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The purpose of this study is to establish the crucial elements of the teacher evaluation systems applied in the State of Florida, USA, and in Turkey. It will compare these two evaluation systems in regard to the purposes of the evaluations, the expectations from the teacher, the evaluation structure, and the qualification of school principals to evaluate teacher performance. This study also presents the weaknesses and strengths of the teacher evaluation systems to assist policymakers, especially those in Turkey, to assess their current evaluation practices to determine possible strategies for improvement.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

It is clear that the success of the organization depends on the performance of the organization’s employees as this can demonstrate to what extent the organization has reached its goals. The purpose of the evaluation system should be to help workers by showing their weakness and/or strengths and providing them with professional development (Wells, 1999). An effective evaluation system is also a crucial process in providing an efficient education system. These practices facilitate improvement by removing problem areas and replacing methods with the aim of a better education. An organization must ensure that instruction occurs in line with the goals, and to determine whether educators are improving their professional knowledge and skills (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

As we know, education has a significant influence on the success of both individuals and societies (Fullan, 1999; Hargreaves, 2002). In this regard, teachers play vital roles in the achievement of educational objectives and have significant impact on educating individuals in all sectors and, so designing the societies (Campell, et al., 2004). Educators and other stakeholders want to be sure that students are getting an education that will enhance their achievements, therefore evaluating those who provide instruction to students is crucial. According to Tucker and Stronge (2005), teacher evaluation refers to a process in which teachers are evaluated on their ability to provide instruction to students. Furthermore, these authors stated that the evaluation process is often intended to provide performance feedback to teachers to help them improve and perform better. Teacher evaluation is described by Nolan and Hoover (2008) in the following way:
Teacher evaluation is an organizational function designed to make comprehensive judgments concerning teacher performance and competence for personnel decisions such as tenure and continuing employment. The process as a whole is aimed primarily at making a summative judgment about the quality of the teacher's performance in carrying out both instructional duties and other responsibilities (p.26).

It has become an important expectation that teachers must have the required professional qualifications, and update their knowledge and skills for effective teaching to meet students' needs. Moreover, the quality of a teacher's teaching has a considerable impact on student learning (Hanushek, 1992; Aaronson, et al., 2007; Nye, et al., 2004). For this reason, evaluation of the teacher's performance has a significant role in determining teacher's mastery and adequacy. However, the evaluation of a teacher's performance is different to that of a worker in other organizations, simply because teachers face a diverse student population in every academic year. For this reason, the priority of the teacher's evaluation should be to master teacher efficiency and accordingly, student achievement (Marshall, 2009). Marzano (2012) described the purpose of the teacher's evaluation as a measurement of a teacher's quality and development of that quality. Like Marzano, Danielson (2002) mentioned that quality assurance and professional learning are the essential purposes of evaluating teachers.

The evaluation of teacher performance continues to be one of the most controversial processes within the education system. Over time, the expectations of teacher evaluation have changed, tending to become more comprehensive and therefore, more sophisticated. Current teacher evaluation practices are based most often on principal observation of classroom instruction and typically include an overall rating of the teacher's performance (Brandt et al. 2007). For example, as drawn from the works of Brandt et al. (2007) and Kersten and Isreal (2005), many schools report
using teacher rating scales, checklists, models with prescribed components, and rubrics
designed to assess effective teaching behaviors, usually without taking into
consideration student achievement. It is important to use a combination of different
measurements to evaluate teacher performance to provide different kinds of information
which may not only help the teacher for professional development (Baker, 2004;
Herman, 2005), but also may help to prevent incorrect decisions (Koretz, 2005). In a
successful evaluation system, the teacher should be aware of which criteria their
performance is judged on, and they should receive feedback which helps their growth.

**History of Teacher Evaluation**

The evaluation of a teacher has existed in one way or another for a long time.
Over time, teacher evaluation systems have been affected by the social norms and the
dominant business practices of the period in which they were established. Teacher
evaluation has a long past dating back to Socrates who was accused of corrupting
Athenian youth by teaching them and punishing them with the death penalty as a result
of his evaluation (Doyle, 1983). The booklet published by Charles Hoole in 1659
included information about the responsibilities of both the teacher and the student, and
the most valuable part was that the view of the responsibility for learning belongs to the
student (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995).

The first country that attempted a national evaluation process was England
during the Victorian era (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). According to the ‘payment by
results’ system in England, the responsibility of learning was on the teacher instead of
on the student (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). As a consequence of the system’s
corruption, the practice ended (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Before 1850, there
were periodic inspections to monitor whether or not the rules were adhered to (Oliva &
According to the study in 1896 by Kratz, 87% of the students who participated in the survey when describing the characteristics of their best teacher indicated ‘helpfulness’ as the most important factor, while 58% of them mentioned ‘personal appearance’ as the next influential factor. This study highlighted how the teacher was criticized in that era.

Early in the 20th century, teacher evaluation was an inspection through random classroom visits to observe teaching practices (Campbell, 2013). During this era, the school was seen as a factory where teachers were workers; students were products, and the role of the superintendents was to tell teachers ‘what is acceptable practice and what is not’ (Glanz, 1998, p.49). The crucial criteria of being a good teacher in this era were good appearance, pleasing personality, and adherence to principles (Shinkfiled & Stufflebeam, 1995).

A story between a teacher and the superintendent in 1910 is an example of the view of teacher evaluation (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). After a day of observation, the teacher asked the superintendent whether or not he was certified being a teacher. This is the response of the superintendent:

“Your certification is well founded... I just certified you! You were prepared for the lesson, you had different things for young and older students to do, you didn't yell or have to speak anyone being bad, you knew your subjects, the children seemed to get along quite well with you and with each other, you had lots of energy, you didn't waste any time telling story or jokes and I like you! (p.7).

In 1910, E.C. Elliot, a professor at the University of Wisconsin, developed a plan called ‘A Provisional Plan for the Merit of Teachers’ for evaluating teachers which was widely accepted and used until the mid-1960s. The plan used a rating scale instrument based on 1,000 points which were combined from the following seven categories: 1)
physical efficiency, 2) moral-native efficiency, 3) administrative efficiency, 4) dynamic efficiency, 5) projected efficiency, 6) achieved efficiency, 7) social efficiency (Davis 1964).

The period between 1920 and 1940 is characterized as a ‘scientific approaches’ era by Peterson (Peterson, 1982). In 1924, the method for the success of teachers was based on measuring factors such as personality, experience, student achievement, the experience of teachers, and training was developed by Monroe and Clark (Davis, 1964). This method led to giving attention to student achievement. By the beginning of the 1930s, teacher evaluation had changed from inspection to supervision (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The responsibility of principals was outlined, and they became responsible for helping the teacher to improve instruction (Glanz, 1991). The report, ‘Commonwealth Teacher Training Study’, which included the traits of effective teachers and guided how to evaluate them, was published by Charters and Waples in 1929 (Charters & Waples, 1929). According to Peterson (1982), this era has great importance in the evaluation of teacher performance because it used an objective rating scale and data sources. Moreover, student test scores were used to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

During the 1940s and 1950s, it was believed by the educators that teachers who have personality traits such as personal appearance, emotional stability, enthusiasm, trustworthiness, warmth were considered as effective teachers, because these traits were crucial factors for teacher evaluation (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). In the 1960s, teachers protected themselves from unfair evaluation systems (Peterson, 1982). The evaluation system was affected by a union contract which highlighted the information
about evaluation criteria to teachers, the frequency of evaluation, and how data were collected (Strike & Bull, 1981). Clark (1993, p.7) mentioned that 'The unions' influence and role in the evaluation of teachers offered the profession the respect the profession was long overdue.' In this period, the aim of the teacher evaluation shifted to increase student achievement and to improve instruction (Stronge & Helm, 1991) (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Teacher evaluation in the 1960s and 1970s is described by Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) as follows:

During the 1960s and increasingly into the 1970s, teacher evaluation attained growing importance. This was partly attributable to public demand for accountability in education which, by now, had shifted from a teacher’s curriculum and program management to the quality of classroom teaching and student learning (p.14).

One of the important teacher evaluation models, ‘clinical supervision' was created from the book titled ‘Clinical Supervision' by Morris Cogan (1973) and Robert Goldhammer (1969) (Glickman, et al., 2001). This model included various performance standards and rating instruments to better observe teaching practice in the classroom (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The Clinical Supervision model was defined by Sullivan and Glanz (2009, p.17) as a model in which ‘teaching could be improved by a prescribed formal process of collaboration between teacher and supervisor'.

Regarding the practices of teacher evaluation in 1980s, Buttram and Wilson (1987, p. 6) highlighted five trends:

1. Districts were becoming more conscientious about relating teacher evaluation to effective teaching research.
2. Training was being provided to administrators to ensure fair and reliable teacher evaluation.
3. Principals were being held accountable for implementing teacher evaluation systems.
4. Districts began to integrate teacher evaluation with staff development.

5. Administrators and teachers were beginning to collaborate more during the evaluation.

In the same time frame, Hunter developed an instructional model to measure teacher behavior and effectiveness by identifying seven steps in lesson design (Danielson & McGreal, 2005). Moreover, the primary components of an effective teacher evaluation system were described by McGreal (1988, p.13) as follows:

- Includes clear criteria, established with significant teacher involvement that reflects the district’s framework for looking at and talking about teaching.
- Provides opportunity for increased teacher involvement within the actual functioning of the system.
- Provides opportunity to use multiple sources of data to ensure the fullest possible picture of teaching.
- Allows and encourages feedback activities that have been shown to encourage professional growth.

In the 1990s, a researcher focused on the revised teacher evaluation system. During this period, teaching was affected by education research involving critical thinking, problem-solving, multiple intelligence, collaborative learning methods (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Stronge (1997) suggested including multiple data sources to evaluate the teacher, and stated (p.10) that ‘An important feature of an effective teacher evaluation system is the use of multiple data sources for documenting performance’. Therefore, five major data sources were highlighted by Stronge (1997): 1) Observation, both formal and anecdotal observation of performance; 2) Client feedback, such as surveys or interviews; 3) Student performance data; 4) Portfolios 5) Self-evaluation. Although teacher portfolios are seen as a valuable implement for professional development (Darling-Hammond, 2001), it is unknown how portfolios will
integrate into professional development and evaluation systems (Wolf & Dietz, 1998). In 1996, The Framework for Teaching, which brought a common language among educators, was published by Danielson (Griffin, 2013). This framework aimed to explain the criteria of the evaluation system for self-assessment and reflection on teaching practices to the teacher (Griffin, 2013).

At the turn of the 21st century, researchers were focused on the relationships between teacher effectiveness and student performance. Therefore, accountability and the reasons for students failing were studied by researchers (Jorgensen & Hoffman, 2003). According to Stronge and Tucker, a quality teacher evaluation system should include three key elements: 1) communication, 2) commitment, and 3) collaboration (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). To increase students' success, the main aim of teacher evaluation should include teachers in the process (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). The process of evaluation was defined by Berube and Dexter (2006):

Evaluation is a formal process developed and implemented by districts to meet state statutes and district policies, to assign teachers a rating at the end of the year, and to determine whether a teacher will return to work the following school year. The evaluation process is in place to ensure quality (p.11).

To summarize, although the evaluation system shifted from the factory model to professional development for teachers, there is still a concern of the relationship between the evaluation and student achievement. Peterson (2000) stated 'Seventy years of empirical research on teacher evaluation shows that current practices do not improve teachers or accurately tell what happens in classrooms' (p.14). The belief that teachers must be responsible for student accomplishment has transformed supervision and evaluation (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). Kersten and Israel (2005) mentioned 'a mere checklist cannot capture the nuances of teaching and learning' (p.49). Because
student learning has become more complex, the teacher evaluation systems should include many interrelated factors such as the evaluation process, performance criteria, qualification of evaluators, and attributes of the teachers.

**Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

It is important to start with the clear and public understanding of the purposes of the teacher evaluation process. Duke and Stiggins (1990) stated that defining the purpose of teacher evaluation was crucial. Many researchers have shared their belief for the purposes of teacher evaluation. For example, according to Doyle (1983), the aim of teacher evaluation is to help the teacher with the goal of improving instruction, to help students choose courses, to encourage faculty to do research on teaching. Manning (1988) stated that the main reasons for teacher evaluation were to determine inefficient teachers, to increase their payment, to assure responsibility, to decide tenure, and to enhance administrative authority. Natriello (1990) described three primary purposes of teacher evaluation: to inspect or influence a person within specific positions; to inspect a person’s action into and out of the position; to approve organizational control system. Haefele (1993) viewed the teacher evaluation system as a process to determine poor performing teachers, to provide constructive feedback, to encourage professional development, to create a shared vision within teachers and administration for student achievement. As reported by Zepeda (2003), the purpose of evaluation is to ensure teacher quality, to promote growth and development, and problem-solving. Marzano (2012) agreed that the main purposes are to evaluate teacher performance, to measure the teacher and to develop the teacher.

