non-periodic</td>
<td>No legislated appraisal</td>
<td>Not mandatory/voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| School leaders               | Australia               | Belgium (Fr.)      | Brazil (Br.)         | Canada                   | Chile          | Czech Republic | Denmark       | England       | Finland       | France         | Germany        | Greece         | Hungary        | Iceland       | Ireland       | Italy          | Japan          | Korea          | Luxembourg     | Malta          | Netherlands    | Norway         | Norway (Eston) | Austria        | Portugal       | Romania        | Slovak Republic | Slovenia       | Spain          | Sweden         | Switzerland    | United Kingdom | United States  | Uruguay        | Venezuela      | Zambia         |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|

StatLink  http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/666933284638
Chapter 9: Ireland

Judith Larsen

Introduction

In most countries, the evaluation of teacher quality, teacher performance, and teaching effectiveness is considered essential to maintaining an educational system that is successful in producing optimal gains in student performance. Multiple criteria should be used in determining teacher effectiveness and therefore a teacher evaluation system should rely on multiple sources of information (Hinchey, P. H., 2010). Teacher evaluation should: (a) be based on professional teaching standards and assess the teaching quality of novice to expert teachers, (b) use well-trained evaluators who are knowledgeable about instruction, (c) be accompanied by useful feedback and connected to professional development opportunities, (d) value and encourage teacher collaboration and contributions to student learning and the school as a whole, and (e) use expert teachers and administrators as part of the review process (Darling-Hammond, 2012).

This paper will review the teacher evaluation system in Ireland by comparing it to the standards listed above and by examining how components of Ireland’s teacher evaluation system rank in terms of the indicators developed by the OECD to measure the state of education internationally for 37 countries (OECD 2015).

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

The Education Act of 1998 established the inspection of teachers only at the primary level, which occurs during their probationary period, or if a school board requests an inspection of a teacher in school if there is a problem they have not been able to solve. In 2004, the Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) was formalized for the primary level and newly established at the post-primary level. WSE assesses the overall work of the school regarding the quality of school management, quality of school planning and school self-evaluation, quality of teaching, learning and pupil achievement, and the quality of support for pupils (Ireland Department of Education and Science, 2009). In July, 2015, the Teaching Council (Amendment) Act established the formal ability of the Teaching Council to consider complaints about registered teachers (Oireachtas Library & Research Service, 2015).

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

In December, 2015, a research report issued by the Ireland National Parliament (Oireachtas) about measuring teacher effectiveness stated: “At the post-primary level, external appraisal of newly qualified teachers is not established as a general element of practice. Instead, the principal signs -off on the completion of the probationary period by the teacher. Outside of the probationary period and cases of underperformance, however, there is no formal procedure whereby the quality of an individual teacher’s work is regularly evaluated.” Efforts to expand the teacher evaluation system for performance management, accountability or developmental purposes has been met with resistance from teachers and teachers’ unions (Irish Times, 2015).
History of the Teacher Evaluation System in Ireland

The Irish educational system began inspection of schools in 1831 when its national school system was established. Ireland lacked a legislative basis for the evaluation of its educational system until the Education Act of 1998 charged the Minister for Education and Skills with responsibility for monitoring and assessing the quality, economy, efficiency and effectiveness of Ireland’s education system (Hislop, 2013).

Irish legislation gives statutory responsibilities for teacher assessment to the Inspectorate, a Division within the Ministry of Education and part of the Civil Service. Today, there is a single Inspectorate in place, but previously, three separate branches were responsible for the evaluation of national, secondary and vocational schools respectively (Irish National Teachers’ Organisation (INTO. 2014). The Inspectorate works closely with the Teaching Council (under the Teaching Council Act of 2001) which is responsible for regulation of the teaching profession and the setting of standards for post-secondary teacher education programs (Hislop, 2013).

While general educational policy decisions are made by the Minister, the Education Act of 1998 established that the Minister can only exercise his powers following consultation with key stakeholders in the education system, including school managers, teacher unions, national associations of students, parents, universities and community organizations (Hislop, 2013). Procedures for determining teacher appraisal are established primarily by teachers’ professional organizations rather than by central or state education authorities (OECD, 2015).

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation in Ireland

Currently, the only formal teacher evaluations that take place in Ireland occur when inspections of probationary teachers are conducted in primary schools during and at the end of their teacher education program using standards set and evaluated by the Teaching Council through its Code of Professional Conduct for Teachers (Appendix A D7.1). Inspectors report on the quality of the teacher’s work on two occasions during the first year of service (Ireland Department of Education and Science, 2009).

The Teaching Council is given statutory responsibility for the registration of teachers. Teachers must meet the registration requirements of the Teaching Council to be allowed to teach in state-recognized primary and post-primary schools in Ireland (Appendix A D7.3b). Teachers may apply for registration in primary, post-primary, further education and Montessori and other categories sectors. The Teaching Council has established the following procedures for the evaluation of teachers during an induction and probation period (The Teaching Council, 2014).

1. Submit an initial application that includes academic transcripts, proof of identity, evidence of character, and other documentary evidence. Each application is assessed according to set criteria regarding qualifications and teaching experience, as well as evidence of character. Registration may be granted in full or with conditions, or refused.

2. Engage in the Induction Program which is a requirement for all newly qualified teachers to be fully registered with the Teaching Council. It is a flexible program designed to build on the learning that took place during initial teacher education.
3. Meet the service requirement for probation by securing employment in a primary school for probationary purposes for at least at least 100 days teaching the same cohort of students.

4. Satisfactorily pass the professional competence evaluation conducted by the Inspectorate of the Department of Education and Skills during the probation according to the following procedures and criteria:
   a. The Inspectorate will consult with the school principal about the teacher’s progress and will inspect the teacher’s work during one or more unannounced inspection visits that occur any time during the school year and will generally last about half a school day.
   b. The inspector will evaluate the teacher’s effectiveness in a classroom environment and in teaching curriculum areas and subjects, as outlined in the Primary School Curriculum. The inspector will also provide advice and oral feedback to the teacher during each visit. At the end of the visit(s), the inspector will inform the teacher if the evaluation of professional competence is complete or if another inspection visit will occur (Appendix A D7.4b). The criteria used by inspectors to evaluate the teacher’s work is shown in Appendix B.
   c. One of the following recommendations will be made by the inspector stating that the teacher:
      1. Has demonstrated satisfactory professional competence in a mainstream setting, or
      2. Has demonstrated satisfactory professional competence in a restricted setting, or
      3. Requires a further period to develop and demonstrate professional competence, or
      4. Has not demonstrated satisfactory professional competence

While no formal evaluation of teachers in post-primary schools take place, these teachers are expected to be entered on the Register on the basis of qualifications as a post-primary school teacher by satisfying Teacher Council requirements that he/she has obtained a primary degree awarded by one of the government-approved universities referred and recognized by the Teaching Council as suitable for the purpose of registration as a post-primary teacher (Appendix AD7.9b).

In addition, according to the Inspectorate of Education of Ireland report (2009), the assessment of teachers is also included in other inspections conducted by the Inspectorate at primary and post-primary schools as described below:

On an annual basis, a Whole School Evaluation (WSE) evaluates the overall work of schools at the primary and post-primary levels regarding the quality of teaching, learning and pupil achievement and quality of curriculum, school management and student support (INTO). The purpose of WSE is to evaluate the work of the school as a unit and to foster and promote the development of school activities as a whole (Appendix A D7.8b). During an in-school phase that takes between two and five days at the primary level and one week at the post-primary level, all pertinent documents are reviewed and meetings and interviews are held with school management teams, and with subject teachers as a group for the subjects being evaluated. In post-primary schools, subject inspectors observe teaching and learning in a range of lessons in the subjects included within the WSE. The subject inspectors examine teaching methods, classroom management, classroom atmosphere, and learning and evaluates evidence of planning for teaching and learning within the lessons observed. Feedback is provided to individual teachers
and to the principal during the evaluation. The inspectors also interact with pupils to evaluate skills and review samples of pupils’ work to gain insight into the teaching processes in the classroom, the pattern and quality of homework, and the quality of pupils’ learning (Oireachtas Library & Research Service, 2015).

Incidental Inspections are short unannounced inspections of teaching and learning take place in primary schools. Inspectors acquaint themselves with the work of individual teachers and of schools as a whole, give teachers assistance and advice, encourage innovation, and suggest suitable remedies for defects observed in teaching methods. The inspector may also examine records of pupils’ progress and discuss with the teachers their preparation for work based on their professional judgement. Feedback is provided to individual teachers and school principals. Currently, the inspectorate is developing mechanisms to aggregate data from these inspections to identify national trends and to inform planning of whole-school evaluations.

Follow-through inspections: evaluate the progress a school has made on implementing recommendations made in an earlier inspection where a written report has been published or issued to the school. Each year, a sample of all schools where a previous inspection was held and where a report was published or issued to the school is selected for follow-through inspection.

Thematic Evaluations take place at both primary and post-primary level to focus on selected aspects of the work of a school in relation to particular programs or initiatives. The format of a thematic evaluation can vary depending on the evaluation focus but typically involves the observation of teaching and learning, review of relevant documents, administration of questionnaires, and meetings with relevant school personnel.

Sources, Methods, and Instruments used for Data Collection in Schools in Ireland

These procedures generally take place to collect data for other types of inspection: Forms and requests for documents are sent to the school prior to the inspection and then reviewed. During school visits, a selection of documents are reviewed, interviews with management and staff are held, and teacher observations are conducted. Interaction with students takes place, and students may be asked to complete questionnaires. During a post-evaluation phase, feedback meetings, report verification and finalization takes place. Appendix B, provides a detailed table of data sources, methods, and instruments used for data collection in Ireland,

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

The Inspectorate of Education of Ireland report (2009) outlines the following use of evaluation findings: Reports on probationary teachers are confidential to the teachers involved and to the Department of Education and Science. These reports cover the recording of progress, classroom management and organization, overall teaching and learning, and recommendations. These reports are not used for formative or summative purposes (See Appendix A. D7.5)

If a school board of management has concerns regarding the professional competence of a teacher, it will seek a report on the competence of the teacher from the Chief Inspector. The board must request the report and state the concerns it has about the work of the teacher and the
steps that it has taken to support the teacher’s improvement. The report is sent to the board of
management to assist it in its deliberations and copied to the teacher. The report is not
determinative. A similar process may be used when the board of management of a school has
concerns regarding the professional competence of a principal.

All other reports generated through school inspections are public and are published on the
Department of Education and Science website, except the reports arising from incidental
inspections, reports about probationary teachers and individual teachers, and complaints. In
general, the audience for all reports includes school management, the principal and middle
management, teachers, relevant administrative sections of the Department of Education and
Science, parents, and the wider public. Composite and national thematic reports, based on
aggregated data are aimed at principals, teachers, school leaders, and teacher educators in
colleges and university education departments, policy makers within the Department of
Education and Science, the education press and laid before the national parliament (Oireachtais

It is expected that school boards of management, principals and teachers will act on the
weaknesses identified in inspection reports and will implement necessary improvements and
change as part of their ongoing school development planning process. If the school has a very
serious weakness, inspectors make clear through oral feedback to the principal, teachers and the
board that improvement must take place. A coordination group of senior inspectors and officials
within the Department of Education and Science follows up to ensure improvement happens.

Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System

A new model of induction and probation called Droichead (Irish for bridge) is being
piloted in select schools for primary and post-primary teachers. The model provides a post-
qualification, school-based experience for new teachers that will require the teaching profession
and the principals of schools to assess and approve the work of the new entrant to the teaching
profession as a condition of full registration. Following satisfactory completion of the Droichead
process, newly qualified teachers are confirmed by fellow professionals as having met certain
criteria and the Teaching Council will remove the Droichead condition from their registration.
This enhanced model will be the recognized route of induction for all new teachers from
September 2018, subject to the required resources and supporting actions being in place.