As teachers are the cornerstone of the student’s education, evaluating teacher quality and effectiveness appropriately is a crucial topic of educational research. It is
necessary to identify the domains of effective teaching to increase teacher capability. To align evaluation tools will help a teacher’s professional development which leads to student achievement. The outcomes of teacher effectiveness are linked to student learning. Howard and Gullickson (2010) agree that ‘The quality of a student’s educational experience is a direct result of the classroom teacher’s ability to exercise sound professional judgment and skill in creating an engaging learning environment’ (p.338).

The research related to teacher quality has mostly focused on four categories over the past 30 years: Teacher qualifications, teacher characteristics, teacher practices, and teacher effectiveness which is a new area for the research (Goe, 2007). According to Goe (2007), teacher quality is described in the following way:

...teacher quality may be evidenced by teachers who possess the following characteristics: (1) qualifications and experience appropriate to grade level and subject matter, (2) high expectations for students, particularly those at risk for poor outcomes, (3) creation of a classroom environment that encourages all students to participate in worthwhile learning activities, (4) desire to help students achieve at high levels, (5) ability to motivate at-risk students to come to school and participate in class, even if their achievement scores do not show significant gains, (6) excellent skills in mentoring new teachers and acting as stabilizing forces in high-turnover schools, and (7) willingness to work diligently with students with special needs, whose test scores may not reflect teacher contributions.” (p. 1)

On the other hand, Stronge and Tucker (2003) stated that ‘Without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers’ (p.3). In accordance with Sclan (1994), teacher performance evaluation should be more than just a checklist of possible performance criteria on which to determine teacher effectiveness:

The old factory-like structure of many of today’s schools, which include hierarchical modes of teacher evaluation, perpetuates a narrow
application of behavioristic technical evaluation criteria, often excluding opportunities for creative, flexible, adaptive thinking. . . .When teaching is reduced to a checklist or a summary of disparate quantifiable behaviors, there is no room for any dialogue and there is nothing left for the teacher to do but to imitate these behaviors unquestionably. . . .For teachers to achieve optimal conditions for their students learning, they must have access to the entire knowledge base of teaching to suit their particular situations. Teachers are more likely to grow in the greatest number of ways when evaluation systems are responsive to what teachers say they need (pgs. 11-12).

Researchers have summarized that three different criteria are critical for teacher evaluation. The teacher evaluation process must be eligible to remove incompetent teachers who do not produce student achievement (Heneman, et al., 2007; Koppich & Showalter, 2005; Odden & Wallace, 2008); to provide constructive feedback to help teacher’s professional growth (Heneman et al., 2007; Odden 2004; Sanders & Horn, 1998); to support a goal-oriented school culture to ensure the quality of teaching and learning occurs in the school, Ellett & Teddlie, 2003; Odden, 2004). Darling-Hammond (2012) stated seven criteria for a quality teacher evaluation system:

1. Teacher evaluation system should have standards to create a common language and to support teachers’ growth;

2. Teacher evaluation system should draw on multiple data sources;

3. Evaluators must be knowledgeable, as well as receiving appropriate training;

4. Teachers should be included in the evaluation process

5. The effective teacher evaluation system should provide feedback for professional development;

6. In order for the system to be effective, it should encourage collaboration to build a professional learning community;

7. Community participation is an important criterion to design the evaluation model.

The characteristics of the teacher evaluation system were stated by Machell (1995) and Marshall (2005): clear and meaningful feedback through multiple data
sources; building trust between teachers and evaluator; goal setting by teachers; and professional development dependent on the evaluation. Although researchers have agreed that a quality teacher evaluation system should be a crucial factor for school improvement (Normore, 2005), it is challenging to develop an effective teacher evaluation process for two reasons: firstly, creating a common definition of the components for teacher effectiveness, and secondly designing an evaluation approach that includes measuring student achievement (Coggshall, 2007). Using a teacher evaluation system to measure teacher effectiveness has some challenges:

1. Using poor evaluation instruments which mostly focus on what could be measured (Donaldson, 2009);
2. Lack of training for the evaluator (Ashby & Krug, 1998; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009);
3. Limited time for accurate evaluation (Halverson & Clifford, 2006);
4. Lack of evaluator skill in specific areas (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009);
5. Lack of quality feedback for teachers (Blase & Blase, 1999; Danielson & McGreal, 2000);
6. Few evaluators who support positive school culture instead of providing critical feedback (Halverson & Clifford, 2006);
7. Lack of results related to evaluation to observe exceptional and remediable teaching skill (Donaldson, 2009).

To sum up, as teaching does matter, evaluating teachers should also matter to student success which is why a quality teacher evaluation system is crucial (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). The most mentioned purposes of the teacher evaluation system are accountability and professional development (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2000). The teacher evaluation should not focus only to hold teachers accountable for their instruction by rating their performance, but also encourage them to improve
instruction (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). Moreover, teacher engagement in the evaluation process makes the evaluation more effective (Kyriakides, et al., 2006). Teachers can make more input in the evaluations and help to improve school climate by creating a shared vision. As reported by Colby, et al., (2002):

Purposes, as a foundation for a teacher evaluation system, should be stated clearly, agreed on by all stakeholders and used to govern the design of the system. In addition, an understanding of these purposes was essential. Not only did the evaluation purpose need to be made explicit, but also teachers needed to perceive the evaluation as a process to help them improve their performance, and principals needed to perceive the process as a means to provide instructional leadership (p.3).

**Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement**

Over the years, researchers and educators have discussed the factors which influence student achievement. Coleman (Coleman et al., 1966, p.325) stated that 'schools bring little influence to bear upon a child’s achievement that is independent of his background and general social context.' Although as claimed in the study by Frymier (1998), 'Because every person is accountable for his or her own behavior but not for what other people do, teachers must be held accountable for what they do as teachers but not for what their students do as learners. Students are responsible for their own learning’ (p.233), Frymier himself admitted that 'Teachers create the conditions where learning can take place ‘(p.234). With this perspective of determining a teacher’s influence on students’ achievement, various research showed that teachers’ performance is the important factor to improve student’ success (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Marzano, 2003; Randi & Zeichner, 2004). It is reported by Koops and Winsor (2006) that ‘the quality of education depends on the quality of teachers in the classroom’ (p.61). Odden (2004) assuming that student achievement can be increased by establishing standards for effective instructional strategies and using them in the
classroom. Furthermore, the study showed that the effectiveness of the teacher is the powerful factor for student achievement, and it is summarized by the authors, ‘More can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor’ (Wright, et al., 1997, p. 63). According to the study which analyzes the variety of factors by Darling-Hammond (1999, p. 38-39) stated that:

The findings of this study, in conjunction with a number of other studies in recent years, suggest that states interested in improving student achievement may be well-advised to attend, at least in part, to the preparation and qualifications of the teachers they hire and retain in the profession. It stands to reason that student learning should be enhanced by the efforts of teachers who are more knowledgeable in their field and skillful at teaching it to others. Substantial evidence from prior reform efforts indicates that changes in course taking, curriculum content, testing, or textbooks make little difference if teachers do not know how to use these tools well and how to diagnose their students’ learning needs.

With evidence of teacher’s effect on students’ achievement, researchers have focused on determining the relationship between teacher evaluation scores and students’ outcomes since the purposes of the teacher evaluation are to ensure teacher’s quality and to promote professional development. Some studies showed the link between teacher evaluation scores and student outcomes. As stated in the study by Milanowski, et al., (2004), there is a ‘substantial’ strong link between teachers’ score received by the evaluation and student’ success. Mathers et al. (2008) also agreed that there is a relationship between effective teaching and student outcomes. According to the study by Gallagher (2004), there was a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between teacher evaluation rating and student outcomes in reading, whereas there was no statistically significant relationship in mathematics. Most studies agreed that teacher evaluation scores are predictive of student success (Jacob & Lefgren, 2008; Kane & Staiger, 2012; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010; Tyler, et al., 2010).
However, as stated in the study by Halverson et al. (2004), principals and teachers could not notice the relationship between student achievement and teacher evaluation scores.

**Teacher Perception of Teacher Evaluation**

As performance evaluation is seen as an important factor for a teacher’s career, teachers’ attitudes have a vital role in the evaluation process. When the teacher has a positive attitude towards the evaluation process, the process is more meaningful and beneficial for the teacher. Milanowski and Heneman (2001) agreed that when the teacher believes the evaluation process is fair and standards focus on the quality teaching, teacher perceptions are likely to be positive. Educators generally agreed that the primary mission of education is to increase student achievement (Stronge & Grant, 2009). In agreement with teachers, the evaluation system must depend on the organization’s goals and mission (Stronge & Tucker, 1999; Tuytens & Devos, 2009).

However, most teachers believed that the evaluation systems do not lead to increased student achievement (Engram, 2007; Marks, 2005). Moreover, teachers believed that the evaluation process does not show teachers either their weaknesses and strengths nor their individual needs (Flores, 2012; Wacha, 2013). From a teacher: ‘A mere description of my lesson is not useful in helping figure out what I need to change. I know what I did in my lesson; now tell me what I should have done’ (Wacha, 2013, p.27).

The teacher believed that the evaluation does not help them to improve their teaching methods because of the lack of feedback (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). According to Zepeda (2002), teachers think that principals are just trying to meet the evaluation requirements or to catch teachers when they are doing something wrong. Teachers do not trust the evaluation process and the administrators who evaluate them.
Donaldson (2012) agreed that the teacher needs to trust the evaluator in order to get benefit from the feedback. According to Donaldson (2012, p.80): ‘For teachers to find these conjectures credible and respond to them with efforts to build on their strengths and address their weaknesses; they must trust the observer and have access to subsequent learning opportunities.’ On the other hand, most of the teachers mentioned that the teacher evaluation process helped them to improve their practice as well as student achievement (Astor, 2005; Colby, 2001; La Masa, 2005). In addition, as reported by Sporte et al. (2013), 76% of teachers participated in the study stated that the evaluation process encouraged their professional development.

As it is mentioned that the support of teachers may affect the success or failure of the evaluation system (Lane et al., 1998; Peterson & Peterson, 2006), it is necessary to determine teacher belief and concern about the evaluation process for implementing a more effective evaluation system. To increase student achievement, educators should enhance their evaluation processes (Ponticell & Zepeda, 2004). ‘Measuring teachers’ perceptions on the new policy helps… policy makers and school principals (as well as other school administrators) to analyze the problems teachers expect caused by the policy and to provide solutions for these problems’ (Tuytens & Devos, 2009, p.929).

**The Role of Principals**

Principals play a critical role in the teacher evaluation process by serving both individual teachers and organizational needs. The quality of teaching is gaining importance, and principals have to address this issue. As principals’ leadership styles can affect teachers’ performance, they have a challenging role regarding decision making. It is important that principals and teachers work cooperatively to create a positive environment in which they trust each other, share visions, and communicate
their concerns for learning openly. According to Davis et al. (2002), leadership plays a crucial role in determining the value of teacher evaluations. Moreover, the teacher evaluation system should emphasize the collaboration between teachers and administrators, share a common voice, and focus on professional development (Davis et al., 2002). The administration can show that it is taking care of its school as well as individuals by providing regular attention through evaluations.

Although teacher evaluations are intending to increase student achievement as well as teachers’ instructional skills, many teachers have experienced a formal teacher evaluation as “a principal’s report of teacher performance, usually recorded on a checklist form, and sometimes accompanied by a brief meeting” (Peterson, 2000, p.18). According to a study by Daley and Kim (2010), principals often evaluate teachers subjectively and inconsistently, and they do not possess training in evaluative methods. High-quality and intense training are first required for evaluators to ensure consistency in observations. Evaluators must be knowledgeable about the instruction and have appropriate training to evaluate teachers’ performance. Effective principals engage teachers about instructional strategies and professional development. They know how to support teachers by providing meaningful feedback. Additionally, the skill level of the evaluator may affect the validity of the teacher evaluation (Tucker & Stronge, 2005). A lack of subject familiarity can cause difficulty for the evaluator to assess teachers’ performance accurately (Donaldson, 2009). It is important to improve the quality of communication between teachers and evaluators to make evaluations effective. Moreover, communication can also improve the climate of the school. Cheng (2009)
shows that teacher participation in decision-making could improve job satisfaction and work engagement.

**Validity and Reliability of Teacher Evaluation**

The term validity is defined by The Standards for Educational Psychological Testing as ‘the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of the test scores entailed by proposed uses of tests ’ (American Educational Research Association, 1999, p.9). Valid teacher evaluation includes the criteria which are significant to determine efficient performance (Glickman et al., 2010). The reliability of the evaluation process depends on its objective. Burling (2012) believed that first it needs to define teacher effectiveness to establish a valid and reliable teacher evaluation system. Danielson (2008) also agreed that in order to validate teacher evaluations, effective instruction should be clearly defined to develop evaluation tools. Moreover, in accordance with the study by Tucker and Stronge (2005), the skill level of the evaluators may affect the validity of a teacher’s evaluation. For instance, evaluators had trouble evaluating teachers’ usefulness because of the lack of the familiarity with the subject (Donaldson, 2009).

Kimball (2002) stated three top components to determine the validity of teacher evaluation instruments: 1) Content validity is established with the participation of the experts in the field to develop the evaluation system and to confirm that it will evaluate teachers’ performance appropriately; 2) Construct validity refers to the results obtained from implementation of assessment tools to reflect what is being measured accurately; 3) Consequential validity refers to the decision made from the results of the evaluation.

Graham, et al., (2012) defined Inter-rater reliability ‘as the measurement of the consistency between evaluators in the ordering or relative standing of performance
ratings, regardless of the absolute value of each evaluator’s rating’ (p.5). According to Danielson (2007), the reliability of a teacher evaluation system was related to the training of evaluators. It is also suggested by Glickman et al. (2010) that to increase the reliability of teacher evaluation, evaluators should be aware of the common errors by participating in training (Glickman et al., 2010). Kimball and Milanowski (2009) showed concerns about the validity of the evaluations:

- relatively little emphasis is placed on following a uniform process; there is a low level of accountability for accurate evaluation unless a teacher’s job is at stake; evaluators are not required to take follow-up training, and the ratings have little consequence for most teachers (p.63)

The lack of consistency among the evaluators affects the reliability of teacher evaluation (Danielson, 2010). Also, Danielson (2010) suggested that evaluators must evaluate a teacher’s performance by using a reliable, valid evaluation tool regularly, and provide meaningful feedback to improve instruction for the purpose of having a reliable teacher evaluation system. It is important to give sufficient time to administrators to observe teachers, otherwise they can misevaluate a teacher’s performance (Pritchett et al., 2010).

**The Value of Feedback**

Feedback is essential for teachers’ development and growth. The teacher evaluation process should be used to assist teacher by providing meaningful feedback which can improve the quality of teaching. Harris (1986) defines the feedback and its purpose:

```
This term, so widely utilized in the various human professions, is unfortunate in many ways. It was borrowed from the field of electronics, where it refers to an amplification process that produces annoying, screeching noise (Jenerette, 1981). In many minds, feedback tends to emphasize telling and selling by an authority figure with passive listening by the teacher (p.186).
```
According to several researchers, the most critical dimensions of the feedback are timeliness, specificity, credibility, utility, and its intent (Goe et al., 2008; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988). Feedback should be honest, useful, creative, and act as a mirror to teachers’ practice. Tugend (2013) stated that the aim of the feedback is to help a person to improve and not to make them feel better, because positive feedback is not always good and negative feedback is not always bad. The aim of the feedback should be to close the gap between where a person is and where the person should be (Hattie, 2012). Without quality feedback, it is hard to create meaningful goals for professional development for teachers (Feeney, 2007). Although most teachers want to improve their instruction, they often do not know how to do it (Johnson, 1997). Because of this reason, administrators must provide feedback to teachers (Marzano et al., 2011). The result of the study (Weisberg et al., 2009) showed 75% of the teachers who were surveyed mentioned that they had not received specific feedback to help them to improve their instructional practice, although the feedback and support can affect teacher practices (Peterson, 2004). Teacher attitudes against the administrators affected their views of the feedback they received, and for this reason, the teacher needs to trust evaluators (Halverson et al., 2004; Kimball, 2002; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). Teacher perceptions of the feedback also related to the relationship between evaluator and teacher (Coggleshall, et al. 2010; Kimball, 2002). Evaluators should encourage teachers to be involved in the evaluation and two-way communication by creating a positive climate; they should encourage collaboration and give constructive feedback Danielson & McGreal, 2000, Kimball, 2002, Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2007; Xu & Sinclair, 2002; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003)
Teachers were concerned when they received feedback from only one person (Xu & Sinclair, 2002; Halverson et al., 2004), and to receive feedback from multiple sources was considered more objective, and useful. Researchers mentioned the four dimensions of effective feedback (Brookhart, 2012; Hattie, 2009; Wiggins, 2012; William, 2012):

- Specific and Goal Oriented Feedback: A teacher should receive feedback that has a goal, because by specifying the goals, they can evaluate how far they are reaching these goals (Wiggins, 2012). However, before setting the goals, it is essential to determine the current skills of each person to avoid overlapping their present knowledge, and to make sure that the desired result can be achieved with the feedback (Brookhart, 2012; Hattie, 2012).

- Attainable and Actionable Feedback: If the person wants to reach their intended goals, his effort will likely increase (William, 2012). It is important to pay attention to a person’s capacity to respond to the feedback (Chappuis, 2012; Wiggins, 2012). To give feedback at the wrong time may cause the person to shut down for further action (Chappuis, 2012).

- Timely Feedback: Researchers agree that it is important to provide feedback soon after the performance has been evaluated (Brookhart, 2012; Chappuis, 2012; Wiggins, 2012). Timely feedback gives an opportunity to teachers to think about their performance (Brookhart, 2012).

- Consistent and Credible Feedback: If the teacher believes that the feedback will improve their performance, they may use it. Therefore, feedback should be accurate, stable and trustworthy (Wiggins, 2012). According to Cantrell and Scantlebury
Feedback is more likely to be used when the system is aligned with what teachers view as best practices; the parts of the system connect logically; scoring processes are reliable; and the indicators do, in fact, indicate what helps students learn better’ (p. 32).

**Summative and Formative Evaluation**

Evaluations are commonly classified as formative and summative in nature. In Stake’s (1991) words, “When a cook tastes the soup, that’s formative; when the guests taste the soup, that’s summative” (quoted in Scriven, 1991, p.169). Similarly, Collinson (2001) states that the distinction between summative and formative evaluation is that “One operates as a deficit model, the other as a growth model; one acts as the stick, the other as a carrot; one represents teacher passivity, the other, active teacher involvement; one is externally motivated, the other internally motivated” (p.151).

The main aim of formative evaluations is to improve the quality of teaching by providing evidence of instructional implementation. Formative evaluations focus on the teacher’s performance and what can be done to improve the teacher’s instructional skills by providing professional development and building collaboration between faculty members. Evaluators indicate the aspects of the teacher’s performance that need growth and make suggestions. Additionally, formative evaluations take place many times during the academic year. Glickman et al. (2010) define formative evaluations as a “supervisory function intended to assist and support teachers in professional growth and the improvement of teaching” (p. 276).

Summative evaluations primarily aim to develop and use data to notify summary judgments of teachers. They are mostly used to make decisions about teacher employment such as promotions, dismissals, and salary increases. Goe (2007) states
decisions related to salaries, rewards, dismissals, and tenure are made by summative evaluations. Additionally, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2010) define summative evaluations as “an administrative function intended to meet the organizational need for teacher accountability” (p. 275). Summative evaluations can help to determine whether or not teachers are meeting the necessary requirements to be effective. Summative evaluations can be very stressful for teachers because they affect their future employment.

Teachers’ attitude toward the evaluation process differs based on whether the evaluation is formative or summative. While formative evaluations provide ongoing feedback to improve instruction, summative evaluations are seen as a formal procedure that provides information about the professional development needs of the teacher as well as aiding in human resources decision-making (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Moreover, teachers believe that formative evaluations can improve instruction and make substantial changes in the classroom while summative evaluations cannot (Flores, 2012; Marks, 2005; Sutton, 2008). Marks (2005) performed a study that compared the formative and summative evaluation systems used in two Michigan schools. The study shows that while the teachers who use formative evaluations believed there is a connection between the evaluation process and instruction, the teachers who use the summative system believe that the evaluations did not enhance the professional instruction.

Teacher evaluation mostly is used to make human resources decisions such as keeping or releasing teachers instead of improving instruction. According to researchers, the objective of neither summative evaluations nor formative evaluations is
met. The system is seen as a checklist-oriented process with a lack of clear standards for job roles, expectations, and functions (O’Day, 2002). Another study by Brandt et al. (2007) that examines teacher evaluation policies found that

District policy documents were more apt to specify the process involved in teacher evaluation (who conducts the evaluation, when, and how often) than they were to provide guidance for the content of the evaluation, the standards by which the evaluation would be conducted, or the use of the evaluation results (p. iii–iv).

Because of the lack of the clear guidelines and standards and the limited time for evaluation, the evaluators were not able to hold the teacher accountable for fulfilling their duties. Moreover, Donaldson (2010) reports that “Both principals and teachers believe that teachers are less effective than ratings indicate” (p. 55).

Many of the deficiencies of formative evaluations are connected to the problem in summative assessments. As mentioned above, it is hard for evaluators to provide effective feedback to teachers because of a lack of the standards for effective evaluation (Brandt et al., 2007; Koppich & Showalter, 2008). The study by Weisberg et al. (2009) shows that only 26% of teachers received feedback on ways to improve their practice. Weisberg et al. (2009) summarized the tradition evaluation system by stating that, “Excellent teachers cannot be recognized or rewarded, chronically low-performing teachers languish, and the wide majority of teacher performing at moderate levels do not get the differentiated support and development they need to improve as professionals” (p. 6). Marzano (2012) also mentions that because teacher evaluations are not able to determine ineffective and effective teachers or develop teachers’ skills, the system has failed. It is important to clearly define teacher effectiveness and how the effectiveness will be measured to have a reliable teacher evaluation system (Burling, 2012). However, Larsen (2005) states, “accountability-based teacher evaluation
practices tend to increase stress, anxiety, fear, and mistrust among teachers, and limit growth, flexibility, and creativity” (p. 292). Formative evaluations present teachers with an opportunity to identify the desired outcomes before the observation. By doing so, teachers are encouraged to use the feedback to improve their instructional strategies.

There has been an ongoing debate about the use of summative and formative evaluations. Some researchers think that these evaluation types should be separated because of their purposes and uses. Fite (2006) states,

Formative faculty evaluation to improve teaching and performance should be separated from summative faculty evaluation used to make personnel decisions. Faculty members who participate in good faith in faculty evaluation to improve their teaching, research, and service must not find that criticism made for formative purposes are subsequently used against them when applying for retention, tenure, and promotion. Both formative and summative faculty evaluation are very important but should be kept separate. An institution should not introduce a faculty evaluation system whose purpose if formative and then gradually transform it into a summative use for personnel decisions (pgs. 196-197).

On the other hand, others feel that the teacher performance evaluation system should focus on both types of evaluations to provide accountability for personnel decisions and professional development. Zepeda (2006) declares:

There are several inherent tensions between the fields of instructional supervision and teacher evaluation. The primary tension includes the belief that the same person cannot provide both formative support (e.g. supervision and coaching) and then later evaluated the overall performance of the teacher for purposes of continued employment. Another tension with the supervision-evaluation or formative-summative tug-o-war is the fact that in many schools, evaluation is practiced as instructional supervision; however, the purpose of evaluation and supervision needs to not be in direct opposition (p.108).

Ultimately, it is important to use both summative and formative evaluations to accomplish the needs of the teachers and schools. As Stronge (1997) mentions, “Performance improvement and accountability purposes are not competing, but
supportive interest- dual interests that are essential for improvement of education service delivery” (p. 4). The main focus of formative evaluations is to improve performance while summative evaluations identify whether or not the performance is improved. Therefore, both types of evaluation are essential. When only summative evaluations are used, teachers cannot receive effective feedback, which is necessary for teachers to improve their weaknesses. Similarly, without the consequences of summative evaluations, formative evaluations cannot provide enough encouragement for teachers to pursue professional development based on feedback.
CHAPTER 2
EVALUATION OF TEACHERS PERFORMANCE IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA, USA

Performance evaluation of teachers is very significant in the sector of Education since it is a design that aids in the learning growth of the students and ensures efficient instruction. In the State of Florida, the performance evaluation results of teachers are used to create a plan for improvement at the school and district level (Christopher & Lora, 2012). The same results can also be utilized in the identification of professional development and making informed decisions for the school administrators and instructional personnel. There have been some critical changes during the time of teachers’ performance evaluation in the State of Florida. Two recent proposals on education reforms by the Senate have triggered debate on significant changes on the school system making it one of the top policy agenda in the State of Florida (Davis & Research and Education Association, 2006). The proposals were the Senate Bill 6 and 736, which was later adopted as a law in 2011. The law emphasized the need to change the profession of teaching in the state of Florida.

History of The Teacher Evaluation in The State of Florida, USA

The teacher evaluation exercise in the State of Florida began in the late 1990s, at a time when the districts were required to undertake teacher evaluation based on the student performance encompassing the learning gains (Stronge et al. 2008). The districts were to use this evaluation in awarding the best performing teachers. However, insufficient funding from the states to pay the best performing teachers led to a reduction of buy-in of districts thus resulting to cumbersome pay plans. (Wilkerson & Lang, 2007). According to the 1997 Florida Statutes, 231.29, the assessment procedures and criteria can be summarized the following way;
Each district was responsible for implementing an evaluation system; the department reviewed and approved each system that applied to teachers,

Evaluations were required for each employee once per year,

Evaluations were to be designed for continuous quality improvement of educational services,

Evaluations must be based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective practices,

Parent input was included and each district had to review its evaluation system each year to make improvements,

Evaluation criteria were applied to instructional personnel (teachers, guidance counselors, etc.), school administrators and supervisors,

The evaluation criteria were: ability to maintain discipline; knowledge of subject matter; ability to plan and deliver instruction; ability to evaluate instructional needs; ability to communicate with parents; other professional competencies determined by the district of State Board rules,

Only categories referred to were satisfactory and unsatisfactory. There were consequences for evaluations: one unsatisfactory evaluation required a 90-day improvement plan and, if the employee remains unsatisfactory, could be cause for dismissal.