Droichead has been designed in collaboration with the teaching profession to reflect the
belief that those best placed to conduct a formal induction are experienced colleagues who have
relevant and in-depth knowledge of teaching and learning in their respective schools. There are
currently more than 330 schools (primary and post-primary) registered for Droichead, with
almost 400 newly qualified teachers participating in the process for 2015/2016, (The Teaching
Council, 2014).
References


Appendix A
OECD Indicator Charts

Chart D7.1. Frequency of various types of teacher and school leader appraisals covered by policy framework (2015)
In general programmes, lower secondary education

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933264038
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of teacher appraisal covered by policy framework</th>
<th>Teachers eligible and included in the policy framework</th>
<th>Frequency of appraisal</th>
<th>Who determines the procedures and who evaluates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (BE)</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (BG)</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Completion of probation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions. Please refer to Annex 3 for additional information.


Please refer to the Reader’s Guide for information concerning symbols for missing data and abbreviations.

StatLink: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933264604
### Table D7.4b. [1/2] Features of teacher appraisal at the lower secondary level (2015)

**For teachers teaching general programmes**

| Type of teacher appraisal covered by policy framework | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| Planning and preparation                              | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Curriculum environment                                | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Classroom environment                                 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Professional development in school                   | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Professional development in community                 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| School climate                                        | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Links to the community                                 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Other                                                 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Classroom observation                                 | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Classroom observation between teacher and collaborators | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Teacher self-assessment                               | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Teacher professional development (without observation) | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Teacher profile                                        | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Student outcomes                                      | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Parent surveys                                        | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Other                                                  | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |

**References/standards against which teachers are appraised**

- No
- NT$:
- DUT:
- CC:
- Other:

**Notes:** Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may have different regulations in states, provinces or regions. Please refer to Annex 3 for additional information. Individual columns for the references against which teachers are appraised (i.e. columns 19-21) are available for consultation on line (see StatLink below).

**StatLink** [http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/889933286413](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/889933286413)
Chart D7.5. Extent to which teacher and school leader appraisals are used for formative and/or summative purposes (2015)

In general programmes

| Number of countries | 25 |


StatLink® http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933284674
Appendix B

Sources, Methods, and Instruments used for Data Collection in Schools in Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Evaluation</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Methods of Data Collection</th>
<th>Instruments/Forms to Guide Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Probation</td>
<td>Inspectors consult with the principal about the teacher’s progress and inspect the teacher’s work.</td>
<td>One or more unannounced inspection visits at any time during the school year for about half a school day.</td>
<td>Forms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation with principal</td>
<td>• Registration Application Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of teacher</td>
<td>• Induction and probation for teacher registration purposes 2013/2014 (Replacement of circular 0029/2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-School Evaluation (WSE)</td>
<td>School information about performance on four subjects English, Gaeilge, mathematics and one additional subject determined by the Inspectorate.</td>
<td>Principal completes school information form in advance by e-mail.</td>
<td>Instruments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School enrolment/admissions policy, attendance strategy and child protection policy</td>
<td>The in-school evaluation phase consists of:</td>
<td>• Observation of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Observation of teaching and learning in classrooms/other learning settings.</td>
<td>• Analysis of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interaction with pupils/review of pupils’ work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- School Information Form
- School Plan
- School's enrolment/admissions policy, attendance strategy and child protection policy
- Minutes of the 3 most recent Board meetings
- Selection of curriculum policy documents
- Relevant school self-evaluation documents.
- Teachers’ monthly progress records for the current school term and the two previous school terms.
- Assessment policy including outcomes of standardized tests.
- Documentation relating to support for pupils.
### Whole-School Evaluation – Management, Leadership and Learning

- Administration of pupil questionnaires.
- Review of school documents.
- Meetings and interviews with in-school management and student council (where a student council exists).

Principal completes school information form in advance by e-mail.

The in-school evaluation phase consists of:
- Observation of teaching and learning in classrooms/other learning settings.
- Interaction with pupils/review of pupils’ work.
- Administration of pupil questionnaires.
- Review of school documents.
- Meetings and interviews with in-school management and student council (where a student council exists).

- Any documents/records relating to specific issues that arise in the course of the evaluation.
- Observation of teachers
- Questionnaires for parents and pupils.
- Interviews with focus groups of students.
- Tests and examinations
- Analysis of documents

- The minutes of the three most recent meetings of the BOM.
- A selection of curriculum policy documents for the subjects being evaluated.
- Relevant school self-evaluation documents.
- Teachers’ monthly progress records for the current school term and the two previous school terms.
- Assessment policy including outcomes of standardized tests.
- Documentation relating to support for pupils.
- Any documents/records relating to specific issues that arise in the course of the evaluation.

### Incidental Evaluation

- Lessons are generally observed in a sample of up to three classrooms during
- Requests for documentation during these inspections are kept to a minimum. There is an expectation that teachers
- Teacher observations
the course of a full school day.

Inspector meets with the principal at the start of the school day and selects the classrooms to be visited. 

are able to present their written plans or schemes of work. Where the focus of an incidental inspection is on another aspect of a school’s work, specific documentation relating to that aspect may be requested.

(school policies, attendance records, school plan)

Observation of other aspects of educational provision such as support for pupils or compliance issues
Appendix C

Criteria to Evaluate the Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT)

The Teaching Council, 2014

The NQT demonstrates a satisfactory commitment to quality teaching under the following criteria:

• Demonstrates engagement with long and short-term planning in line with school policies (e.g. assessment and other relevant teaching and learning policies) and the primary school curriculum under the following criteria:

  • Develops an adequate class timetable referenced to the specified minimum weekly time framework in the Primary School Curriculum and the recommendations included in Circular 56/2011.

  • Provides clear and suitable teaching and learning objectives with due regard to the Primary School Curriculum and the School Plan.

  • Prepares an appropriate range of resources.

  • Plans for differences in pupil abilities, backgrounds and learning styles.

  • Maintains good quality progress records.

  • Classroom management and organization.

The NQT demonstrates good classroom management skills under the following criteria:

• Promotes good behavior through the use of appropriate behavior management systems.

• Cultivates a caring relationship with pupils (including use of praise and positive feedback).

• Provides an attractive learning environment (layout, quality of display including pupils’ work, interest centers etc.).

• Uses resources effectively.

• Manages SNA support in the classroom context (where appropriate).

• Quality of teaching across curriculum areas.

The NQT demonstrates a satisfactory commitment to quality teaching under the following criteria:

• Practices independently through the provision of support, guidance and motivation to pupils towards the achievement of quality learning outcomes.

• Utilizes an appropriate range of teaching methods, resources and assessment techniques.
• Covers an appropriate range of material.

• Provides for differences in pupil abilities, backgrounds, learning styles with particular reference to attention levels and receptiveness of pupils.

• Demonstrates good communication skills.

• Structures and paces lessons appropriately.

• Ensures regard for continuity and progression.

• Quality of pupils’ learning in curriculum areas.

The NQT demonstrates a satisfactory commitment to quality learning under the following criteria:

• Ensures that the pupils are on task and working purposefully.

• Enables pupils to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of material covered, skills and attitudes.
Chapter 10: Mexico

Lyssa Wilson

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

In 2013, Mexico’s President Peño Nieto signed La Ley del Servicio Profesional Docente, a law devoted to reforming many aspects of the Mexican education system, including universal teacher evaluation. Historically, national oversight for teachers in Mexico has been absent. Slowly, Mexico added horizontal promotional structures, aimed to allow for wage increases while keeping teachers in the classroom, formalized exams for teacher recruitment, and standardized exams for continuing education for teachers, see Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Milestones in Teacher Evaluation in Mexico](image)

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluations were performed mainly for promotional reasons and were considered voluntary. With these reforms, the intended purpose of teacher training in Mexico will evolve from evaluating for promotion to an emphasis on teacher improvement. Santiago, et al. (2013) identify two main objectives with teacher evaluation in Mexico, (a) improving teacher practices by identifying strengths and weaknesses to improve professional development and (b) to insure optimal teacher performance to increase student learning (p. 104). However, in the same report the authors are critical of the currently operating system for not emphasizing the improvement of teacher quality in teacher evaluation (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 121). Mexico, with some encouragement and help from the OECD, seems dedicated to overhauling its teacher evaluation systems. It will be challenging for Mexico to implement top down approaches on teachers of a wide array of opinions, and drastically change the sentiment of teacher evaluation and the teacher profession of the country.
The intention of a nationalized teacher evaluation structure is to provide quality and qualified teachers to every child, providing them with the opportunity to succeed in an increasingly complex market. Historically, the teacher evaluation systems of Mexico have not succeeded in this. Educational challenges facing Mexico’s students start with the challenges facing Mexico’s teachers.

**Historic Development and Background**

While Mexico has the fifteenth largest GDP in the world, it ranks last or near last in almost all educational indicators tracked by the OECD. The OECD reports that only 37% of Mexican adults have completed a secondary education (as compared to the OECD average of 75%), student achievement is ranked 35th out of 36 countries with an average score of 417 out of 600 (compared to the OCED average of 497), and the average years of formal education a child can expect is only 14.36 years (ranked 36 out of the 36 OECD countries) (OECD, n.d.). Education is considered essential in the development of a country and its people.

The turbulence of Mexico’s economic and political situation can be seen in the instability of the classroom. Mexican classrooms have large class sizes (33 students on average, compared to TALIS countries with an average of 24 students) and high rates of student poverty (almost half of lower secondary teachers serve at a school with 30% or more socio-economically disadvantaged students) (OECD, 2013, p. 1). The majority of Mexico’s schools face a personnel shortage (60% as reported by teachers responding the TALIS, compared to 47% of TALIS countries), and a shortage of qualified teachers (56% as reported by teachers responding to the TALIs, compared to 39% of TALIS countries).

The lack of qualifications for teachers in Mexico is startling. Some reports show 40% of teachers in Mexican public schools have never attended a teacher education institution, and of those who have spent only 15% of their training learning subject content knowledge (Vivanco, 2013). While the OECD reports 62% of teachers completed a teacher training program, this is abysmal in comparison to the 90% of other TALIS countries (OECD, 2013, p. 1). Additionally, only 9% of Mexican teachers were reported to have a tertiary degree (OECD, 2013, p. 1). Smith (2013) writes that most teacher jobs are handed to family members regardless of education or training. With 1,175,535 teachers in the county working in basic education (19% in preschool, 49% in primary education, and 32% in secondary education), Mexico seems primed to benefit from more formalized and professionalized teacher evaluation.

For most of the 1990s and into the 2000’s, teacher assessment was mainly used as a mechanism for promotion and salary increases. It was only more recently, that mechanisms for teacher recruitment, certification, and continuing education was formalized. Even after these reforms, much of teacher evaluation served to stratify teachers into a hierarchy, allowing “better performing” teachers access to more sought after positions, locations, and salaries. Little attention was given to honestly identifying weaknesses in practice or improvement for the sake of students. Figure 1, reviews the major milestones in teacher evaluation since 1993, leading up to the recent La Ley del Servicio Profesional Docente (LSPD) reforms.
Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

A wave of education reform through the Programa Nacional de Carrera Megisterial (PNCM) came in 2002. Trends in standardized testing from other countries were beginning to be incorporated into Mexico’s educational system. In 2006, a national standardized test for student achievement was implemented, Evaluación Nacional del Logro Académico en Centros Escolares (ENLACE) (Santiago, et al., 2013). While the weight of student performance on standardized testing grew in teacher evaluation, a standardized exam for teachers was also introduced to assess continuing education for teachers in service. A second wave of reform occurred in 2013 with the signing of the LSPD, promising mandatory and formalized teacher evaluations.