Beginning in 1999, the evaluation criteria were changed as (1999 Florida Statutes, 231.29): performance of students; ability to maintain discipline; knowledge of subject matter; ability to plan and deliver instruction; ability to evaluate instructional needs; ability to communicate with parents; other professional competencies. The districts were to use this evaluation in awarding the best performing teachers. Before 2006, the traditional way of compensating teachers was through scales of payment whose reward was based on teachers' work experience and their advanced level of education. (Odden & Wallace, 2008). This method was viewed by many as teacher-centered rather than the integrated teacher-learner centered education system.
Beginning in 2011 with the Student Act, the teacher performance evaluation is designed to support student learning growth and to identify professional development. The evaluation’s result is used when developing district and school level improvement plans. The newly proposed system was based on the performance of the teachers to warranty salary increment (Johnson et al. 2009). This means that it does not matter the number of years one served as a teacher or the level of advanced education, but salary increment of a particular teacher is to be dictated by the performance. In evaluating the performance, the system required that evaluation must focus on at least 50% of the value the teachers add to the achievement of the students until 2015 (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2011). The annual statewide assessment should be done on students' performance.

The system proposed the use of data as an indicator of students' performance hence a clear indication of the teachers' performance (Bondy & Ross, 2005). Progressive assessment of student performance regarding grades per subject at the district level by the District evaluation team is one of the factors considered in evaluating the teachers' performance. Under this new law, teachers are categorized into four distinct groups concerning performance. The first category is highly qualified, followed by adequate, then needing improvement and finally unsatisfactory (Behrstock-Sherratt, 2013).

Besides, Senate Bill 736 has done away with the previous policy of the state, which placed jurisdiction on districts to award the teachers' tenure after an average of 3 to 5 years of service provision by extending the contracts of their professional service into long-term (In Dowdy & Wynne, 2005). The new law offered yearly contracts that
expired at the end of every year irrespective of the teachers' length of service for all the teachers employed after July 1, 2011. A continuous debate on teaching, learning and the duty of the institution of the public school system by various factions have been caused by the provisions of the new law. Most people in the sector of education have found it hard to cope with the new changes, and some argue that it infringes on their right of teaching in a free environment without any evaluation (Horn & Wilburn, 2013). The proponents of the new regulations believe that it is the only way the education system can be enhanced and improved in the State of Florida. The system considers the value added to the student in term of performance a bigger deal than normal status quo.

**Current Teacher Evaluation System in The State of Florida, USA**

Systems of teacher evaluation in the State of Florida are properly designed to enhance achievement of the students and improve the instructions given by the teachers as cited in the Student Success Act and Race to the Top. The evaluation results help in provision of development considered professional for instructional personnel and assist in improvement plan development for the schools and district (1012.34, F.S. (2) (a)). The Department of Education is mandated to monitor programs and provide effective training so that there is a clear understanding of the evaluation procedures and criteria by individuals responsible for the evaluation exercise. (1012.34, F.S. (2) (f)). The criteria for teacher evaluation should entail at least one-third of the students' performance and practices of instructional personnel, in addition to the other performance indicators (1012.34, F.S. (3)). It is necessary that teachers who are already employed should have their performance evaluation done at least once annually and newly recruited teachers evaluated at least twice in the first year of their teaching
career. (1012.34, F.S. (3) (a)). The performance evaluation exercise should distinguish the four existing performance levels namely ‘Highly effective,’ ‘Effective,’ ‘Needs improvement,’ and ‘Unsatisfactory’ (1012.34, F.S. (2) (e)). Each school district in the State of Florida can use their standardized instructional framework.

According to 2016 Florida Statutes (1012.34, Personnel evaluation procedure and criteria), the new system of evaluation as proposed by the Senate Bill 6 and Senate Bill 736 focuses on three main areas. First, it emphasizes the development of the system that evaluates the performance of a teacher. As earlier pointed out, the system is broken down into four aspects which are monitored transparently and independently. The first category which is the "highly qualified" encompasses all teachers with excellent performance track record and are highly dedicated to their terms of service. Evaluation is done statewide with best-performing teachers placed in this category. The second group comprises of teachers with an average score, and they are categorized as, "qualified'. Again, their evaluation is done based on looking at the result of the students. It is the students' performance, which put teachers in a particular category. The third group which "needs improvement" comprise all teachers who are below average regarding performance. The final category is where all teachers with poor evaluations are found, and they are grouped as "unsatisfactory". This is an alarming group, which requires urgent measures to curb any further decline in the students' performance within the system of education in Florida. With this kind of ranking, it is easier for the state department of education to impose measures to improve on the teacher's work plan. The school superintendent of the districts is given the responsibility of establishing and evaluating related duties of the school personnel and their
respective responsibilities, in accordance with 2016 Florida Statutes (1012.34, Personnel evaluation procedure and criteria). All the school administrators and the system of evaluating the schools within the districts have to be approved by the Department of Education.

Secondly, the current system also impacts the compensation systems that are tied to the performance evaluation other than the experience and education of the teachers. The initial system factored compensation of teachers on the experience level and teaching ranks of faculty and did not put into consideration the performance of the teachers when evaluated (Odden & Wallace, 2008). This part of the proposal has remained contentious for the Senate Bill since it required that the traditional pay scale is discarded and contracts of long-term professional eliminated from the system. Under the law, annual salary adjustments for administrators of the school and instructional personnel were to be provided by the districts. The salary adjustments that were to be done annually should be reserved for those teachers who achieved sufficient rates of performance (Johnson et al. 2009). The modifications were expected to be the educators’ base pay for their permanent increment rather than the one-time stipends or bonuses they were being offered. This system of annual salary adjustment encouraged the performance of teachers, which in turn may lead to the significant positive outcome from the students. It is viewed as a competitive age system that provides healthy competition among teachers to ensure positive results.

Finally, the new teacher performance system seeks to eliminate the long-term professional service contracts that are provided for at the district level and replace it with recurring annual contracts. The new policy proposes that those teachers who are
employed after their period of probation should have the right to continuous annual contracts (House of Commons Education Committee, 2012). The districts can choose to renew the teachers’ contracts without any objection provided the teacher in question finished the cycle of his/her annual contract. This system would ensure the performance of the teachers is enhanced and improved every time due to the close supervision by the district officials as set out in the law.

**The Value-Added Model**

To measure the growth of student learning in the State of Florida, the student growth implementation committee evaluated eight different Value-Added Models (VAM) to come up with the right Model of measuring an increase in student learning. Generally, the value added model uses the current and previous test scores to evaluate the teacher's role in the student growth achievement. William Sander developed VAM as a statistical model, and it was designed to calculate the teacher's contribution to students on a yearly basis based on the ratio of the entire performance of a student (Behrstock-Sherratt, 2013). In particular, the use of VAM method in the state of Florida helps in determining the teacher's tenure and contract termination, the needs for professional development, and qualification for pay bonuses. Additionally, it has a significant impact on the professional reputation of a teacher. The method also acts as a tool for decision-making.

Having explored different models, the committee recommended the use of class covariate adjustment models. Covariate adjustment model starts by analyzing the projected growth for every student concerning the student historical data every year (Christopher & Lora, 2012). The model also represents the actual growth as observed among the learners who have got same test scores in the last two years. The Covariate
Adjustment Model developed by the Student Growth Implementation Committee accounts for three most important aspects; the characteristics of the student, the classroom characteristic, and the characteristic of school. Considering the characteristic of students, two previous years of student achievement are put into an account, including the severe predictor of the growth of the student. Also checked is the number of subjects the students enrolled for and their relevance to the courses taken.

Other factors under consideration in students’ characteristics are; the status of students regarding disability, the English language learner, the student attendance, the gifted situation of students, their mobility or the transition number, and the variation from the age model in grade basically as a retention indicator. Based on classroom characteristic, the VAM model focuses on the size of the class and its condition about provision of the conducive environment for learning process (Johnson et al., 2009).

The use of this type of VAM also recognizes an independent factor that is related to the learning environment that has an impact on the students’ way of learning. It is also known as the school component, and in the statistic, it is the factor controlled for in the measured model at the level of the school simply by subject and grade (Behrstock-Sherratt, 2013). The school component in this model may represent what the school has regarding leadership, culture, and environment on the learning of the students. In developing the Covariate Adjustment Model, the SGIC made a decision to include 50% of the component of the school to measure the effectiveness of the teacher (Teacher Value-Added Score = Unique Teacher Component + .50 * Common School Component). The inclusion of a small fraction of the school component to the measurement of the efficacy of a teacher helps in recognizing how teachers to some
extent contribute to the overall component of the school. However, some factors can be embedded within the academic component which is beyond the teacher’s control and, therefore, they cannot be directly held accountable for (Christopher & Lora, 2012).

Florida’s value-added models draw on data from FCAT and Grade 9 Algebra I statewide assessments. The Commissioner has approved formulas for courses associated with FCAT 2.0 and grade 9 Algebra I. The formula produces a value-added score for a teacher, which reflects the average amount of learning growth of the teacher’s students above or below the expected learning growth of similar students in the state, using the variables accounted for in the model.

- A score of “0” indicates that, on average, students performed no better or worse than expected based on the factors in the model.
- A positive score indicates that students, on average, performed better than expected.
- A negative score indicates that students, on average, performed worse than expected.

Many teachers receive value-added scores in more than one grade or subject, and teacher value-added scores are aggregated over time. Using the average yearly growth on FCAT by students statewide in each grade and subject, the Aggregate VAM Score displays the VAM score as a proportion of that average growth. The Aggregate VAM Score also combines a teacher’s results from grades and subjects taught. For courses not associated with statewide assessments, districts determine how their local assessment data is used for teacher evaluation purposes.

As a matter of fact, the Florida’s VAM has been a section of the multi-faceted system of evaluation for teachers, and it was independently developed by the Florida committee of education. The State of Florida adopted this VAM since it accounts for
even factors that are found beyond the teacher’s responsibility. It also evaluates teachers comprehensively since it doesn't rely on one test score or the data generated in one year only. The process of development of the VAM is a continuous process. Both the Department of Education, American Institute of Research, and the SGIC still work together to continue analyzing the developed Value Added Model with the aim of getting the right feedback from the stakeholders to assist them necessary adjustment if needed (Christopher & Lora, 2012).

The developed Value-Added Model in Florida had some advantages to students and teachers. For instance, teachers are assigned a class of students with different characteristic and proficiency level to teach them and bring them to the same footing. Secondly, the VAM levels the playing ground by putting in consideration the characteristics and proficiency of the assigned students to teachers. Finally, the VAM are designed in such a way to mitigate the effect of differences among the entry level classes to avoid any form of disadvantage or advantage to school or teachers’ students with different characteristics. The changes that have been effected together with the current system of teachers’ evaluation in the State of Florida can be described as a significant step the state has made in improving its education system.
People can be beneficial to the society only by receiving a good education. In other words, the quality of education plays a prominent role in the development of a country. Moreover, the regulation and design of education system gain much more crucial importance in the future of a country when this country has a highly centralized education system, such as Turkey. The education system in Turkey consists of two establishments: (1) the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), which administers K-12 education, and (2) the Council of Higher Education, which administers higher education in Turkey (Senel, 1998). The MoNE consists of central, provincial, overseas organizations and affiliated institutions, and it is responsible for all educational services in the country, in accordance with the provisions of the National Education Basic Act, numbered 1739, which was enacted in 1973. Educational supervision in the Turkish Education system is carried out by the MoNE. Two separate units exist for supervision: The Directorate of Guidance and Inspection in the central organization of the MoNE, and The Directorate of Education Supervisors in provincial.

History of The Teacher Evaluation System in Turkey

When it comes to the Turkish education system, it is not known exactly when the inspection services started and the titles of appointments for this task were made. It seems that the need for the inspection and supervision subsystem in the Turkish Education System was felt during the Tanzimat Period. In the Turkish Education System, the historical development of educational inspection can be examined by dividing into two periods: pre-republic era and republican era.
In the early days of the Ottoman Empire, schools were opened and managed by religious communities, so there was no system of control in today's sense. Supervisors were then assigned to check the schools that had opened. After 1862, along with the beginning of the schooling period, the concept of supervision and supervisors began to be used, although it did not have a systematic approach (Öz, 2003). The “Instructions to be Submitted to the Hodjas of Primary (Sibyan) Schools”, which was accepted as the first regulation concerning the inspection was published in 1846. This regulation refers to supervisors for elementary schools as “Mekatibi Muin (School Supervisor)”. In this period, the inspection service was carried out by the “Provincial Education Boards” (Aydın, 1986). This regulation demonstrates that Muins (supervisors) were assigned to supervise the Elementary (Sibyan) and Middle (Rüştiye) schools. Muins were given the task of guiding teachers and inspecting schools. Muin means helper, guide, and director. In that period, the term was used to define supervisor (Taymaz, 2012). Therefore, for the first time, supervising was considered as a teaching aid.

One of the documents known about supervising in the history of Turkish education is the Council of Education manual issued in 1876 (Akyüz, 1989). This documentary mentioned subjects such as; “Once those who are in charge of supervising schools in various regions are indicated, they will inspect the schools once a week on the following topics: Do teachers, servants and students attend school regularly? Are the students being well trained? Are they paying attention to prevent strangers from entering the schools? Are students being observed not to misbehave outside of school? Are students being instructed to write their lessons on the board every day and are they being questioned on what they have learned? Are they being
lectured by other people in the class and with books that are officially prohibited? Are the teachers teaching properly and are any of them incapable of teaching? Are they paying attention if students are going home in groups quietly in the evenings, and not spitting and disturbing anyone? (In order to ensure the last point, the teachers will give lectures every day after classes, and at least once a week, a teacher will walk beside the children.)” (Buluç, 1997).

Three inspectorates were set up in 1879, including Istanbul, Anatolian side and Rumelia side inspectorates as Maarif-i Umumiye (General Education) centers. In 1889, supervisors were assigned to foreign and minority schools. In 1894, supervisors were commissioned to supervise provincial centers. In the same period, another group was added to the already existing supervisor group in the name of the Educational Supervisor of the Imperial Rumelia Province (Vahapoğlu, 1990).

With the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, the issue of inspections had become one of the important topics on the agenda. During this period, the general purpose of inspections was to supervise the education and training activities of minority schools on behalf of the state. This situation contradicted the aims of minority schools. In the years following the declaration of the second constitutional system, amendments were made in accordance with concept of constitutionalism in the state administration. Teaching programs were changed and the problem of training the teachers had been discussed.

“Instructions Concerning the Duties of the Supervisors of Mekatib-i Ibtidaiye (Elementary Schools)”, the first regulation to state the capacities of the duties and authorities of the Ministry of Education Supervisors, was published in 1910. With this
regulation, it is observed that supervisors had conducted investigations as well as supervising and guidance duties. Among the topics included in the scope of the investigation are: the number of classrooms, location of school, necessary work and operations to be done according to the number of students living in the villages. The subjects included in the scope of the supervising were the supervision of the teaching, the school fixtures and the equipment used in the school. This regulation also requires the supervisors to determine and prevent the use of books that are not approved by the “Grand Education Board” (Aydıın, 1986). It was emphasized that the inspectorate was a serious institution with the “Instruction Concerning the Duties of the Supervisors of Elementary Level Education” published in 1914. In addition, the organization of supervisors was accomplished in provinces, cities and municipals (Aytekin, 1991). The issued regulation requires the supervisors to determine the extent to which the teaching and learning of the areas they have supervised is appropriate for the law, to examine the teachers' courses, attitudes and behaviors, in addition to checking the school fixtures. They were asked to prepare a report on the required precautions for the related institution in the light of findings they obtained as a result of their supervision (Aydıın, 1986). As mentioned in this regulation, it is required that supervisors be sensitive while guiding teachers. Supervisors are expected to consider teachers' sensitivities during guiding, and be understanding towards their privacies (Aydıın, 1986). Supervision in the first years of the Republic is generally aimed at ensuring advances in education, enabling to train teachers at work, enlightening teachers and helping them to improve themselves with innovations. The first study on inspection and supervision during the Republican period was a regulation on the Duties of Primary Education Supervisors,
which was enacted in 1923. The first document on the selection of inspectors can be considered as the “Instructions for Primary Education Supervisors” dated 1927. According to the instructions, to be a primary school supervisor, it was necessary to be a primary school graduate; be between the ages of 24-45; and to teach for five years in primary school. Primary school assistant principals and teachers of education classes could be supervisors, if they wanted to. The supervisor could be selected and assigned by the direct orders of National Education directors or education chiefs. According to the “Instruction on the Selection from the Applicants for the Primary Educational Supervisors”, principals and teachers of primary schools who have completed 25 years of age and graduates of “middle schools for teachers” who have been teaching for at least two years could be inspectors without an exam (Başar, 1993).

A development report prepared in 1926 stated that guiding supervisors were needed. Accordingly, it is envisaged to raise the intellectual level of teachers, to encourage them to read and examine, to teach advanced teaching and learning methods, and to raise awareness about the economic movements of education. The program is intended to train supervisors to focus on the subject (Su, 1974). In 1929, the “Guide to Primary Education Supervisors” listed the personal and professional characteristics required for primary school supervisors’ auditors, and it also stated that the supervisor must first be a good teacher. In 1933, the Ministry of National Education was expanded and the formation and duties of the Supervision Board were determined. According to law enforced in 1938, to become an education supervisor or a graduate of an equal-level foreign country school, it is required to be a graduate of the Gazi Institution of Education. In addition, supervisors were being assigned by ministry (Başar,
In-service training for supervisors was first mentioned in the “Regulation for Primary Education Supervisor Internship” published in 1945. In 1950, Ministry Supervisors gathered in Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir.

From 1862 to this day, there have been many changes in the supervision system and selection of supervisors. The inspectors were performing their duties under the authority of the Ministry of National Education before the enforcement of the law no. 6528 published in 2014 named as, “The Law on the Amendment of the Basic Law on National Education and Some Laws and Decree Laws”. The structure of the ministry was divided into two under the names of central and provincial organizations. The central organization was structured under the name of the Department of Supervision Board affiliated to the Ministry of National Education Guidance and Supervision Units. The inspectors serving in the central organization of the Ministry were given the title of “Ministry Supervisor”, and inspectors working in the provincial organization were given the titles of “Primary Education Supervisor” (Taymaz, 2012). But with the law numbered 6528, fundamental changes have also been made in the supervision system. With this law, the two titles of supervision were brought to an end and the supervision unit in the central organization of the ministry and the supervision unit in the provincial provinces were consolidated under the single structure named as “Department of Guidance and Supervision”. This merger has changed the name of the ministerial supervisors and the education supervisors to “Education Supervisors”. According to this law, the procedures and principles for selection, assignment, duties etc. of "education supervisors" shall be determined by regulation. The related regulation has been published in the Official Gazette (2014). This regulation defines the duties, authorities and responsibilities,
appointments, assignments, working procedures and principles of the Education Supervisors. A three-year institutional supervision and development plan model has been introduced in the supervision system with the "Ministry of National Education Department of Guidance and Supervision and Department of Education Supervisors Regulation", which was prepared by the Department of Guidance and Supervision and published in the Official Gazette (2014). In this context, it is necessary to prepare the three-year supervision programs for the period of 2014-2017 by the Department of Education Supervisors. Within the scope of the plan, provincial and district directorates, combined classes, primary schools, middle schools, all high school types, private education institutions, private student dormitories and other institutions will be included in the three-year supervision program. These supervisions will be conducted with a focus on guidance, and follow-up plans will be prepared for the improvement areas identified in the institutions at the end of the supervisions.

**Literature Review**

As a result of the desire to regulate and supervise social life in Turkey through education, education supervision has been applied for many years with the understanding of checking, searching for mistakes, and “supervising” and evaluating teachers for not behaving erroneously. The vast majority of research on educational supervision in Turkey reveals that there are significant problems in the system. The supervision process is not appropriate for its intended purpose, the supervised teaching process is far from improving the professional skills of the teachers, and supervisors cannot fulfill the duties expected from them adequately.

There are a number of studies that emphasize the negative consequences of bilateralism in the form of ministry inspectors and education supervisors. It is mentioned
that the lack of an organic integrity and cooperation between the two supervisory departments negatively affects the supervision understanding that is based on the improvement of professional assistance for teachers and teaching (Memduhoğlu et al., 2007). The fact that ministry inspectors are generally focused on institutional supervision based on operating conception does not coincide with the concept of supervision that primarily focuses on guidance to improve the teaching process and professional development (Balcı et al., 2007; Eyi, 2007). As a matter of fact, it is stated that the majority of the teachers have not received class supervision and guidance for many years, and that ministry inspectors could not provide the continuity of course supervision in middle schools which is their assigned duty (Taymaz, 2002). In the study conducted by Dağlı (2006), it was revealed that the problems that the education supervisors had the most difficulties with were because they had to be attached to the Provincial Directorates of National Education, the investigation task assigned to them and the heavy work load.

In research conducted by Memduhoğlu (2009), it has been revealed that teachers and administrators are more concerned about the control of the documents, the lack of focusing on teachers’ in-class teaching deficiencies and their professional development, but that this approach has recently been partially changed. According to Balcı et al. (2007), control-oriented supervision leads to defending supervision, obscuring incompletes and wrongdoings. It is contrary to the developer’s function of modern control that the supervisor, who should be the most qualified person in the system, reports the issues and shortfalls in the system and does not focus on correcting and improving them. It is inevitable that teachers and supervisors should have
communication and interaction throughout the supervision. Within this relationship, trust, respect, cooperation and understanding are equally important for both teachers and supervisors at the same time (Yılmaz, 2007). It is stated that there is no open and healthy communication between the supervisors and the teachers as stated in many of the studies, and it is considered that the reasons for this are; the negative perception towards supervision, the attitudes of supervisors and the duty of the investigation carried out by supervisors (Büyükışık 1989; Ecevit 1996; Kartal 1997; Sarı, 1987; Memişoğlu, 2001; Ünal, 1999).

Educational supervisors supervise both class and branch teachers. However, the lack of a sufficient number of supervisors from each branch in each city requires supervisors to supervise branch teachers when they are not qualified for the assignment. In this case, it is difficult for the supervisor to provide sufficient guidance and counseling. In many studies, it is revealed that the numbers of supervisors were inadequate and the workloads were heavy (Arabacı, 1995; Can, 2004; Dağlı, 2004; Kapusuzoğlu, 2008; Memişoğlu, 2001; Ünal, 1999). Because of this, not enough time is devoted to guidance, and supervisions are often completed in a limited time of one or two class hours. (Sabancı & Günbayı, 2004).

A study has shown that supervisions are not conducted within a natural process as it is necessary to have in supervisions for elementary schools; on the contrary, the school administrator notifies the teachers prior to the supervision and the problems are being solved in order to please the supervisor. The school administrator and the teachers are trying to cover the issues within their responsibility. In addition, the artificial
relationship between the school administrator-supervisor-teacher makes it difficult to have an objective supervision. (Can, 2004).

According to research by Topçu and Aslan (2009), Argon (2010), Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013), the majority of teachers stated that school principals could better evaluate themselves. Bursalioğlu (2002) emphasized that school principals must go through an academic education in order to be competent. However, it is known that the vast majority of school principals do not undergo academic education. It is a fact that school principals, who do not have the necessary qualification for guidance, cannot serve for the intended purpose of guidance. Therefore, it is better for school principals to participate in the supervision and guidance work after having the necessary qualification in the field of supervision and guidance. Yılmaz (2009) shows that school principals do not take managerial education as the most important reason why they cannot perform supervision duties. However, Taşdan (2008) and Topçu and Aslan (2009) point out that the increase of managerial responsibilities and duties of school principals affect the effectiveness of supervision / guidance in a negative way. Özmen and Batmaz (2006) state that the vast majority of school principals do not have enough knowledge and skills to conduct supervisions which stands as an obstacle to the fulfillment of supervision activities. In the research conducted by Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013), the vast majority of teachers negatively evaluate school principals' supervisions because of the lack of objectivity and expertise required to perform supervision/guidance duties. In addition, the fact that duties and responsibilities of the school principals is high, and that the education administration is not considered as an
expertise, resulted in the failure of school principals to fulfill the roles of educational leadership and supervisor/guidance (Akçay & Başer, 2004; Kaykanacı, 2003).

**Current Teacher Evaluation System in Turkey**

In the Turkish Educational System, there exist several regulations that regulate the in-class inspection of teachers. According to the article 43 of the Ministry of National Education, Primary Education Inspection Presidency Regulation, the duties and responsibilities of inspectors are a) Guidance and on-duty training, b) Inspection and Evaluation, c) Investigation, d) Inquiry and e) Research. Afterwards, as mentioned before, the inspection system of the Ministry of National Education was subject to a major overhaul, as a result of a change made in the Legislation numbered 6528 of Decree Law on Organization and Duties of Ministry of National Education numbered 652. According to this new restructuring, education inspectors working in the Department of Guidance and Inspection of the ministry along with those working in the Provincial Department of Education Inspectors carry out the duties of guidance, inspection, research, investigation, inquiry and preliminary examination (Official Gazette 2014a). In the article numbered 57 of the regulation, which regulates the duties and responsibilities of inspectors and deputy inspectors, there is no mention of teacher or class inspection (Official Gazette 2014b). In one sense, it means that their responsibility of executing in-class inspections is taken from them while only mentioning their responsibilities regarding administrative inspection. Following these changes, it was proposed that the in-class inspections should be performed by the directors who are responsible for the purposeful administration, evaluation and amelioration of the school. Even though it seems as if the duty of on-duty training was given to the school principal,
in the previous regulation (MoNE, 2011), the school principal was also responsible for the class inspections by attending classes.