Methods, Sources, and Instruments

The introduction of Exámenes Nacionales para la Actualización de Maestros en Servicio (ENAMS) is the first assessment in Mexico for the purpose of teacher improvement. The main goal, as stated by Santiago, et al. (2013) was to assess professional competencies of teachers and identify needs for further professional development (p. 107). In the form of multiple-choice tests, there are 15 different varieties tailored to subject and level of teaching. The exam items ask questions about theoretical situations teachers would face in their daily work (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 107). They focus on two domains: main references for teaching (e.g., competency-based education) and knowledge of subject area (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 107).

The ENAMS is one of the few teacher assessments that provide direct feedback to teachers about their practice. In the past, brochures were returned to teachers with individualized diagnoses, explaining their results (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 123). (However, this practice was scheduled to be suspended in 2012.) According to responses on the TALIS, teachers in Mexico reported receiving feedback on their teaching through analysis of students test scores and observation of their classroom (OECD, 2013, p.1), see Figure 2. However, it is unclear from the survey results which assessment mechanism these reports are through (ENAMS or PNCM). Additionally, these could be results of localized efforts to improve teacher quality in schools. It is encouraging to note that teachers in Mexico have positive views on the feedback they do receive and how it has helped them to improve their practice (OECD, 2013, p. 1).

Figure 2. TALIS responses form Mexican teachers on use of evaluation feedback. (OECD, 2013)
In addition to assessments for promotion and salary increases, Mexico does have a monetary incentive program for teachers. The Programa de Estímulo a la Calidad Docente (PECD), introduced in 2010, is a strategic incentive to reward teachers in high-performing schools located in poor and rural communities (Vivanco, 2013). This fiscal encouragement is based solely off of students’ test scores on ENLACE (the national standardized test for students). Incentives are offered at the individual level, along with the school level for collective stimulus (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 111). Both rewards heavily rely on student testing and improvement. While developments that attempt to address educational inequality are a positive advancement, research by PovGov Program has shown that PECD has had no impact on student achievement (Vivanco, 2013).

Like the vertical and horizontal promotional assessments, the ENAMS assessment structure remained voluntary, leaving many teachers not regularly assessed. In 2009 – 2010, only 34% of all teachers in the basic education system participated in these assessments (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 109), leaving almost 60% of teachers not subjected to any type of evaluation process. This is a large oversight in the teacher evaluation systems of Mexico and a large reasoning behind the new reforms that accompany the LSPD. This new legislation mandates universal evaluation for teachers, principals, and directors in all aspects of basic education.

The stated purpose for these universal evaluations is to improve the quality of education and strengthen accountability for public and professional teachers (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 112). While these programs are in the early stages of implementation, Santiago, et al. (2013) claim the main criteria for evaluation will heavily rely on student performance (50%), continuing education (20%), and professional training (5%) (p. 112). The remaining 25% will be a composite of professional performance based on standards of teaching and school management (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 112).

Details about evaluation protocols, instruments, or implementation are scarce, as efforts have been delayed since the original passing of the LSPD in 2013. Mexico did respond to the 2015 OECD D7 indicator on teacher evaluation in regards to these new evaluation standards, noting that they are in the process of implementation and many details are not yet available. The OECD D7 indicator does identify Mexico’s teacher evaluation policy to evaluate teachers for regular appraisal, for promotion, and completion of probation, along with a reward scheme. They identify that regular appraisals occur every four years with a written exam, and that no additional instruments are generally used for evaluation purposes1 (OECD, 2015b, p. 10).

Before 1993 the only source of teacher assessment was for the purposes of vertical promotion (El Escalafón Vertical). This system of assessment was used as a decision tool for who would move up the ladder within a school or education system. Regulated by the Comisión Nacional Mixta de Escalafón, the main factors considered in this assessment were the teacher’s knowledge (measured through highest degree earned and professional improvement) (making up 45%), aptitude (measured through efficiency and initiative) (25%), years of service (20%), and

---

1 Currently the main tool for teacher evaluation is standardized tests designed by the National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEE). Research for this paper did not identify any accessible tools or instruments for evaluative purposes.
discipline and punctuality (10%) (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 108). The indicators or standards for these criteria do not seem to be regulated across schools or states, and are rather loosely defined. While this assessment was mainly a vehicle for teachers to access higher salaries, opportunities for vertical promotion were typically scarce, only open when an administrative position is vacated or newly created (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 108).

To further aid teachers in accessing increased wages while staying in the classroom, the Programa Nacional de Carrera Magisterial (PNCM) introduced a horizontal promotional structure in 1993 (la promoción horizontal). This horizontal system allowed teachers to access higher salaries without taking administrative roles, such as principals or directors as with the vertical promotion. This system operated relatively independent of the vertical ladder, providing for a rather complex system of assessment and promotion. As shown in Figure 3, la promoción horizontal operated five levels labeled A to E in each of the vertical steps.

![Gráfica 4.1 El sistema de promoción vertical (Escalañón) y el Programa Nacional de Carrera Magisterial](image)

**Figure 3. Vertical and horizontal promotional structure.** (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 109)

Wage increases ranged from an additional 25% of the base salary at Level A to 200% at Level E (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 109). Similar to the vertical promotional assessments, the PNCM considered continuing education, preparation, years in service, and school management as criteria in the assessment. These assessments did add school performance as a criteria of
teacher assessment, however, in 1993 they made a very small proportion of a teacher’s final score (7%). This later increased to 20% in 1998, and later up to 50%, the changes in criteria weighting is shown in Figure 4, (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 110).

Figure 4. Change in teacher evaluation criteria weighting over time. (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 110)

Prior to 2008 there was no formalized path to becoming a teacher or entering teacher service. With a significant number of teachers in the country not having formal teacher training and widespread nepotism in job positions, the Examen Nacional de Conocimientos, Habilidades y Competencias Docentes (ENCHD) was a leap forward in formalizing the teaching profession. The ENCHD was a multiple-choice exam, given to teachers entering the profession. This standardized test for teachers covered four domains (a) intellectual abilities, (b) knowledge of the curriculum, (c) teaching skills, and (d) education standards and teacher ethics. While the language around the ENCHD seems similar to other professionalization exams, it is not intended to separate those qualified and not qualified. Instead, the exam intends not to identify the “good” teachers but the “best” teachers (Santiago, et al., 2013, p. 105). Teachers who score low on the ENCHD are still guaranteed a teaching spot, however, one in a school with fewer applicants. Teachers who score higher are given priority in choosing the location of their school (e.g., urban over rural), the school they teach in, and their position. While the scope of this paper did not allow for a more in depth analysis on how these practices have influenced student achievement, it is hard to ignore how this would have led to a highly unequal education structure, giving more qualified teachers to students of high socioeconomic status, further perpetuating inequality in the country.

Use of Teacher Evaluations

Historically, teacher evaluations in Mexico have been used for the sole purpose of teacher promotion and salary increases. Throughout the past decade, national assessment has been instituted for teacher recruitment, continued education, and most recently quality insurance. Details on how these new teacher evaluations will be utilized at the local, state, and national
levels are currently unclear. Intentions of future use are indicated by Mexico’s responses to the OECD D7 indicator. It is noted in the OECD Annex that testing for regular appraisals will occur every four years with a written exam and if teachers fail three times in a row, they will be fired (OECD, 2015b, p. 10). However, this is contradictory to another response in the OECD D7 indicator that says Mexico does not use teacher evaluation for formative or summative purposes (OECD, 2015c). It is currently unclear how and for what uses the future initiatives in teacher evaluation will bring for Mexico.

Future Plans for Development

The future of Mexico’s national teacher evaluations is unclear. While the LSPD legislation has promising ideas, such as the development of national teaching standards, the inclusion of portfolios as a tool to evaluate teachers, and improving the teacher database (El Registro Nacional de Alumnos, Maestros y Escuelas), public support for these initiatives is uneven. A left-wing sector of the national teachers union, Coordinadora Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación (CNTE), protested the implementation of LSPD. Thousands of teachers went on strike, mostly members of CNTE, claiming that these reforms were not education reform, but labor reform and the removal of workers’ rights (Vazquez Medina, 2013). Others in support of the LSPD reforms claim that current teacher unions use “placement and promotions as a means of control” (Smith, 2013) and these new initiatives are meant to shift focus away from securing jobs for teachers and towards improving achievement for students. Protests against new teacher evaluations forced the government to suspend the implementation of assessments, but President Nieto says they will continue to move forward (Montes, 2015).
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Chapter 11: Netherlands
Nizoramo Haitova

Overview of the Structure and Purpose

According to Reezigt, Creemers, & Jong (2003), compulsory education in Netherlands start at the age of five, however many children at the age of four already attend elementary schools, and there is possibility that in the near future the law will change due to this practice. Fulltime compulsory education is a 12-year schooling, but part-time education is compulsory till the age of 18. Students study at the elementary level for eight years and then move on to the secondary level, which consists of different tracks.

Per the Constitution, education is one of main concerns of the Dutch government. As the result of many struggles on the establishment of schools in the beginning of 20th century, the education system now provides groups of citizen with schools that are in line with their religion convictions. About the 70 percent of schools in Netherlands are privately run by school boards and some vocational and even universities are based on specific religion. The schools are funded by government and is free to students and parents. Public schools are run by representatives of municipalities.

According to the Constitution, schools are free to determine what they teach and how they teach it. Schools are free to choose the textbook and to define their organization within the schools. The team of teachers work under the leadership of school principal who in turn is accountable for all decision in this field by the school board. The government still have some basic control on the quality education through defining school subjects that need to be studied and what goals need to be achieved by students at the age of 12. The government is responsible to define the content of national examination, the number of hours to be taught weekly and yearly. The government also controls the training and qualification requirements of teachers per Topbac (2001) as cited in Reezigt et al., (2003). Topbac further states, “currently there are 7,753 elementary schools in The Netherlands with 103,300 teachers who serve 1,638,800 students and 668 secondary schools with 6,300 teachers serving 891,000 students” (p. 68).

According to Reezigtt et al. (2003), in Netherlands, the Inspectorate is the only organization with formal power to evaluate schools. The Inspectorate is a staff department of the Ministry of Education, which has semi-autonomous status, and it is situated outside the Ministry. The Inspectorate mainly concerned with the quality of schools rather than individual teachers. Although, they do evaluate teachers but they use this data to evaluate overall teaching quality. “The Inspectorate evaluates teaching practice as part of its school supervision and national monitoring tasks” (OECD, 2014, p. 96).
Historical Overview of the Evaluation in Schools

In Netherland, Inspectorate performs evaluation of schools and the aim of the evaluation is twofold: inform the Ministry of Education about the state of art in different educational sectors, and to inform schools about their educational quality (Reezigt et al., 2003). According to Reezigt et al. (2003), in the past, there were local inspection committees, municipal inspectors, inspections of Jewish school by rabbis, inspections of Catholic schools by Episcopal inspectors, and inspections of Protestant schools by inspectors of Protestant church, which gradually disappeared over the past decades. Even though Dutch inspectorate exist over 200 years but the evaluation function is the recent one. According to Dodde (2001), as cited by Reezigt (2003) in the first century of its existence, the Inspectorate main role was to stimulate local authorities to provide education and to monitor school truancy. Later its major task was to control schools’ compliance with government regulations. As the result of the government’s active role in educational policy, a gradual change came about after 1970. According to which, schools were expected to innovate in many respects and Inspectorate were assigned to assure if they did so (Reezigt et al., 2003).

The central government policy shifted to deregulation and decentralization. At this time, the Inspectorate task was to report on schools’ activities and become autonomous very rapidly. New system of inspection was developed after 1990 to implement this task. According to Topbac (2001), in 2002 a new law regarding the functioning of Inspectorate came into force, which defined the main role of Inspectors as judging quality of education based on clearly outlined framework (as cited in Reezigt et al., 2003). As Topbac (2001) puts it, schools, which perform high quality self-evaluation, are inspected less intensively, instead schools that do not perform self-evaluation are inspected in detail especially those who perform poorly. As such, inspectors are more focused on failing and low performing schools. The visit of the team of inspectors to school may take about three days, schools are informed about the inspectors visit in advance. In this visit, the inspector observes lesson, interview teacher, meet with school officials such as school board and principal, meet with parent and talk to students, after which he/she writes a report and send it back to school (Reezigt et al., 2003). Since 2000, all reports on schools are accessible for public on internet. The current framework used by inspectors resembles the well-known Stafelbeem’s (1983) model of evaluation Content-Input-Process-Outcome (CIPC) (Reezigt et al., 2003).

Current Teacher Evaluation

According to OECD (2015) data “Many teacher and school leader appraisal policies are initiated by the government, but are convened by and executed by the parties making up the Central Agreements for education, namely, associations of school leaders, trade unions for teachers, and associations of employers, i.e. school boards” (Annex). According to National regulations “schools should have regular performance interviews with all staff, including teachers, at least once every four years in primary education and once every three years in secondary education (OECD, 2013 cited in OECD 2014, p. 96)).

Teacher appraisal in Netherlands is a responsibility of the competent authority of each school (OECD, 2014). According to Santiago and Benavides (2009), “teacher appraisal has
typically two major purposes…first, it seeks to improve teachers’ own practices by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development – the improvement function…second, it aims to ensure that teachers perform at their best to enhance student learning – the accountability function” (as cited in OECD, 2014 p. 96). The task of teacher evaluation usually is delegated to the principal or other executives. Some teachers may be evaluated several times with detailed procedure compared to others. Sometimes teachers receive feedback on their professional behavior from their colleagues, or external agents of school support services. The teacher is never forced to attend courses or to take part in coaching procedures (Sontag et al., 2001 cited in Reezigt et al., 2003). In general, there is no summative evaluation of teachers conducted in Netherlands. If even a teacher evaluation occurs it is formative in nature.

According to Reezigt et al. (2003), while teacher appraisal is the responsibility of school leaders, its implementation varies from school to school. Systematic teacher evaluation in Dutch education system virtually do not exist, or even if it occurs, it is not rigorous. The reason is not a lack of the standards, in fact, several professional teacher organizations published detailed guidelines for teacher behavior but it is often used when a new teacher is hired. Principals, in theory aware about the quality of teaching staff and of the main goal of the school. These goals appear on the school plan and if the quality of the staff is not sufficient to meet them, the long-term plan or additional teacher development will be composed. The principal should gather information about teacher quality through classroom visits, staff appraisal at least annually, and if possible using the formal guidelines for teacher profession. Only half of the elementary schools in Netherlands have plan for staff professionalization and one of the four have a long-term plan (Reezigt et al., 2003).

For many years, school support services and other institutions offered courses for teachers, however, despite the fact that the schools were given authority to spend their budget, many schools felt to provide teacher training for their staff (Karstaje et al., 1994; Louwes et al., 1999 as cited in Reezigt et al., 2003). Even though the schools have a teacher-training plan, they cannot force teachers to attend a course if they do not want to, although it is becoming normative for teachers to attend courses now. From the review, it appears that, the formal teacher evaluation and school self-evaluation process are not well developed in Dutch education system. Although, most schools started to use student-monitoring system, but it is not used to evaluate teacher’s educational quality. In such a complex governance framework of the Dutch education system, it is recommended to identify who will be responsible for teacher appraisal and whether those in charge possess a required competency (OECD, 2014).

According to the OECD report, school board is responsible for principal evaluation. “At the primary level, school leader appraisal is required by a national policy, convened by the Association of School Leaders, Teachers Trade Unions, and the Association of Employers in primary education” (OECD 2015, annex). There is neither government policy nor policy convened by associations of school leaders, teachers and employers at lower and upper secondary levels (OECD, 2015). However, there have been recently agreement on professional standards for school leaders in secondary education and registration became mandatory since Spring 2016. “School leader appraisal is mandatory at the primary level, and will become
mandatory at the lower and upper secondary levels starting in 2016” (OECD report, 2015, annex).

Methods, Sources, and Instruments

As it was mentioned in previous paragraph, the current framework used by inspectors resembles the well-known Stafelbeem’s (1983) model of evaluation Content-Input-Process-Outcome (CIPC) (Reezigt et al., 2003). Yet I could not find the framework that is used for teacher appraisal. In OECD (2015) in indicates that data is not available for this part. According the OECD (2014), the main instruments used for student evaluation and assessment in the Dutch school system for 2013 were as follow:

- School-based assessment including results-oriented work
- LVS and other student monitoring tools used for formative purposes
- CITO school leavers test and other examinations used in Year 8
- Examinations at the end of each secondary track

The main instruments used for teacher evaluation and assessment in the Dutch school system for 2013 were as follow (OECD 2014):

- School-based teacher appraisal
- Voluntary teacher registration

Below are the instruments used for school evaluation and assessment in the Dutch school system for 2013 (OECD, 2014):

- School internal quality care
- Quality control by school boards
- Risk-based inspection

The instruments used for system evaluation and assessment in the Dutch school system for 2013 are as follow (OECD, 2014):

- National sample-based assessments (PPON, JPON)
- National cohort assessments (COOL)
- International surveys (TIMSS, PIRLS, PISA, ICILS, ICCS, TALIS)
- Collection of indicators
- Inspectorate thematic evaluations
- Program evaluations

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

Primarily, teacher evaluation in the Netherlands is used for formative purposes. It “may also have summative consequences for teacher career or salary advancement, but this depends on the internal regulations and practices of each school and school board” (OECD, 2014, p. 98). If incompetent teacher is found, it is more likely that principal find solution. School boards can fire a teacher based on the low performance, or they may delegate this responsibility to the school leader. This however, happens very rarely. “In order to dismiss a teacher, the school leader needs
to prove that the concerned teacher underperformed consistently and did not respond to opportunities for support, coaching or professional development offered by the school” (OECD, 2014, p. 98).

**Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System**

According to Reezigt et al. (2003), “teacher evaluation is not yet common practice in The Netherlands…until recently evaluation procedures were not required for promotion or accountability and staff development was voluntary undertaking of schools” (p. 78). As such, there is no strong relationship between teacher evaluation, staff development, teacher improvement and school improvement. Dutch effectiveness research could successfully incorporate teacher and school effectiveness factors but failed to have influence on educational practice due to its isolation in educational field (Reezigt et al., 2003). However, research effectiveness had an impact on the instrument and the practices of the Inspectorate and thus it was indirectly effective to some degree in educational practice. Even though the Inspectorate perform formal evaluation, the data from visiting classroom, and teacher observation is used by inspectors to only draw official statement about the school as a whole but not about individual teachers.

When teachers want to be evaluated, they need to rely on other sources even if the Inspectorate formalized and intensified school evaluation system (Reezigt et al., 2003). For example within the school, it is possible to perform informal technique for teacher evaluation by principal, external agents such as school counselor. “The Education Cooperative, a teacher professional organization created in 2011, has recently launched a teacher peer review project, which provides a new form of institutionalized feedback for teachers” (OECD, 2014, p. 96). A teacher review project is based on assumption that teacher peers are better match for evaluating teaching practice and providing constructive feedback, and thus the peer review project consists of the teams of teacher who visit each other’s schools and develop tools to observe and evaluate teaching practice (OECD, 2014).

Teacher evaluation is not linked with any salary increase; however, the idea of the merit pay is going to take place soon. It may be that one of the reasons for why evaluation is underdeveloped is because it is not linked with salary increase (Reezigt et al., 2003). The other aspect is that principals are not accustomed with the idea that they have to evaluate personnel and thus feel insecure while implementing such task. However, this will change when principals attend courses that inform evaluation procedures and human resource management (Reezigt et al., 2003). Traditionally school leaders came from community of teachers, but this trend is changing, as now those who did not have prior teaching experience, or who have learned to operate as mangers or individuals from business community are being hired to fill principal positions. There is a hope that this new principal find it easy to evaluate their teaching personnel (Reezigt et al., 2003).

Schools are becoming more and more accountable for their educational quality and they need to learn how to use the system of quality assurance. Another aspect mentioned in Reezigt et al. (2003) is that “although attention to teacher evaluation may grow in Netherlands in the near future, the current teacher shortage may work in a counterproductive way” (p. 80). Because of
the lack of teachers, the requirements of teachers when they enter the school are lowered, since, to have someone in classrooms is more important than critically to assess the quality of the teachers. In addition, dismissing an ineffective teacher would not be easy since it is hard to replace teachers.

**Conclusion and Take Away**

Despite the fact that the education outcomes in Netherland are showing good results, there is a need in teacher evaluation in order to further improve quality of teaching. Considering the shortages of personnel, the formative evaluation still can be very effective approach in teacher evaluation. Finding and utilizing appropriate and approved standards and benchmarks for evaluation will enhance effective teacher evaluation. The evaluator competency is one of the main aspect to consider, thus it is important to train evaluators prior to conducting evaluation.
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Chapter 12: New Zealand

Katelyn Tanis

Introduction

New Zealand is located in the southern Pacific Ocean and home to 4.3 million people. New Zealand has historical influences from colonization by Great Britain and the indigenous Maori people. As of July, 2015, New Zealand has 2,538 public, private, and integrated schools (Education Counts, n.d.). In 2015, there were 47,000 teachers in New Zealand, with 84% being European Pakeha, 11% being of New Zealand/Maori ethnicity, and Asian and Pasifika ethnicity comprising the remaining teachers (Education Counts, n.d.). Further, New Zealand has one of the most developed school systems with good student outcomes when internationally compared (Nusche, D., et al., 2012). Students have been top PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) performers since 2000, scoring above OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) average in mathematics, science, and reading. New Zealand is also above average in relation to public expenditure on education as well as in teacher student relations (Pont et al., 2013).

Overview of the Structure of Teacher Evaluation

Teachers and school leaders in New Zealand are given a significant amount of autonomy, trust, and ownership concerning teacher appraisals. Schools operate autonomously as their own entities, without belonging to a larger district or authority (Wylie, 2007). Additionally, teachers are given the responsibility to assess their own student’s learning. Evaluators are typically experienced teachers and managers. Data is collected through classroom observations, teacher’s self-appraisal, portfolios, interviews, and surveys. Self-appraisals play a significant role in a teacher’s appraisal. Principals then compare their appraisal results with professional organizations such as New Zealand’s Teacher Council, which sets standards and define what “accomplished teaching looks like” for the profession (OECD, 2015).

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation is used for two purposes in New Zealand. First, teachers complete an appraisal to earn or renew their teacher registration. Secondly, registered teachers are appraised yearly. Yearly appraisals help employers determine teachers’ salary progression, performance and any goals that the teacher can set to improve their teachers’ professional learning.

Historic Development and Background

Much of New Zealand’s education law began with the Education Act of 1964. This act established the nation’s Department of Education, educational boards, school committees, governing boards, and how schools are established. This Act also established appointment and employment of teachers and school inspection standards (New, 1964). During this time, schools were overseen by the Department of Education. This federal organization appointed teachers to schools, determined the number of teachers accepted into teaching programs, were responsible for building and upkeep, and lastly, oversaw teacher and school performance. However, the
Education Act of 1989 (referred to as ‘Tomorrow’s Schools) made significant changes to the education system (Impact, n.d.). This act established and defined in increasing detail essential teacher evaluation system components such as school boards, payment of teacher salaries, and teacher registration (New, 2014) Boards of Trustees (made up of elected members of the school community) were charged with managing individual schools. More importantly, the Education Act of 1989 moved the responsibility of assessing performance from the state to individual schools (Impact, n.d.). One reason for the decentralization or shift to school-based management was a focus on connecting schools with their communities. Policy makers thought that educational decision would be better made if they were connected to the communities the schools were in, including Maori communities (Wylie, 2007). Schools were now allowed to choose their own teachers and manage their own day to day operations. One of the reasons for this change was dissatisfaction with the current system in New Zealand at the time. Following this change, the Ministry of Education required every school to create their own personnel policies that encourage high levels of performance. Since 1989, the Education Act has been updated multiple times. In 1995, the Education Review Office noted that schools and principals were not creating or implementing systems for managing teachers and performance. Over time, New Zealand has focused appraisal efforts on both formative and summative purposes (Ell, 2011).