According to the 2011 Teacher Inspection Guide of the Ministry of National Education, teacher inspection was defined as the inspection of papers, class schedules, evaluation of teaching-learning environments, tools, equipment and technologies, inspection of the value given to the student and the capacity of counseling, evaluation of the special field program and its content, surveillance of their teaching capacities and their individual characteristics. It was proposed that, for teachers who performed poorly during the evaluation, an improvement plan should be prepared by the inspector, teacher and the school principal in order to improve them in the areas where they are found to be lacking in.

With the provision appeared in the Official Gazette (2015) beginning with the school year of 2015-2016, all teachers were to be evaluated by school principals and this evaluation was to be taken into account when handing out certificates of achievement to the teachers.

"Criteria for evaluation -ARTICLE 54 –

1. According to the hereby regulation, any teacher that works in any kind of educational institution of any level belonging to the Ministry and has completed their candidature process is to be evaluated by the principal of the educational institution they are part of.

2. The Form found in Attachment-3 is taken as a basis for the criteria for evaluation. The evaluations are made through a module created in MEBSİS, one month following the end of the school year.

3. The evaluations that are covered by this article are to be executed in time, in accordance with the principles and methods announced by the Ministry and in an objective and impartial way by the Provincial Director of National Education.

4. These evaluations are taken into account when handing out a certificate of achievement to the teachers.
5. General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development is responsible for the resolution of any problems that may arise concerning the execution of the evaluation and the guidance of the practice."

There are 3 different sections found in the form mentioned in the criteria for evaluation: criteria to be used in the evaluation of school counselors, criteria to be used by special education teachers and criteria to be used by teachers that do not belong to these two groups. According to the teachers’ performance evaluation rubric, there are ten categories, each category has five sub-categories, and the evaluation scale is as follows: never (0 points), rarely (0.5 points), sometimes (1 points), often (1.5 points), and always (2 points). The highest score is 100 point (0-59: inadequate, 60-74: medium, 75-89: good, 90-100: excellent).
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

All countries are attempting to develop their schools with the aim of improving the society and economy of the country. It is obvious that teachers are central to school improvement efforts. To improve the effectiveness and equity of education, it is crucial that all students receive high-quality teaching, which is provided by high-quality teachers. Therefore, teacher performance evaluation remains one of the most controversial processes within education systems all over the world. This research aims to examine the teacher evaluation systems in the State of Florida, USA, and in Turkey to present the similarities and differences. The study explains the teacher evaluation systems in the State of Florida and Turkey by comparing them in terms of the purposes of the teacher evaluations, the expectations from the teachers, the teacher evaluation structures, and the qualifications of principals to evaluate teacher performance.

Teacher Evaluation System in Terms of the Purpose and The Expectations from the Teacher

In The State of Florida

According to Florida Statute 1012.34, also known as the K-20 Education Code (2016), the goal of a teacher evaluation system is not only to identify the strengths and weakness of the teacher but also to improve student achievement and provide supportive feedback and professional development services to teachers. Additionally, the results are used when developing district and school level improvement plans. Rule 6A-5056 of The Educator Accomplishment Practices (2011) defines the core standards of the effective educators in three main principals:
1. The effective educator creates a culture of high expectations for all students by promoting the importance of education and each student’s capacity for academic achievement.

2. The effective educator demonstrates deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught.

3. The effective educator exemplifies the standards of the profession.

Each effective educator applies the foundational principles through six (6) Educator Accomplished Practices. Each of the practices is clearly defined to promote a common language and statewide understanding of the expectations for the quality of instruction and professional responsibility.

(a) Quality of Instruction.

1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning. Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently:

   i) Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;

   ii) Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge;

   iii) Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;

   iv) Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;

   v) Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons; and,

   vi) Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.

2. The Learning Environment. To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently:
i) Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;

ii) Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;

iii) Conveys high expectations to all students;

iv) Respects students’ cultural linguistic and family background;

v) Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;

vi) Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support;

vii) Integrates current information and communication technologies;

viii) Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; and,

ix) Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.

3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation. The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to:

i) Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;

ii) Deepen and enrich students’ understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter;

iii) Identify gaps in students’ subject matter knowledge;

iv) Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;

v) Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;

vi) Employ higher-order questioning techniques;

vii) Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;

viii) Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;
ix) Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement; and,

x) Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.

4. Assessment. The effective educator consistently:

i) Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students’ learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;

ii) Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;

iii) Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;

iv) Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;

v) Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student’s parent/caregiver(s); and,

vi) Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.

(b) Continuous Improvement, Responsibility and Ethics.

1. Continuous Professional Improvement. The effective educator consistently:

i) Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students’ needs;

ii) Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;

iii) Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;

iv) Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;

v) Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices; and,

vi) Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.
2. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct. Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to Rules 6A-10.080 and 6A-10.081, F.A.C., and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.

In Turkey

According to the Teacher Inspection Guide published by the Ministry of National Education, the main purpose of teacher evaluation should be to guide the teachers to improve in areas they are found to be lacking and not to punish them. In article 43 of law number 1739, teaching is defined as the following: “It is an educational profession which takes on the governmental duties of teaching along with its related administrative roles.” Teachers are responsible for the execution of these duties in accordance with the main purposes and principles of the Turkish National Education system. Preparation for the profession of teaching is carried out with liberal arts and specialty education coupled with pedagogic training. Following the general purposes and fundamental principles outlined within the Basic Law of National Education number 1739, the main purpose of education is to raise individuals of the information age who are aware of their responsibilities and duties within the Republic of Turkey and are highly competitive, and teachers are the most important element for its accomplishment. It is the aim of the teacher evaluation to provide insight into the administration so that goals are met during the educational process, to aid in the removal of any inconsistencies or incompatibilities that might arise between planning and execution, and to help and guide the teachers when it comes to any work-related problems that they might encounter. The main
responsibilities of teachers are as follows (Regulation for Middle Education, 2009, numbered 27305)

- Ameliorate educational standards, form a communication between the school or the establishment and its circle and improve it, help the administration with its administrative duties, and set an example for the students in terms of appearance, manners, and use of language.
- Prepare annual unit and lesson plans and teach the lessons they are entrusted with.
- Provide the practice of lesson-related research, applications, and experiments in which students actively participate.
- Ensure that students learn by investigating, researching, practicing, and experiencing.
- Prepare the necessary environment for students to think independently and creatively, make assessments from gathered information, freely express their opinions in a discussion, and be tolerant.
- Ensure that during their educational studies, students have access to everything that can be provided.
- Carry out their duties outlined in the Special Education Services Regulations for the teaching of students that need special education.
- Give importance to getting students to adopt strong study habits personally or within a group.
- Perform duties related to student clubs and social services that have been assigned to them.
- Execute their duties as a class counselor in accordance with the Ministry of National Education Regulation on Promotions and Examinations within Middle Education Institutions, Ministry of National Education Regulation on Guidance and Psychological Counseling Services, and other regulations.
- Execute tasks and procedures related to extracurricular activities, projects, and homework by guiding the students.
- Help train candidate teachers in accordance with a program prepared by the school principal.
- Duly execute examination-related tasks and procedures.
• Take attendance before class and write the result on an attendance form or in the class book and sign it.

• At the end of the lesson, write the subject, activity, experiment, homework, application, attendance, and other work in the class book.

• Prepare a plan for study and research trips, ask the students for their feedback after the trip, and provide a report to the school or the institution principle.

• Participate in any work related to the board, committee, team, student club, class counseling, and social services to which they are assigned, as well as national holidays, ceremonies and meetings, courses, and seminar.

• Be present at the school on the dates indicated on the work schedule and execute the duties they are given.

• Participate in the meetings of teachers’ board, group teachers’ board, and other boards, and execute the duties they are given.

• Follow the scientific and technological novelties related to their field and include them in their teaching.

• Cooperate with the school administration to provide the required study materials and ensure the correct use and safety of the study materials with which they are entrusted.

• Follow the electronic records related to them and their assigned position and do data input and updates; present documents that need approval to the school principal.

• Follow every educational regulation–related change and modification.

• Cooperate with the parents concerning the behavioral and educational status of their child.

• Provide the school administration with the address and contact information of where they will be during their off days and vacations.

• Execute their watch duty, which is one of the fundamental elements of education, in accordance with the roster and principles of watch duty.

Personal activities of teachers are as follows:

• Attend in-service training, meetings, and seminars to improve their professional knowledge, skills, and capacities.

• Do postgraduate education.
• Prepare and carry out national and international projects.
• Follow articles for their vocational development.
• Conduct scientific research and publishing articles.
• Conduct research to improve the process of teaching and exploit its results.
• Make an ongoing effort for their vocational development.
• Participate in the preparation of the strategic plan of the school.
• Participate in the activities of the school’s administration and development teams.
• Develop alternative material strategies and activities.
• Stay in touch with students and their parents by seizing intra- and extracurricular educational opportunities.

Discussion

The main purposes of teacher evaluation are essentially the same in both regions. To raise better future generations, the aim of teacher evaluations is to determine the strengths and weaknesses of teachers and provide them with the necessary professional development services. Additionally, in the State of Florida, the evaluation results are used for the development of school districts and school-level improvement plans. In Turkey, however, the evaluation results will be used to award teachers certificates of success and to provide them the guidance they might need.

For the most part, the effective educator criteria defined in the State of Florida and the expected duties and responsibilities of teachers in Turkey are fairly similar. In both regions, it is expected that teachers will improve themselves and provide student-centered learning in a fitting environment. In addition to curricular activities, teachers in both regions are regarded as exemplary individuals and are expected to obey the ethical rules of the society. Ultimately, the State of Florida has defined in a detailed
manner what it takes to become an effective educator, whereas the duties and responsibilities defined in Turkey should be explained in a more detailed manner while keeping the teachers informed on this subject.

**Teacher Evaluation System in Terms of Structure**

**In The State of Florida**

According to the Florida Statutes (Section 1012.34 (3)(a)), Instructional personnel evaluation criteria must include:

- Performance of students. - At least one-third of a performance evaluation must be based on data and indicators of student performance. Section 1012.34(7), Florida Statutes, requires districts to measure student learning growth using the formula approved by the Commissioner for courses associated with the statewide assessments. The Student Growth Implementation Committee recommended and the Commissioner of Education approved using a value-added model (VAM) to measure learning growth for purposes of teacher evaluation. The Commissioner has approved formulas for courses associated with FCAT 2.0 and grade 9 Algebra I. For teachers of courses other than those associated with FCAT and Grade 9 Algebra I, districts select other assessment data to include in evaluations.

- Instructional practice. - At least one third of the performance evaluation must be based upon instructional practice. The evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices adapted by the State Board of Education.

- Other indicators of performance. – The remainder of a performance evaluation may include professional and job responsibilities as recommended by the State Board of Education or identified by the district school board, and peer reviews, objectively reliable survey information from students and parents based on teaching practices that are consistently associated with higher student achievement, and other valid and reliable measures of instructional practice.

Each School District’s instructional personnel evaluation framework is approved by the Department of Education. The department also assists districts in monitoring the fidelity of the implementation of each district’s evaluation system for compliance with the law. The key components of Districts’ Instructional Practice Frameworks (Marzano, Danielson. EMCS, or other approved model): Common Language; Reflects Complexity
of Teaching; Tied directly to Student Achievement; Deliberate Practice: Focused Practice and Focused Feedback; Transparency; Mutual Accountability; Professional Learning and Growth.

According to the 2014-2015 Teacher Evaluation Instructional Practice Models’ information:

- 29 School Districts have used the State Model which is based on the meta-analyses of Dr. Robert Marzano;
- 19 School Districts have used the Danielson Model and some of these districts have adopted principles from the state model, including the scoring system and deliberate practice;
- 10 School Districts have used the Other Model and some of these models include indicators from the state model;
- 14 School Districts have used the EMCS (Educational Management Consulting Services) systems which include indicators from the state model Domain I.

In this study, Alachua County Public Schools Instructional Personnel Annual Evaluation Process has been used as an example. There are three components for the instructional personnel evaluation:

Administrative appraisal (1/3 of total);

i) Teacher has to prepare the professional development plan which is aligned to the school improvement plan.

ii) Informal (snapshots) observation and formal observations (minimum of two yearly)

iii) Formal Observation feedback will occur within 10 days of observation and includes written comments.

iv) Formal Administrator Appraisal is aligned to the Alachua county Public School Instructional Framework.

Student Data Component (1/3 of total);

Lesson Study Protocol (1/3 of total).
Alachua County Public Schools Instructional Framework has four Domain and 20 criteria (see Appendix A). Evaluations must differentiate among 4 levels of performance: Highly Effective (≥86); Effective (≥70 but < 86); Needs Improvement (≥60 but < 70); and Unsatisfactory (<60).