A study by Timperley (1998) documents that the origin of some discontentment towards teacher evaluation in the 1990’s resided in the tension between summative or accountability purposes and formative or developmental evaluation. Evaluating teachers in New Zealand for summative or accountability purposes historically has political roots where the state seeks to remove inadequate teachers. In New Zealand, teachers and educators have shown favor towards the latter purposes (Timperley, 1998). A 2007 study (Cameron) found that beginning teachers reported that both summative and formative feedback was appreciated. Today, schools conduct both summative and formative evaluation, but focus on formative evaluation.

**Current Application of Teacher Evaluation**

Today, schools in New Zealand have a high influence over their own appraisal activities. There is a high level of use of both summative and formative evaluation for teacher and school leader appraisal in New Zealand (OECD, 2015). New teachers can begin their career with a provisional teaching certificate. After obtaining a provisional certificate, new teachers are then required to teach for a probationary period of two years. This time is generally referred to as a mentoring and induction period. During this time, teachers are paired with a more experienced teacher with whom they can ask questions, discuss concerns and learn about becoming a better teacher (Cameron, 2007). After the induction and mentoring period is complete, the teacher can apply for a full certification. (Beginning, n.d.) Teacher appraisals occurring during this time help the teacher identify areas for professional improvement and are considered when the teacher applies for their full teacher registration. Teacher appraisals cover the following topics: planning and preparation, instruction, classroom environment, professional development, contribution to school development, and links to the school’s community (OECD, 2015). Appraisals in New
Zealand are generally not used for promotions or rewards and mechanisms are in place if a teacher wishes to appeal the results of their appraisal (OECD, 2015).

The Education Council of New Zealand has been holding workshops throughout the country with the goal of providing “professional leaders with the opportunity to strengthen their systems to ensure their teachers and students benefit from appraisals as a professional learning and development process” (Appraisal, n.d.). The Appraisal of Teachers Project has been surveying professional leaders to assess their responses to new teacher appraisal criteria. Appendix A, demonstrates the goals of the project. There are seven phases to the workshops that inform teachers and school leaders on topics such as strengthening understanding of the appraisal process, self-appraisal, professional learning group and implementing effective appraisal processes. This image also illustrates New Zealand’s dual focus: professional learning and development for registered teachers, and appraising registered teachers against Registered Teacher Criteria. Appendix B, is an example of criteria, key indicators, and standards for registered teachers that may help school leaders as evaluators (Appraisal, n.d.). Lastly, appendix C, is an example of material from a workshop instructing teachers on self-appraisal. The project also has helpful information and resources for principals, additional research and resources specific to Maori teachers and students.

**Methods, Sources, and Instruments**

Teacher evaluations occur for one of two broad reasons: 1) to gain or renew teacher registration or 2) as part of employer’s performance management process. Teachers teaching on a full certification are required to complete an appraisal once a year in all public and independent or private schools (OECD, 2015). In addition to a yearly appraisal, teachers can also be appraised for the following reasons: employment status decisions, as a result of a complaint, as a result of performance problems, at the discretion of school board or school director, and for voluntary reasons (OECD, 2015). Teachers in New Zealand can be appraised by central education authorities or the government, school boards, principals or supervisors, teaching professional organizations or peer evaluators from the same school (OECD, 2015). Usually, evaluators are experienced teachers, principals or managers.

A strength of New Zealand’s teacher appraisal system is well established teaching standards for both new and registered teachers. Professional organizations, such as New Zealand’s Teacher’s Council, define and determine what are and are not satisfactory teaching practices. (Nusche, D., et al., 2012) Next, New Zealand has a teacher registration system in place. This ensures that all new teachers meet a certain level of teaching quality, and that beginning teachers are adequately supported. Additionally, the appraisal process focuses on formative evaluation with the goal of teacher development. Teachers are not fearful of the results of student testing, or whether their appraisal results will cost them their career. Teachers are also the ultimate authority in assessing their student’s progress. Consequentially, this gives teachers a reason to take ownership over their student’s progress. Appraisal results reflect a teacher’s salary and career, and good performance leads to salary and career progression. Lastly, New Zealand’s teachers are given significant amounts of trust and autonomy during the appraisal process.
Neither teachers nor school leaders in New Zealand fear appraisals or the results (Nusche, D., et al., 2012).

However, New Zealand’s appraisal system varies across the country. With the autonomy and trust given to individual schools, it is difficult to implement a standard system country wide. Additionally, multiple professional organizations setting standards for teaching practices can send conflicting messages to teachers and school leaders. Another critique of New Zealand’s appraisal system is the lack of external parties involved in the teacher registration process. Because teachers are registered locally, there is no external influence or moderation among all schools. The OECD also notes that key issues that New Zealand faces in the future are an above average impact of socio-economic background on student’s performance, large performance and completion gaps and lower outcomes from Maori and Pasifika students. New Zealand should focus efforts on improving the educational success of students with diverse backgrounds (Pont et al., 2013).

According to the OECD (2015), appraisal data is collected throughout teacher evaluations by means of classroom observation, interviews and dialogue between the teacher and evaluator, surveys, teacher self-appraisal, and a teacher’s portfolio. The standards against which teachers’ appraisal results are compared are established by national teaching standards, job descriptions, codes of conduct, school development plans or projects, and internal school regulations (OECD, pg 510).

According to Hinchey (2010), using classroom observations to collect appraisal data is generally a fair method. Observations give the evaluator rich information about classroom behaviors and activities. Additionally, this method provides information for summative and formative purposes. However, observations can be weakened by using evaluators who have not been adequately trained. This method can also be extremely time consuming and doesn’t take into consideration out of classroom activities (Hinchey, 2010). Interviews and teacher self-appraisal is effective in that it can provide information on factors that cannot be observed such as intentions, beliefs and knowledge. However, reliability and validity can be weak because of instruments that are not well established. Lastly, a teacher’s portfolio can also measure and demonstrate unobservable aspect of teaching, but using portfolios for appraisals can be time-consuming for both teachers and evaluators. Evaluators need to be skilled in assessing portfolio content, even though portfolios can be difficult to standardize across teachers or schools (Hinchey, 2010).

**Teacher Evaluation Findings**

Appraisal results in New Zealand don’t significantly impact teachers’ salaries and career progression, but a good appraisal can have a positive impact on teachers’ salaries. However, teachers’ careers and salaries are more likely to be influenced by their length of service and willingness to take on additional roles. For example, registered teachers who product satisfactory results on their yearly appraisal will be eligible to continue in salary progression in their pay range. Teachers who agree to take on additional tasks, such as being a supervisor or lead teacher, are eligible to earn more in their pay range. Professional development activities also do not play
a large role in teacher’s salaries or career progression (OECD, 2015). Teachers in primary, lower secondary, and upper secondary environments who receive underperforming appraisal results may be subjected to a future appraisal, be deferred for promotion or career advancement, or have their permanent contract withheld. New teachers may not pass their probationary period or have their certification withdrawn, thus failing to progress to registered or certified teacher status (OECD, 2015). According to the OECD, teacher appraisal results have little to no influence on various decisions such as school budgets, bonuses, evaluation of school performance, school administration or individual teachers. There’s no influence at all on whether or not a school would close because of appraisal results. After conducting appraisals, principals use standards set by the New Zealand Teacher’s Council to assess performance.

**Future Plans for the Development or Reform of the Teacher Evaluation System**

Educational laws in New Zealand continue to develop and outdated laws continue to be updated. Today, New Zealand continues to update their educational laws that directly impact teacher appraisal systems. Most recently, a taskforce was established to continue updating the Education Act of 1989. Topics to be addressed include: synthesizing and disseminating common goals for students, increasing effectiveness of school boards and better resources management (Education, n.d.). Additionally, OECD’s review of New Zealand notes that there is room for improvement in linking appraisal, professional development, and school development together (Nusche, D., et al., 2012).

To conclude, New Zealand’s education and teacher appraisal system has made significant progress since the Education Act of 1969. Teachers are empowered to take responsibility for their own progress as well as their student’s progress. However, unlike appraisal systems in other countries, teachers can take responsibility for their student’s progress without fearing that they will lose a professional accreditation, their reputation as a teacher, or their job.
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Appendix A

So, what is the appraisal of Teachers Project?

**DUAL FOCUS**
To build professional leaders' knowledge and confidence to:

- Promote teachers' professional learning and development
- Appraise teachers against the Registered Teacher Criteria

**LEADING TO:**
National consistency and an understanding by professional leaders of what the Registered Teacher Criteria look like in practice in English and Māori-medium schools and early childhood education settings

**LEADING TO:**
Improved learning and achievement for tōrere in English and Māori-medium settings
Professional leaders and teachers using the Registered Teacher Criteria and Tekaaraka
### Appendix B

#### PRACTISING TEACHER CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Certificated Teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. establish and maintain effective professional relationships focused on the learning and well-being of ākōnga | i. engage in ethical, respectful, positive and collaborative professional relationships with:  
  - ākōnga  
  - teaching colleagues, support staff and other professionals  
  - whānau and other carers of ākōnga  
  - agencies, groups and individuals in the community | • communicate effectively with families, whanau and caregivers  
• share information with colleagues  
• establish constructive relationships with students |
| 2. demonstrate commitment to promoting the well-being of all ākōnga | i. take all reasonable steps to provide and maintain a teaching and learning environment that is physically, socially, culturally and emotionally safe  
ii. acknowledge and respect the languages, heritages and cultures of all ākōnga  
iii. comply with relevant regulatory and statutory requirements | • develop and maintain a positive and safe physical and emotional environment  
• create an environment which encourages respect and understanding |
Appendix C

**Overarching Statement:** Teachers play a critical role in enabling the educational achievement of all ākonga/learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicators: Engage in ethical, respectful, positive and collaborative professional relationships with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ākonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching colleagues, support staff and other professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau and other carers of ākonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies, groups and individuals in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions I might ask myself:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do I do to establish working relationships with my ākonga, their whānau and my colleagues and others to support the learning of those I teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of the relationships I have with children, colleagues, and parents/whānau?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I develop these further?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the centre leader/manager, head teacher, colleagues or senior management help me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I access agencies, groups, individuals in the community?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies that might help me:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate openly and frequently with centre leaders/managers, head teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish collegial relations with staff by participating in staff professional activities, taking an interest in what other staff members are doing, regular positive interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in centre processes and be an active member of the team. Share ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress and behave in a professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in professional learning, both in centre and through outside agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in regular communication with parents/whānau to discuss children’s care and educational needs and strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in centre community events e.g. parent/whānau evenings, fundraising events, cultural celebrations, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request observations to provide feedback from mentors, appraiser colleagues regarding teaching and learning practices (implementation of teaching strategies) and teacher/child interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote positive and appropriate relationships with children and their parents/whānau e.g. greet/farewell children, parents/whānau each day, share insights of daily happenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information or encouraging reflective thought with children and their parents/whānau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek feedback from the children, colleagues, parents/whānau and community on a regular basis e.g. about children’s interests, strengths and learning experiences they may have engaged in outside of the centre environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion 1:** establish and maintain effective professional relationships focused on the learning and well-being of all ākonga

**Tātaiako: Whanaungatanga:** Actively engages in respectful working relationships with Māori learners, parents and whanau, hapū, iwi, and the Māori community
Chapter 13: Palestine
Najat El Geberi

Overview of the Structure of Teacher Evaluation

During the past decades, the Teacher Evaluation System in Palestine kept developing in a slow and cumulative way, till it reached its current structure. The slow path of development was due to the different unstable political situations that Palestine went through.