**In Turkey**

All teachers are evaluated by the school principals at the end of the school year, beginning with 2015–16 school year. The criteria of the evaluation were published throughout Turkey by the Ministry of National Education, and school principals have to use these criteria and the same rubric to evaluate teachers’ performance. The teacher performance evaluation rubric has ten categories, and each category has five sub-categories (see Appendix B). The evaluation scale is as follows: never (0 points), rarely (0.5 points), sometimes (1 points), often (1.5 points), and always (2 points). The highest score is 100 point (0-59: inadequate, 60-74: medium, 75-89: good, 90-100: excellent).

**Discussion**

Data sources:

When the structures of the teacher evaluation systems within both countries are taken into account, their differences are obvious. The most significant difference is the data sources used for performance evaluations. Multiple data sources are used for the evaluation of teacher performances in the State of Florida. Within the literature review, it can be seen that the use of multiple data sources in teacher evaluation systems is highly recommended. On the other hand, the teacher evaluation system in Turkey is solely based on the grading of teacher performances by principals via the teacher performance evaluation rubric created by the Ministry of National Education. One should consider the accuracy of results when it comes to teacher performance
evaluations based on a single data source. In addition to this, objectivity and the qualifications of the principals who are doing the evaluations should also be taken into account in regards to the trustworthiness of the teacher performance evaluations. In the State of Florida, the Value-Added Model uses data from FCATs and Grade 9 Algebra I statewide assessments of student performance data for the evaluation of teacher performances, and for the evaluation of teachers whose subjects are not associated with FCATs and Grade 9 Algebra I, the choice of student performance data is entrusted to the school districts. School districts use EOC, AP, IB, AICE, or local assessments for the evaluation of teachers in the 'non-VAM' group. This situation sparks several discussions on how reflective the utilized student performance data would be on the real performances of teachers whose subject areas are within arts, music, physical education, guidance counseling, etc.

Evaluation time and frequency:

As mentioned within the literature, one of the most important objectives of teacher performance evaluations is to provide meaningful feedback to the teachers for professional development. For this reason, timing and frequency of these evaluations carries a high importance. Each school district has its own Teacher Evaluation System that is prepared in association with the State of Florida. So in this study, the system that is implemented by Alachua County is used. In Alachua County, for the instruction personnel's annual evaluation process, both formal and informal observations are made. The spontaneous practice of informal observations within the whole school year results in constant monitoring of teacher performance by the school principal. Formal observations must be executed at least twice a year (e.g. according to the 2015-2016
formal observation timeline, the first observation must be executed by October 30, 2015 and the second observation by March 15\textsuperscript{th}, 2016). This enables one to monitor the improvements of the teachers until the next observation, in accordance with the feedback provided by the school principal. When it comes to the system implemented in Turkey, it is indicated that the teacher performance evaluations are to be executed at the end of each academic year. This, however, brings along two important issues: (1) Since the evaluation is made at the end of the academic year, in order to verify whether the teacher took into account the provided feedback, one has to wait until the end of the next academic year. This causes the teachers who are qualified as 'inadequate' or 'average' as a result of the evaluation, and who don't follow the provided feedback or try to improve themselves, to continue working as a teacher without any change in their professionalism for one more year; (2) Execution of formal observations once every academic year makes the evaluations less trustworthy. Teachers know that their performances will be evaluated by school principals at a pre-determined date for a limited period of time. If that's the case, one has to ask: during the evaluation, how much of the performance of the teacher who already knew when the evaluation would be done would represent his/her actual daily performance? In fact, on the evaluation day, most of the teachers would be coming to work more prepared than they would on a normal day. Also, it is obvious that an evaluation that is done once a year is not sufficient for the evaluation of teachers' whole performances.

Evaluation Rubric:

There are some similarities between these two teacher evaluation systems regarding the evaluation criteria used by school principals to evaluate teacher
performances. In both systems, teachers are expected to: prepare lesson plans that increase student participation and success, establish a class environment that promotes learning, use their communication skills effectively, use several teaching methods according to the readiness levels of the students, use appropriate methods to assess student achievement, improve themselves in their own subject, be in cooperation with their colleagues, carry out their professional duties, etc. The criteria that are present in teacher performance evaluation rubrics are in accordance with the core standards of the effective educators described within The Educator Accomplished Practices by the Florida Department of Education, and the main responsibilities of teachers described by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey. Despite the similarities, the clarity and the evaluation scale used by these rubrics differ significantly. It can be seen that in the teacher performance evaluation rubric used in Alachua County, following each criterion, behaviors that are to be taken into account and should be observed are expressed. On the other hand, when it comes to the rubric used in Turkey, only criteria are provided and teachers are expected to be evaluated based on how frequently they meet these criteria. That's why this rubric has become more of a questionnaire than an evaluation form. Moreover, unlike Alachua County, lack of evidentiary information for each criterion in the rubric in Turkey has resulted in school principals evaluating teachers based on what they understand from these criteria. This, as a result, prevents every teacher from being evaluated in the same way.

Teacher Evaluation System in Terms of the Qualification of the Principals

In the State of Florida

The Florida Department of Education gives two kinds of certificates to school administrators. Level I programs give the first certification in educational leadership to
prepare the persons to perform as school leaders who would want to become school principals. Level II programs build on the Level I programs to produce certification for school principals.

Level I - Educational Leadership: According to the Administrative Rules 6a-4.082, The Specialization requirements for certification in Educational Leadership;

1) A master’s or higher degree awarded by an acceptable institution as defined in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C.

2) Successful completion of the Florida Educational Leadership Core Curriculum.

(a) The Educational Leadership core curriculum consists of the following principal leadership standard areas: Instructional leadership; Managing the learning environment, Learning, accountability, and assessment; Decision making strategies; Technology; Human resource development; Ethical leadership; Vision; Community and stakeholder partnerships, and; Diversity.

(b) Documentation of successful completion of the Florida Educational Leadership Core Curriculum shall be by one (1) of the following plans:

- Successful completion of a Department of Education approved Florida pre-service program in educational leadership offered by an acceptable institution as defined in subsection 6A-4.003(1), F.A.C. A newly-created state institution that meets approval requirements described in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C., shall be considered as having met the accreditation requirement.

- A graduate degree major in educational administration, administration and supervision or educational leadership awarded by an acceptable institution as defined in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C.

- A graduate degree with a major in a subject other than educational administration, administration and supervision or educational leadership, and successful completion of a Department of Education approved modified Florida program in educational leadership offered by an acceptable institution as defined in subsection 6A-4.003(1), F.A.C. A newly-created state institution that meets approval requirements described in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C., shall be considered as having met the accreditation requirement.
• A graduate degree with a major in a subject other than educational administration, administration and supervision, or educational leadership awarded by an acceptable institution as defined in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C., and thirty (30) semester hours of graduate credit which includes credit in each of the principal leadership standard areas specified in paragraph (2)(a) of this rule and an internship or a course with associated field experience in educational leadership.

• Successful completion of an Educational Leadership training program approved by the Department of Education and offered by a Florida public school district.

  Level II- School Principal: According to the Administrative Rules 6a-4.083, an individual meets each of the following requirements to be eligible to receive certification as a school principal;

  1) Hold a valid professional certificate covering educational leadership, administration, or administration and supervision.

  2) Document successful performance of the duties of the school Principalship. These duties shall be performed in a Department of Education approved district school principal certification program pursuant to Rule 6A-5.081, F.A.C., designed and implemented consistent with the principal leadership standards approved by the State Board of Education. In addition, these duties shall:

    (a) Be performed as a full-time employee in a Florida public school in a leadership position through which the candidate can fully demonstrate the competencies associated with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

    (b) Be a formally planned professional development program designed and implemented to prepare the individual to effectively perform as a school principal.

    (c) Be comprehensive of all the duties of the school Principalship.
(d) Be performed under the direct supervision of a currently practicing school principal or district manager who has been approved by the district school board to serve as the supervising principal or manager for this program.

3) Demonstrate successful performance of the competencies of the school Principalship standards which shall be documented by the Florida district school superintendent based on a performance appraisal system approved by the district school board and the Department pursuant to Rule 6A-5.081, F.A.C.

4) An individual who holds a valid Florida Educator's Certificate covering administration or administration and supervision issued prior to July 1, 1986 and served as a school principal prior to July 1, 1986 for not less than one (1) school year may apply for certification as a school principal under the provisions of Rule 6A-4.0085, F.A.C.

In addition to these requirements, an individual seeking certification in educational leadership level I must pass the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). Because the level II school principal certificate builds upon level I training, no additional examinations are required to hold this certificate. FELE is aligned with Florida Principal Leadership Standards and consists of three subtests. Subtest one and subtest two are multiple choice, and subtest three is multiple choice and a written performance assessment that aims to determine proficiency in written communication and the ability to analyze educational data. Subtest one and subtest two contain approximately 70 multiple-choice questions, and a passing score is 48 correct answers. Subtest three contains approximately 55 questions, and a passing score is 36 correct questions. The written performance assignment is scored holistically by two raters. The
score is the combined total of the two raters' scores. A passing score is at least seven out of the 12.

The 10 standards are divided into three subtests;

- **Subtest 1 - Leadership for Student Learning:** Student Learning Results, Student Learning as a Priority, Instructional Plan Implementation, and Learning Environment.
- **Subtest 2 - Organizational Development:** Faculty Development, Leadership Development, and Professional and Ethical Behavior.
- **Subtest 3 - Systems Leadership:** Decision Making, School Management, and Communication.

**In Turkey**

As mentioned above, starting with the school year of 2015–16, school principals evaluate the performance of all teachers. This new practice has brought along the question of the competence of school principals for the evaluation of teachers’ performances. According to the Ministry of National Education Regulation for the Assignment of Administrators in Educational Institutions Article 5 – (1) (2017), the main qualifications to look for when assigning administrators are the following:

- They have a bachelor's degree.
- Following the last day of the application for evaluation, they are employed within the Ministry staff.
- They have the qualifications to become a teacher in an educational institution that is similar to the one to which they are being assigned, and there is a lesson that they could give with a monthly salary in an educational institution that is similar to the one to which they are being assigned.
- Following the last day of the application for evaluation, their administrative role has not been revoked in the last four years due to a judicial or administrative investigation.
- For those who are to be assigned to an administrative role in an educational institution that does not require compulsory service, they have fulfilled, postponed, or are being exempt from this obligation according to its related regulation.
According to the Ministry of National Education Regulation for the Assignment of Administrators in Educational Institutions Article 6 – (1) (2017), the main qualifications to look for when assigning principals are the following:

- They have previously worked as a principal.
- They have previously worked as a founding principal, head vice principal, vice principal, or teacher authorized as a principal for at least one year in total or for each role.
- They have worked as the branch director or as a high-level staff member within the ministry.

According to the Ministry of National Education Regulation for the Assignment of Administrators in Educational Institutions Article 7 – (1) (2017), special qualifications to look for when assigning head vice principals and vice principals are the following:

- They have worked as a founding principal, head vice principal, vice principal, or teacher authorized as a principal.
- They have worked as the branch director or as a high-level staff member within the ministry.
- Including candidature, they have worked as a teacher for at least four years.

If the number of evaluated candidates to be assigned as a head vice principal or vice principal at educational institutions that are yet to employ a head vice principal or vice principal does not surpass three times the quantity of these institutions, the duration indicated in the division (1), clause (c) of the article is reduced to two years.

Additionally, according to the Ministry of National Education Regulation for the Assignment of Administrators in Educational Institutions Article 7 – (3) (2017), the following additional qualifications are sought when assigning head vice principals:

- For those being assigned as a head vice principal to a science high school, they have been a branch teacher in mathematics, physics, chemistry, or biology.
• For those being assigned as a head vice principal to a high school for social sciences, they have been a branch teacher in Turkish language and literature, history, geography, philosophy, psychology, or foreign language.

• For those being assigned as a head vice principal to a fine arts high school, they have been a branch teacher in visual arts or music.

• For those being assigned as a head vice principal to a sports high school, they have been a branch teacher in physical education.

• For those being assigned as a head vice principal to an Imam Hatip high school, they have been a branch teacher in Imam Hatip high school vocational classes.

• For those being assigned as a head vice principal to an institution of vocational and technical education, they have been a workshop and laboratory teacher.

If no candidate that meets the qualifications mentioned in the 3rd division of the article can be found, then teachers from other fields can also be assigned to the position. Candidates applying for an administrative role are subjected to an oral examination. Additionally, they are given points based on their level of education, duration of service, and rewards and punishments received for the duration of service. Three points are given to those who successfully completed their master’s degree in educational administration and politics, management, public administration, or political sciences, and five points are given to those who completed their Ph.D. in one of these fields. Candidates obtaining their master’s degree in a field other than these are given two points, and those obtaining their Ph.D. are given three points. For the duration of service within the educational institution, points are granted for each reward and removed for each punishment. By calculating the arithmetic mean of these two points, the highest-scoring candidate is assigned as an administrator for a duration of four years. Oral examination subjects and grading are as follows:

- Capacity of analytical thinking and analysis: 10%

- Representability and degree of merit: 10%

- Capacity for reasoning and degree of understanding: 10%

- Communicative skills, self-confidence, and persuasiveness: 10%

- General knowledge: 10%

- Atatürk’s Principles and History of Turkish Revolution: 10%

In several provinces, in-service training on educational administration, educator training during the training of candidate teachers, popularization of social activities, and application of laws and regulations will be provided by the Ministry of National Education to the newly assigned administrators.