The person who is responsible for conducting evaluations for all school’s teachers is the school principal. Each school principal has an account and username on the General Personnel Council website. He will access to his account and add all teachers who work in his school. The principal starts to grade the different criteria included in the Evaluation form by using a manual prepared by the General Personnel Council. This manual explains each grades limitation. The same process is done by the supervisor who visited the teachers at the same school. Supervisors have also accounts on the General Personnel Council website and use the same forms to evaluate teachers. Before 2013, evaluation results were considered confidential and weren’t released to teachers, but after 2013, the ministry started to release the results after the end of January. Teachers have the right to complain if the results of the evaluation aren’t satisfactory for them. The ministry will form a committee to judge any complaint request and investigate in its legitimacy.

The second type of evaluation managed by the Ministry of Education is a formative type of evaluation. This assessment is made by the school principal and the educational supervisor assigned by the ministry. This evaluation takes a descriptive form and is conducted at least two times per year. The main goals of this evaluation are: to develop the teacher’s performance and improve his abilities, to give recommendations to transfer teachers between different schools, and to promote a teacher from the primary to the secondary grades. The highest percentage of evaluation is done by the school principal (60% of the evaluation). 40% of the evaluation is considered from the supervisor’s evaluation. This evaluation is conducted with all types of teachers in all grades and from all specialties. Supervisors and school principals use different forms for this purpose, but almost have the same main criteria for evaluation.

New teachers are usually the most targeted group for evaluations by both school principals and supervisors. New teachers are assigned in the beginning for a one year contract. After the year ends, the teacher performance is evaluated and according to the results, a decision is made to give a fix term contract or to renew the probation period. If the probation period is renewed for another year and the teacher’s performance didn’t improve, his contract will be terminated and he will be stopped from working as a teacher. For experienced teachers, the rate of supervision is usually low. School's principals and the supervisors may visit experienced teachers once a year only, especially if his record is excellent.
Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The main purposes of teacher evaluations are as follows: to grant annual bonuses for teachers, to shift to another position or to promote the employee, to submit feedback on the employee's performance, to install a new teacher, and to nominate employees to attend training courses.

Current Application of Teacher Evaluation

There are different types of supervision done by the ministry of education. The first type is the Specialized Supervision. This type of supervision differs according to grades’ levels. From the first to the fourth grades there are four types of supervisors, the first one is for scientific courses. The second one is for literal courses. The third one is for English and the last one is the General Supervisor. From the fifth of the twelfth grades, there are five types of supervisors for the following courses: English, Arabic, Math, and Science, in addition to the General Supervisor.

The second type of supervision is the Cooperative Supervision. This type of supervision is concerned with providing support for all teachers in one school or to a small category only. It is provided only for specific topics that the school needs, such as classroom management, or any topics that had been recommended for improvement during the comprehensive supervision.

The third type of supervision is the Comprehensive Supervision. In this type of supervision, the school’s principal is the targeted one. Supervisors come to school to evaluate the principal’s involvement in developing teachers’ performance. The supervisor attends any lesson done by a teacher with the presence of the principal to observe the quality of instructions and advises given by the principal to the teacher. He observes also the nature of the relationship between the teachers and the principal. The main goals of teachers’ supervision are as follows:

1- Improve the performance of the teaching staff and thus improving students’ achievement.
2-Form a close relationship between teachers and educational supervisor.
3-Follow the development of the teacher as a result of attending follow-up training.
4-The development of teacher performance in general.

Historic Development and Background of the Teacher Evaluation System

Before the arrival of the Palestinian Authority in 1994, the situation of education in Palestine was chaotic due to the continuous destructive policies adopted by the Israeli government. In 1948, Israel invaded cities and villages inhabited by Palestinians and destroyed all signs of life. All types of schools were affected by these invasions. At that time, teacher evaluation was a simple primitive process done by the school principal only for development purposes and usually done orally. Reports or written feedback were rarely given to teachers. Between 1948 and 1967 the responsibility of managing the daily life in Gaza Strip and West Bank moved to the Egyptian and the Jordanian administrations, respectively. The educational system was managed totally by UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Work Agency). Supervising schools and teachers moved to the UNRWA responsibility and the curriculums used in Gaza Strip and West Bank were the same used in Egypt and Jordan. Evaluating teachers at
that time was done in a systematic way. An evaluation form was filled by the school principal one time per year and sent to the UNRWA headquarter. This type of evaluation was a summative type and was done for promotions or to grant annual bonuses.

From 1968 to 1994 the situation of education deteriorated due to the continuous Israeli policy of closing schools for months and depriving children of studying especially after the first Intifada in 1987. No real evaluation for teachers was conducted. Schools were closed for months or weeks and during the periods when schools opened their doors, teachers tried their best to finish the most important parts of the curriculum. School principals didn’t have the time to evaluate teachers for development purposes, they were so burdened with the students’ problems especially with the Israeli army. Summative evaluation was still a requirement at that time, but never done professionally, because the school principal couldn’t judge teachers’ performance in times of emergency and couldn’t give a real assessment.

The Teacher Evaluation System in Palestine started to have an official and effective form only after the arrival of the Palestinian Authority in 1994. In the beginning, the evaluation was the responsibility of the school principal and the supervisor assigned by the ministry of education.

**Current Application of Teacher Evaluation**

The current Teacher Evaluation System in Palestine started in 2013. It is divided into two main systems. The first one is managed by the General Personnel Council and the second one is managed by the ministry of Education. The system run by the General Personnel Council proceed a summative electronic evaluation. This evaluation is not only for teachers but also for all governmental employees. The evaluation is conducted at the beginning of each year. It starts at the beginning of January and end by the end of the month.

Both summative and formative evaluations were done by them for different purposes. Regarding the summative evaluation, the following steps were implemented.

1- The teacher’s annual performance report is filled out through separate templates; one is filled by the supervisor, and the other is filled by the school principal.

2- The given grades are classified according to the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>more than 85</th>
<th>84 -75</th>
<th>74-65</th>
<th>64-50</th>
<th>Less than 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Faire</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3- The educational supervisor fills out all report for teachers who is in charged with supervising them, then he delivers all the reports to the head of Supervision Department, in late May.

4- The head of Supervision Department read all the reports, and then to keep them classified by schools.

5- The school principal fills in the evaluation reports for each teacher in his school, and then send all reports to the head of school administrations, between the first to the sixth of May.
6- The Accreditation Committee consisting of the heads of departments of educational supervision and school administrations is responsible for the following work:

- Fill out the part of report dedicated to the committee evaluation and calculate the mean value of the overall teacher evaluation provided by the supervisor and the school principal.
- Review the reports in which a significant difference is detected between the supervisor’s evaluation and the principal’s evaluation. In that case, another revision for all previous reports will be done.
- Attach the supervisor's report to the report of the school principal, and send all reports to the Department of administrative affairs at the ministry who shall retain the original copy of each report in the teacher's file, and send a copy to the supervisor, and other copy for the school accompanied by an objection form. In case the teacher is not satisfied with the results, he has the right to send an objection form to the ministry of education no later than the mid of May.

7- In case a teacher objected to his evaluation results, and the general supervisor finds a huge gap between the report presented by the principal and the one presented by the supervisor. A committee comprising three supervisors (who didn’t participate in evaluating the teacher previously) will be assigned to visit the teacher and give final feedback.

Regarding the formative evaluation, the supervisor, and the school principal were both responsible for providing guidance especially for new teachers or weak teachers. They were responsible for developing the teacher, improving his skills and strengthening his points of weaknesses. This type of evaluation was descriptive.

In order to avoid the bias that can happen when the same supervisor does both summative and formative evaluations, the Ministry of Education differentiated between the types of supervisors who do the formative evaluation are named cooperative supervisors, and the supervisors who are responsible for summative evaluation are named comprehensive supervisors. The comprehensive supervisor was responsible for evaluating all aspects related to the teacher based on different criteria. This type of evaluation is summative and quantitative in nature.

After 2013, the Teacher Evaluation System started to be done electronically by schools’ principals and supervisors using the General Personnel Council portal. This type of evaluation is the summative type and is the official way to promote, give bonuses or dismiss a teacher. The formative type of evaluation is done by supervisors and principals was kept only for development issues and had no influence on the results of the summative evaluation.

Methods, Sources, and Instruments Used in Evaluating Teachers

There are different tools used for the purpose of evaluating teachers. (All tools explained below are included in the Appendices). The main tool used currently for summative purposes is the one displayed in the General Personnel Council portal. The name of the tool is “An Evaluation Form of a Teacher- Evaluated from Two Levels”, see Appendix 1. This tool contains 22 questions distributed in three main categories. The first category is about teacher’s functional
discipline. The second category is about evaluating teacher’s performance. The third part is to assess personal skills. This tool is filled out by the principal and the supervisor with the aid of “The Procedural Manual for evaluating Governmental employees’ performance”.

The manual contains all explanations about the different grading situations. For example, the teacher will be given an excellent grade (from 85-100%) for the punctuality in attendance if he is committed to coming to work and leaving. On the opposite, the teacher will be given less than 50% if he doesn’t come on time, leaves early and doesn’t return to school in case the principal assigned him a task outside the school. The manual is divided into four main themes as follows: the first one is the disciplinary theme. The second theme is the performance theme. The third one is the personal competencies theme, and the last one is the supervision theme.

There are other tools used for the formative purposes. The first instrument is the “Supervisory report for supervisor’s visit to the teacher”, see Appendix 2. This tool is administered by the educational supervisor and contains the following sections:

- The most important positive things about the teacher.
- The most important things that need to be developed.
- Procedures that the supervisor and teacher agree on implementing.
- Educational supervisor’s recommendations regarding teacher's performance and training
- Educational supervisor’s recommendations for school director

The supervisor must write a brief paragraph in each section and describe all points of weaknesses and strengths. This step comes after filling out a checklist that covers all aspects of teacher evaluation. The supervisor will combine the main important aspects in his report.

The second tool used to evaluate teachers is used by the school principal. The instrument’s name is “Supervisory report for principal’s visit to the teacher”, see Appendix 3. This tool contains the following sections evaluated based on two main themes, the first one is Positive things / and strengths and the second one is Things need to be developed:

- Planning
- Managing the classroom
  - Managing the class
  - Implement the lessons
  - Managing behavior
- Classroom environment
- Evaluation of students
- Training and study days

The tool also has a recommendations section. The principal must write a brief paragraph in each section to describe all points of strengths and the points that need improvement. This step comes after filling out the same check list done by the supervisor.
Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

One of the main tools used by the teacher to complain regarding the results of the evaluation, see Appendix 4. If the teacher sees that the results were unfair, he has the right to object and to use this tool to write a complaint. He will clarify what are the main points that the supervisor or the school principal have misjudged. A committee will be formulated from three supervisors to investigate in the complaint, then report the results of the investigation. The Appendices also contain the old tools used by supervisors and school principals to conduct a summative evaluation before the application of the new system of evaluation, see Appendix 5.

Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System

Modifying evaluation forms and methodology is annually done with the coordination between the General Personnel Council and the Ministry of Education. The process is developed constantly. The only point of disagreement is the current evaluation system is releasing the results of the evaluation, which causes Enmity between principals and teachers. The previous evaluation system kept the results confidential and only for purposes of promotion or giving bonuses. Teachers’ reports were kept in their files in the General Personnel Council. The following criteria are going to be used to develop future evaluation instrument. These criteria are developed recently in order to evaluate teachers more fairly:

- Criterion (1): the teacher has to know the philosophy of the Palestinian curriculum, objectives, and broad outlines.
- Criterion (2): The teacher has the knowledge and the understanding of the academic content of different grades thought by him.
- Criterion (3): The teacher has a knowledge and understanding of the modalities of his students’ learning, according to their abilities and developmental characteristics.
- Standard (4): The teacher has the knowledge and understanding of how to teach the lesson according to students’ needs and abilities.
- Criterion (5): The teacher has the knowledge and understanding of how to link the different fields of specialization and integrate them.
- Criterion (6): The teacher has the knowledge and understanding of the foundations of Educational Measurement and Evaluation.
- Criterion (7): prepare clear educational plans with defined goals, with taking into account individual differences among students.
- Criterion (8): Provide a safe educational learning environment, which supports the process of learning and improving.
- Criterion (9): Provides educational climate that is characterized by flexibility, innovation, and constant stimulation on critical thinking and creativity.
- Criterion (10): Use educational resources and teaching aids in the learning process.
- Criterion (11): The teacher develops his educational practices according to the feedback received from the school principal and the supervisor.
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Appendix 1

Electronic Tool Used for Evaluating

Palestinian National Authority
General Personnel Council

(An evaluation form of a teacher - evaluated from two levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evaluation Items</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Punctuality for Official attendance and leaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Use the official time of work effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Compliance with regulations, instructions and maintenance of public money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Coordinating annual leaves and the suitable time to use them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Case of disciplinary sanctions during the year (employee gets a full mark if he didn’t get any sanctions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The level of students’ academic achievement is improved at the end of the scholastic year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The commitment to distribute the curriculum to the semester plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Preparing applications of knowledge and homework for students and correct them and follow them consistently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>High skills in preparing and presenting lessons plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Applying and committing to educational fundamentals, philosophy and core values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mastery of scientific material and the ability to achieve goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Applying continuous empowerment and taking into account individual differences among students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Development of modern educational concepts and promote good behavior of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ability to organize and manage class and maintaining order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess personal skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The positive behavior towards students (being a role model).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Effective communication and teamwork with colleagues and superiors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Accept guidance positively and adhered to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Take responsibility and behave wisely in emergency situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Participate in school activities and different committees to strengthen the relationship with the local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Keep on learning, self-development and continuous professional development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Withstand work pressures and maintain the required levels of achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Taking care of general appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Teachers Supervision Tool Filled by the Supervisor

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

________________

Directorate of Education:

Palestinian National Authority

The Ministry of Education and Higher Education

Public administration of educational supervision and rehabilitation

________________

School:

National number:

________________

Supervisory report for supervisor’s visit to the teacher / Report No ( )

Teacher: ___________ ID Number _______ Date of Hire / /

Qualification _____ Specialization: _______________ Topic: ______

Class: ______ Division: ( ) Lesson Topic: ______ Class time classification: ( )

The most important positive things

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

The most important things that need to be developed

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Procedures that the supervisor and teacher agree on implementing

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Educational supervisor’s recommendations regarding teacher's performance and training:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Educational supervisor’s recommendations for school director

Date: / / Supervisor’s name and signature: ________________ Supervisor’s name and signature: ________________ Director of Education authentication: ________________
Appendix 3
Teachers Supervision Tool Filled out by Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palestinian National Authority</th>
<th>Directorate of Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Higher Education</td>
<td>School:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration of educational supervision and rehabilitation</td>
<td>National number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisory report for principal’s visit to the teacher / visit No ( )

Teacher: _____________________ ID Number: ______________________________ Date of Hire: / /

Qualification: __________ Specialization: __________________________ Topic: ______

Class: ______ Division: ( ): Lesson Topic: ____________________________

Class time classification: ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Positive things / and strengths</th>
<th>Things need to be developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings and study days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal’s recommendations: ___________________________________________________________

Date: / / the teacher signature: ______________________________ Principal’s name and signature: ______________________________
### Report for Supervisory Visit (Check List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the field</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment</td>
<td>Processing suitable classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize the contents of the classroom (to attract and stimulate students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom hygiene.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Display students’ products in an appropriate manner in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take care of the general appearance of teacher and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the teacher Changes students’ sitting and their places constantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stadiums planning and equipping (particularly for sports class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The teacher Write down his remarks in a note book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide arranged records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Organizes exams and homework schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ awareness of their strengths and needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up students’ work inside the classroom and provide feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher follows the cumulative card for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ Benefit from the correction of their work, and make them improve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement, responses</td>
<td>Students’ behavior with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ interaction in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity of attention and focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students collaborate with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obvious Progress in students’ performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievements Fit with the main goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher informs students and parents about tests’ results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students use appropriate language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher documents students’ information and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings are held with parents to discuss their children’s achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers and study days</td>
<td>Commitment to attend training courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active participation in training courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide the director with a summary about the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep a file hat contains achievements or successes that have been achieved as a result of the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovations shown by the teacher after attending the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage research</td>
<td>paying tribute to students’ achievements in the school radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and preparing educational</td>
<td>Honoring outstanding students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>The teacher encourages students to produce learning tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher uses teaching aids at school such as laboratories and library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are encouraged to research, analysis, predict interpret and develop hypotheses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the teacher defies students’ thinking and invest all their abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School devotes some space to display students’ work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher prepare different tools for different goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Mastery</td>
<td>The teacher is highly prepared for the lessons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ability to answer students specialize questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher is able to design appropriate educational activities suitable to the level of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s scientific background for the courses that he offers to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily and annual planning</td>
<td>The teacher prepares an annual plan which is clear, flexible and realistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher proceeds according to an annual plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existence of a plan for lessons that has diverse goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals are clearly defined, taking into account potentials of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The readiness of educational resources (tools, dictionaries, laboratories ...) if required in any educational situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective classroom management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lesson Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of lessons’ preparation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lesson plan is suitable for the flow of the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start and end of the time limit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an appropriate classroom environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time distribution to implement activities designed for the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The diversity of activities and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an opportunity for students’ self-reliance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The diversity of learning resources, organizing and using them effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of homework (follow-up previous ones and assign new ones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implementation of lesson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide an introduction that is relevant to the theme of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share lesson’s goals with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a logical sequence in presenting the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher provides a sound scientific material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses techniques and teaching instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of time on the activities of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The art of asking questions and managing discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s interventions are directed, focused and at the right time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish the lesson with a summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring students’ progress (formative and summative evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an appropriate language suitable for students’ level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Behavior management</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of relationships between the teacher and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using different types of reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the attraction of students’ attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act fast in emergency situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account students’ feelings and respect their views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage students in the study plans and tests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>other aspects</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s attitudes towards the profession of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher accepted the instructions and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating and building professional relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrich the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept and apply new educational ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to Creative initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a therapeutic and a development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The diversity of tests, and taking in consideration the principles of measurement and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a continuous evaluation and benefiting from its results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participation of the teacher in school committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and participation in various educational competitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Teachers Objection Tool

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Objection form on teacher’s annual performance report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palestinian National Authority</th>
<th>Directorate of Education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Higher Education</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration of educational supervision and rehabilitation</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National number:</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection form on teacher’s annual performance report

Teacher: ______________________ ID Number | Date of Hire / / 
Qualification: ____  Specialization: __________________ Topic: ______

First, items related to the supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher Objection</th>
<th>The opinion of supervisor regarding the teacher’s objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, items related to the principal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teacher Objection</th>
<th>The opinion of the principal regarding the teacher’s objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, Summary of objection if not mentioned above:

............................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................

Name and signature of teacher............................................. Date / / 200

Opinion of the objection Committee:

............................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................

Director of Education authentication

Signature of committee members:  Member 1  member 2  member 3
# Appendix 5

## Old Tool Used in the Evaluation of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palestinian National Authority</th>
<th>Directorate of Education: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Higher Education</td>
<td>School: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration of educational supervision and rehabilitation</td>
<td>National number: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teacher’s annual performance report (done by the principal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: ____________________________</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Date of Hire / /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification ______ Specialization: __________________</td>
<td>Topic: ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Maximum Grade</th>
<th>The offered grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Punctuality to official working hours (attendance, leave, time of classes, shifts)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Using divertive educational methods and the ability to manage the classroom.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benefit from tests analysis to improve students’ performance.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Take care of his preparation notebook and official records on a day basis.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ensure and commit to the prepare of therapeutic and development annual plan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Invest school resources and available expertise to improve students’ performance.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Actively participate in school committees, creative projects and benefit from seminars and study days.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Follow-up students’ homework and provide feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Accept guidance and instructions and benefit from the feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bring new ideas and accept others’ opinions and their new initiatives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The teacher is distinguished by his behavior as a role model and he cares about his general appearance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The ability to connect and communicate, and build professional relationships.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Belonging to the school and the profession.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Act well in emergency situations and bears the pressure of work.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cooperation with co-workers, and deal with them as a team.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total sum in letters</th>
<th>The total sum in numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______________________</td>
<td>_______________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations and recommendations of the principal: ____________________________

Name and signature of the principal: ____________________________ Date / / 200

Commission on Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total sum in supervisor’s report</th>
<th>Total sum in principal’s report</th>
<th>General Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinion of the Committee

Signature of committee members: Member 1 member 2 member 3

Director of Education authentication
# Old Tool Used in the Evaluation of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palestinian National Authority</th>
<th>Directorate of Education: ______________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Higher Education</td>
<td>School: ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration of educational supervision and rehabilitation</td>
<td>National number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teacher’s annual performance report (done by the supervisor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: ______________________</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Date of Hire / /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification: _____</td>
<td>Specialization: __________________</td>
<td>Topic: _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Maximum Grade</th>
<th>The offered grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledgeable regarding his specialty, and uses different sources of information.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The ability to manage the classroom (class management, implementation of the lesson, behavior management).</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diversification in methods in line with educational goals and attitudes.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employ annual developmental and therapeutic plans to serve educational goals.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Using the principles of measurement and evaluation in constructing tests.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benefit from the evaluation in its different forms to improve performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepares lessons effectively.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Selection of appropriate teaching tools for use.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Taking into account individual differences among students (examples, activities, questions...).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Choose and follow students’ homework that achieve educational goals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Raising students’ motivation by asking questions and encouraging them</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The preparation of a variety of activities to enrich the curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Allow for students’ interventions and treat them with respect.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Punctuality and effectiveness in attending seminars and study days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cooperates with the supervisor and uses his recommendations.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Use proper language within the classroom.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The total sum in letters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The total sum in numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Observations and recommendations of the supervisor**

Name and signature of the supervisor: ______________________

Date / / 200
Chapter 14: United States-District of Columbia

Nathan Ledlow

Introduction

Historically, Washington D.C.’s experimentation in teacher evaluation has been closely watched and many times copied (Brown, 2016). The pendulum has swung back and forth many times in regards to teacher evaluation in the United States and it’s a topic that has been at the forefront of political context in recent years. Politicians from all states within the U.S. have been on a rampage against public education while tearing down union organizations and revamping teacher evaluation has been one of their high priorities. Educators within the public sector have become the scapegoat for the United States’ many problems. Stock market is down? Blame public education. Crime rates are up? Blame public education. Mentally ill individuals engaging in mass shootings? Blame public education. Teacher and educator evaluation are not the be-all end-all; however, it is a process that when done correctly and efficiently, can have a positive impact on student learning.

Structure of Teacher Evaluation

Former D.C. Schools Chancellor Michelle Rhee was the driving force behind implementing the current evaluation model called IMPACT. Since its adoption in 2009, IMPACT has been the most talked about and heavily scrutinized evaluation system in the U.S. In its current form, it’s a system that takes into account, professional behavior, principal observation, master educator observation, and includes a value-added component that takes into account the test performance of their students. Upon its implementation, IMPACT quickly became a model evaluation system that provoked many states to imitate many of D.C.’s practices.

Michelle’s number one priority was to improve teacher quality within DCPS. She made national headlines early on in her tenure for firing 76 teachers who she deemed to be ineffective at teaching (Lewin, 2010). From the start of Rhee’s reign, she along with her DCPS administrative colleagues began working on defining “good teaching”. They were not worried about “what to teach” their students; however, they were focused on “how” they were going to teach it. To help implement her plans for effective teaching, Rhee and colleagues looked at research driven by Marzano and Danielson, two globally renowned education experts, to help define DCPS’s guidelines for a teaching and learning framework (TLF, 2008). From their work, DCPS came up with a set of “nine commandments” that would now guide effective instruction within the school district. The “Nine Commandments” for the DCPS Teaching and Learning Framework (TLF) are as follows:

1. Lead well-organized objective-driven lessons
2. Explain content clearly
3. Engage students at all learning levels
4. Provide students multiple ways to move toward mastery
5. Check for student understanding
6. Respond to student Understanding
7. Develop higher-level understanding
8. Maximize instructional time
9. Build a supportive, learning-focused classroom

The DCPS administration would then use these “nine commandments” as the guiding force around developing their new teacher evaluation system called IMPACT.

**Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

There are indeed multiple goals of teacher evaluation from helping to improve teacher practice to providing guidance on making decisions in regards to tenure, advancement, or termination. For the sake of development, multiple formative evaluations are conducted throughout the school year that provide an opportunity for an outside observer to view and deliver formative feedback to the teacher before and after a lesson is taught. Theoretically, this process allows for the teacher to hear perspective from a colleague who is an expert in instructional practice as well as reflect on how that lesson in particular just took place. In order to make decisions regarding tenure, advancement, or termination, one or two summative evaluations take place in the middle of a school year and at the conclusion of that same year. Summative evaluations are made up of the multiple formative observations, professional behavior, and may include artifacts displayed in a portfolio that provide a clearer picture of that individual teachers day to day interactions with their students.

Overall, teacher evaluation is a very time consuming process that many schools do not have the luxury of devoting the necessary resources to. As previously stated, when the evaluation process is done efficiently and correctly it can have a positive impact on the educational environment. When done haphazardly and unevenly, it can result in negative consequences in multiple areas of the day-to-day operations of a school district.

**Historic Development and Background of the Teacher Evaluation System**

According to the OECD, “Teacher appraisal is the evaluation of individual teachers resulting in judgements about their competencies and performance.” (OECD, 2015). While evaluation of teachers has made major headlines over the last seven years, the goal to improve the practice of teaching actually began in 1896 with the report of a study conducted by H.E. Kratz (Imig & McNerney, 2014). In this study, Kratz asked 2,411 students from the second through eighth grade to define the features of their finest instructors. By conducting this study, Kratz’s objective was to create clear characteristics that all teachers could be judged by (2014).

In the mid-twentieth century, Arvil Barr led an investigative study on supervisors’ ratings of teachers and how this method was the most efficient way to move forward (2014). Not fully willing to buy into Barr’s study, a few researchers studied average gains in student achievement and discovered that what supervisors’ thoughts of teachers had very little, if anything at all, in regards to student learning (2014). Throughout their research, they would find conflicting effects; positive effects from specific teaching behaviors in one study, yet negative effects on achievement in another study. In a study conducted in 1950, Domas and Tiedeman evaluated more than 1,000 analyses of teacher qualities, described in nearly every possible way, and established no clear link between teacher behavior and student achievement (Domas &
Tiedeman, 1950). Due to the vague association between teacher characteristics and student achievement, researchers Getzels and Jackson raised the concern that there was no research based merit that linked teacher characteristics to student learning and all research surrounding the topic should cease to continue (2014).

In June of 2007, Washington D.C. mayor Adrian Fenty tabbed Michelle Rhee as the next chancellor of District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS). Rhee was a surprising choice due to her lack of experience, however she came aboard determined to turnaround one of the lowest performing school districts in the nation. Michelle was (and is) an extremely intelligent individual who graduated with a Bachelor degree from Cornell University and a Master degree from Harvard University. Rhee began her educational career as a teacher in the Teach for America program where she was placed in some of the lowest performing schools in Baltimore, Maryland. After a three year stint as a teacher, Michelle became CEO of the New Teacher Project, a nonprofit formed with the goals of trying to improve teacher quality. After serving for the New Teacher Project, Rhee was appointed chancellor of DCPS.

Moving forward to 2009, President Barack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan introduced their Race to the Top initiative to encourage states to adopt more rigorous approaches to teacher evaluations. In order to receive grant money from the Race to the Top program, states were required to apply to the U.S. Department of Education. Part of the application process required states to clarify how they were going to increase rigor in regards to their teacher evaluation practices. Based off of the application review, certain states were awarded millions in additional revenue to enact their proposed changes.

**Current Application of Teacher Evaluation**

The amount of times that the IMPACT system will be utilized throughout a school year is dependent upon a teacher’s record of performance, as well as their experience. For teachers who struggle or are new to the profession, they should plan to be observed at least five times per school year. For teachers who have established themselves as an expert practitioner, they will only be observed once or twice per school year. The nine commandments are used as an instructional guide for the observer to utilize while evaluating the teacher. Each classroom visit will last approximately 30 minutes and the objective is for the visitor to see all nine commandments displayed by the teacher during the observation time. The observations are unannounced as the expectation is that the teacher needs to be prepared to be observed at any time.

**Methods, Sources, and Instruments**

For teachers within DCPS they are evaluated on yearly basis based off of multiple data sources. First, as previously mentioned, teachers are evaluated off of their classroom observations. Either a building administrator or a master educator is responsible for visiting the teacher’s classrooms and collecting data. All data collected revolves around the nine commandments and whether or not the observer witnessed these instructional strategies taking place during the allotted time.
Second, teachers are also evaluated on student assessment data. Due to the implementation of the Common Core curriculum, many states within the U.S. have also had to implement new standardized assessments. Because of this, DCPS is currently not using standardized assessment data for their teacher evaluations (however this will change in years to come). With that said, teachers are required to assess their students on classroom generated data. Teachers must meet with their administrator at the beginning of the school year and collaboratively agree on how students in their classes will be assessed. This process is largely done by teachers conducting pre – and post – tests.

Finally, teachers within the DCPS system are evaluated on their commitment to the school community. DCPS includes this section in their evaluation system due to their belief that their students’ success depends on the collective efforts of everyone within the system. This section is evaluated by an administrator twice per school year for each teacher. To evaluate, administrators will use the following set of standards:

- Support of the local school initiatives
- Support special education and ELL programs
- High expectations
- Partnership with families
- Instructional collaboration

As previously stated the nine commandments within the IMPACT system will be utilized for formative assessments. The IMPACT system, as a whole, will be used for a summative mid-year check as well as a summative end of year assessment, see appendix for forms, instruments, and rubrics.

Use of Teacher Evaluation Findings

When teachers receive their IMPACT score, they are to examine and analyze the formative and summative evaluations. Once they have thoroughly looked over their final ratings they should begin to develop a plan (if need be) on how they are going to improve. Teachers are encouraged to work with their buildings instructional coach first and foremost. Each school within the DCPS system has a school-based instructional coach that is employed to support and encourage teachers with feedback and guidance. Coaches will advise teachers on their key takeaways from observation sessions, ideas for improvement, and recommendations for professional development. Teachers are also encouraged to discuss their strengths and weaknesses with their building principals, as these administrators are there to help and support teachers in need.

On top of working with building support, it is recommended that teachers, who need help, participate in a variety of professional development options. The D.C. Public School system has a plethora of PD lesson videos directly related to each of the nine commandments from the Teaching and Learning Framework. Teachers have the option to view these videos online through their district education portal.

Finally, teachers can participate in a program called Teaching in Action. This is a program that matches up teachers who are weak in an area, with a teacher in the district who is strong in that same area. The teacher who needs assistance is given release time from their
classroom to be able to observe their new “mentor teacher.” After observation, has taken place, a post-conference is conducted so the two teachers can talk about what took place and how he/she can improve their instructional practice moving forward.

**Future Plans for the Development or Reform of Teacher Evaluation System**

Modifications to the *IMPACT* teaching evaluation system will be implemented for the 2016-2017 school year. Moving forward, “master educators” will no longer be conducting teacher observations. Beginning next school year, D.C. employees currently serving in the “master educator” position will now operate as department or grade level coaches (Brown, 2016). Instead of being evaluated by independent evaluators, teachers will now be participating in weekly department/grade level meetings, while their assigned coach (formerly master educator) will serve as the meeting facilitator. This person will be there to talk about lesson plans, what struggles the teachers are currently facing, and overall ideas on effective pedagogy (2016). Because of the change in job assignments, all classroom observations will now be conducted by building and district administration.

One final change to the system will result in not only student test scores being included in final teacher evaluation ratings, but student surveys as well (2016). Details on how these surveys, combined with test scores will be rated are not yet available. Focus groups will be assembled to help generate ideas on how this might look and function.
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Appendix

Figure 1

Impact Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Components for 2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the School Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because of the timeline by which DCPS will receive results from the PARCC assessment, IVA will not be included in final IMPACT scores for 15-16*

Figure 2

Rubric for Teacher Assessed Student Achievement Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Student scores on teacher assessments indicate, on average, exceptional learning such as at least 1.5 years of growth*; each assessment used is approved by the administration, and scores reported are by the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Student scores on teacher assessments indicate, on average, significant learning, such as at least 1.25 years of growth*; each assessment used is approved by the administration; and scores reported are validated by the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Student scores on teacher assessments indicate, on average, some learning, such as at least 1 year of growth*; each assessment used is approved by the administration; and scores reported are validated by the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Student scores on teacher assessments indicate, on average, little learning, such as less than 1 year of growth*; assessments used are not approved by the administration; or scores reported are not validated by administration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 3

**Sample Score Chart: Established Teacher**  
**Teaching and Learning Framework (TLF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Framework (TLF)</th>
<th>Admin cycle ends 12/17</th>
<th>Admin cycle ends 6/9</th>
<th>ME cycle ends 2/11</th>
<th>ME cycle ends on 6/9</th>
<th>OVERALL (Average of Cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLF SCORE (Average of teach 1 to Teach 9)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 1: Lead Well-Organized Objective-Driven Lessons</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 2: Explain Content Clearly</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 3: Engage Students at all Learning Levels</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 4: Provide Students Multiple Ways to Move Toward Mastery</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 5: Check for Student Understanding</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 6: Respond to Student Understanding</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 7: Develop Higher-Level Understanding</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 8: Maximize Instructional Time</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach 9: Build a Supportive, Learning-Focused Classroom</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4

**Sample Score Chart**  
**Commitment to the School Community (CSC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to the School Community</th>
<th>Cycle Ends 12/17</th>
<th>Cycle Ends 6/15</th>
<th>Overall (Average of cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSC Score (Average of CSC 1 to CSC 5)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 1: Support of the Local School Initiatives</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 2: Support Special Education and ELL Programs</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 3: High Expectations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 4: Partnership with Families (for Teachers Only)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 5: Instructional Collaboration (for Teachers Only)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5

**Sample Score Chart**  
**Core Professionalism (CP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Professionalism (CP)</th>
<th>Cycle ends 12/17</th>
<th>Cycle Ends 6/15</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP Score (Lowest of CP 1 to CP 4)</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 1: Attendance</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2: On-time Arrival</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 4: Respect</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6

**Sample Score Chart**  
**Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component Score</th>
<th>Pie Chart %</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Framework</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>x 75</td>
<td>= 279.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement Data</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>x 15</td>
<td>= 52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the School Community</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>x 10</td>
<td>= 33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7

Final Rating Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective 100-199 Points</th>
<th>Minimally Effective 200-299 Points</th>
<th>Developing 250-299 Points</th>
<th>Effective 300-349 Points</th>
<th>Highly Effective 350-400 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- A score of exactly 200 would be classified as Minimally Effective
- A score of Exactly 250 would classified as Developing
- A score of exactly 300 would be classified as Effective
- A score of exactly 350 would be classified as Highly Effective

Figure 8

Changes for 2016-2017 school year

1. Plan
   - Develop annual Student achievement goals
   - Create standards-based unit plans and assessments
   - Create Objective-driven lesson plans

2. Teach
   - Nine Commandments

3. Increase Effectiveness
   - Assess student progress
   - Track and analyze student progress data
   - Improve practice and re-teach in response to data