**Discussion**

Qualifications sought from educational administrators and the way these administrators are trained demonstrate the type of education aimed for in these systems. When the qualifications to become a school principal are considered, two main differences arise between Turkey and the State of Florida: degree requirements and examinations.

**Degree Requirement:**

To become a school principal in the State of Florida, one has to have level I educational leadership certification. Having a master’s degree is one of the
requirements for this certification. This certification also permits one to work as a vice principal. For the level II school principal certificate, the candidate must have a valid professional certificate covering educational leadership and administration or administration and supervision. In Turkey, however, having a master’s degree is not a prerequisite in any field whatsoever, including educational administration. If the school principal candidate has a master’s degree, he or she is awarded extra points. Trying to solve this problem via in-service training does not seem to be working very well either. Partially due to personal reasons and partially due to institutional reasons, school managers fail to have enough in-service training. It is obvious that for school administrators to be qualified in their fields, they have to have a master’s degree in educational administration. This level of education should be one of the main criteria when assigning school administrators.

Examination:

When the examination system to become a principal is considered, since the examination in the State of Florida is both written and multiple choice, it negates any subjectivity. Additionally, the test subjects are chosen specifically to increase the professional proficiency of the principals. Therefore, it can be said that the Florida State examination system is successful. Moreover, because of the master’s degree prerequisite for the level I educational leadership certificate and as a result, the level II school principal certificate, candidates often acquire the necessary qualifications within these fields during their master’s degree program. On the other hand, there have been several changes made to the system of administrator assignment used in Turkey. According to the previous legislation, head vice principals and vice principals were
assigned based on written examination results, whereas principals were assigned based on oral examination results. However, with the new legislation, the oral examination conducted by the evaluation committee was put forth as the sole examination requirement when assigning administrators. Article 8 of this legislation defines who will take part in this committee as follows:

The evaluation committee is comprised of two district national education directors appointed by the provincial national education director and two branch directors operating in provincial or district directorates of national education and is under the chairmanship of the provincial national education director or either a provincial national education vice director or the branch director responsible for the human resources of the provincial national education directorate who are both appointed by this director. Using the same method, substitute members are chosen for each committee member.

It is expected that the commission that created this article mentioned will evaluate the administrator candidates on the subjects underlined within the legislation. However, no explanation is given on whether these committee members are qualified to evaluate these candidates. This lack of qualifications results in the prevalence of subjective evaluations and the openness of administrator assignments to the influence of the individuals administering the oral examination. Moreover, not basing the assignment of educational administrators on objective criteria shakes the educators’ trust in administrators, which results in disputes within the school administration. The examination of school administrators on areas that will not be of any use when they are in service and the lack of subjects such as instructional leadership, school administration, and human resource development within the examination subjects negatively affect the professional efficiency of the school administrators.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The effectiveness and efficiency of the education system is determined through an evaluation system. As teachers are probably the most important factor in improving education, many people give special importance to good teachers, and many country’s policies are intended to improve teacher quality. Although the common perception of teachers’ effectiveness is related to the ranking of the school that the teachers graduated from or how long they have taught, the most reliable way to assess teachers’ effectiveness is by looking at their instructional practices and the processes they used in teaching their students. The evaluation of teacher performance is the best predictor of a teacher’s effectiveness if the evaluation procedure is designed with the aim of assisting teachers in improving their skills and increasing student achievement. However, the evaluation system is seen as more of a bureaucratic exercise than a system aimed at improving the quality of teachers. It is clear that there is no simple system for evaluating teacher performance. However, to make the evaluation system reliable, valid, and fair, it is necessary to establish evaluation purposes, to develop multiple methods according to those purposes. An effective teacher evaluation system includes reliable assessment, which provides teachers’ strengths and areas that need development, meaningful feedback, and professional development opportunities. Moreover, it is important to design and improve the evaluation system by analyzing the current research on teacher evaluation. It is crucial to clarify the policies on teacher effectiveness to sow high expectations, to retain qualified teachers, and to ensure that all students receive highly effective teaching. Policy makers have an important role as they have an opportunity to
reconsider policy choices to improve the system. If they provide an effective evaluation system, it can improve teacher learning, as well as student achievement.

The following section provides some recommendations for improving the teacher evaluation system, in accordance with the review of literature and the discussion part of the study.

**Recommendation for the Teacher Evaluation System in the State of Florida**

Needless to say, no evaluation system can be perfect in any profession, especially in education. But, a better system than the current ones can be developed, and the State of Florida is making efforts to improve their teacher evaluation system by following contemporary research and including growth and student achievement in the process. As the system incorporates VAM to determine teachers’ effects on student achievement, it is important to ensure that student test scores support valid and reliable inferences about teachers’ contributions to student learning. Moreover, there are some challenges using student assessments as a component of the teacher evaluation process. As it is known, teaching is a collaborative and developmental process, and teachers build on the efforts of previous teachers. Because of this, students’ groundwork can affect their performance on the tests. It is also questionable to what extent these standardized tests assess student learning correctly. Doing well on a test is not the same as being well-educated, or some good students could be bad test-takers. Maybe the most important issue is that, as a result of using students’ test scores, schools and teachers mostly rely on test-taking, instead of learning, creativity, problem solving, and other essential skills, considering that one-third of the teacher evaluation is based on student achievement, and teachers’ salaries and their contracts are based on the evaluation. This consequence can also affect teachers’ performances, as they feel
threatened and insecure, as well as pressured by the school and district to ensure their students do well on state tests.

It is clear from the last three years of teacher evaluation reports (Table 5-1); in the State of Florida, more than half of the teachers are receiving ‘Effective’ performance ratings. However, according to the 2015-2016 Annual Legislative Report on Teacher Evaluation reports about the agreement between performance evaluation ratings and VAM classifications (Figure 5-1), a huge gap is seen with the other three performance ratings. This result also needs to be taken into consideration, as to which one (performance evaluation rating or VAM) is more accurate, and how these gaps can be narrowed. Because of the reasons mentioned in this section and the data from the report on teacher evaluations, policy makers should strengthen their policy by ensuring that instructional effectiveness is the predominant criterion of the teacher evaluation.

Table 5-1. Florida Department of Education, Annual Legislative Report on Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Effective (%)</th>
<th>Effective (%)</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (%)</th>
<th>3 Years-Developing (%)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>41,9</td>
<td>55,7</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>37,5</td>
<td>60,9</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>52,0</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation for The Teacher Evaluation System in Turkey

Even though there have been recent changes regarding the teacher evaluation system, it is imperative to reorganize the teacher evaluation standards in Turkey, in line with modern developments and approaches. Policy makers are especially responsible for making this a reality. Recommendations may provide general guidelines for policy makers to follow to improve the teacher evaluation system.

It can be seen that the legislation on the selection and appointment of educational administrators does not perform well when it comes to the training of leading administrators that are sought after nowadays. It is clear that there is a need for a system that does not allow any intervention in assignments in order to ensure a high-quality education. The examination that is done for administrator assignments has to be fair and trustworthy. For this reason, it is necessary to perform written and oral examinations while assigning administrators. Through professional experience, school administrators are expected to master subjects on school administration, inspection, evaluation, administration law, leadership, human relations, effective communication, human resources management, and budget management, as well as the related
legislations. For educational administration candidates, holding a master’s degree should be compulsory. Also, it would prove highly helpful for school principals that are to be assigned to perform an internship alongside a successful school principal and train with the aid of educational experts and educational inspectors so that they can acquire the necessary qualifications. It should become obligatory for current educational administrators to participate in in-service trainings in order to improve their knowledge and skills in educational administration. Moreover, with the cooperation of universities, administrators should be encouraged to pursue a master’s degree in educational administration.

Researchers recommend that an efficient teacher evaluation system should be comprised of multiple sources of data. It is clear that an evaluation that is performed once a year (at the end of the academic year) is not enough to evaluate the true performance of a teacher. Student success data should also be included within the evaluation system. In coordination with the Ministry of National Education, General Directorate of Assessment, and Evaluation and Examination Services, a decision should be made on how the student performance data that is to be used for the evaluation of teacher performance is to be obtained. Furthermore, teacher evaluations should be performed at least twice a year (one at the beginning and one at the end of the academic year) and the provided feedback should be beneficial for the professional development of the teachers. Teacher evaluation rubrics should be based on scientific research, describe the criteria in a manner that everyone can understand, and be established in accordance with the Turkish Educational System.
The purpose of the teacher evaluation system should be clearly described in a way that everyone can understand. Moreover, it should be clarified for what purpose the evaluation results are to be used. For now, the aforementioned evaluation is used to award teachers with certificates of success. It should also be mentioned that teachers in Turkey are assigned following the results of a written exam conducted by the Ministry of National Education. Teachers carry on with their duties unless they are fired. This means that teachers are protected by tenure. When they meet certain criteria (service time, duty service score, etc.), a request can be made for a reappointment. Apart from this, the salary of a teacher does not change depending on the staff rank. These two reasons (tenure and constant salary) might lead to teachers and school principals no longer taking the teacher evaluation system seriously. That is why the purpose that the evaluation results are going to be utilized for should be made clear.
Domain I: Creating a Culture for Learning:

The professional teacher creates a culture for learning that builds positive relationships with and among students, acknowledges and supports the value of diversity and differences among students, fosters a safe environment, and sets high expectations for student learning. The teacher organizes and maintains the physical environment for maximum learning, implements effective classroom procedure, and skillfully manages student behavior.

A: The teacher creates and facilitates, for and among students, a classroom environment of respect and positive relationships, where diversity is accepted and valued.

U: The pattern of interaction between teacher and students and/or among students is characterized by negativity. Interactions may include uses of sarcasm, instance of yelling, and/or belittling of students. The teacher ignores or does not effectively address instances of disrespect and/or put-downs.

NI: There is evidence that the pattern of interaction between teacher and students and/or among students is generally characterized as appropriate behaviors. Occasionally, interactions may include uses of sarcasm, yelling, and/or belittling of students. The teacher attempts to address instances of disrespect and/or put-downs but does so ineffectively or with inconsistent results.

E: The pattern of interaction between teacher and students and/or among students is characterized by appropriate and polite behaviors. There is evidence of respect exhibited between teacher and students and among students. Any instances of disrespect or inappropriate interactions are addressed successfully by the teacher.

HE: The pattern of interaction between teacher and students and/or among students is characterized by highly respectful behavior. There is evidence of genuine warmth and caring between teacher and students and among students. Students work cooperatively and appropriately among themselves to correct inappropriate interactions with minimal need for teacher intervention.

B: The teacher creates and facilitates a culture of high expectations for student learning.

U: There is little to no evidence of a culture of learning or of high expectations. Students invest only minimal energy into the learning process, may be compliant, but demonstrate no commitment to hard work, excellence, or high achievement. Large groups of students are often disengaged. The teacher does little to communicate expectations for quality or commitment.

NI: There is some evidence of a culture of learning and high expectations, but generally only for select students. Most students invest in the learning process at a compliant level, but demonstrate little evidence of hard work or excellence and are focused on mere task completion. Expectations for high achievement are reserved to only certain students. Students sometimes may be disengaged.

E: There is ample evidence of a culture of learning and high expectations for all students, and
classroom interactions support the learning process and encourage hard work. There is evidence that learning is valued and students invest in the learning process at a cognitive level. The teacher communicates expectations for high achievement for students. Student disengagement is minimal and is skillfully redirected.

HE: The classroom culture provides clear evidence of consistent cognitive engagement by all students at a high level. Learning is clearly valued, and students invest in the learning process at a highly engaged level. The learning environment is vibrant, and the teacher insists on high achievement for all students. Students assume responsibility for high quality work, such as making revisions, expending effort to add detail, and by helping other students, with minimal teacher support.

C: The teacher organizes and maintains the physical environment for maximum learning.

U: There is evidence of unsafe arrangement of the physical environment and/or the physical environment is arranged in a manner that prevents access to learning by some students. Coordination of the physical environment (including technology) and learning activities is poorly done or not done at all.

NI: It is evident that basic room safety and physical arrangement is adequate and learning is accessible to most students. Physical environment (including technology resources) is coordinated to support basic learning activities. Teacher makes some attempt to modify the environment to meet the requirements of learning activities.

E: The physical environment is arranged for safety and learning activities are accessible to all students. Physical environment supports efficient, productive, and active student learning activities. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources (including technology). Learning environment is effectively modified to meet the needs of varied learning activities.

HE: The physical environment is arranged for safety and learning activities (i.e., creating a print rich environment) are accessible to all students, including students with special needs. Physical environment supports efficient, productive, and active student learning activities. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources (including technology). Learning environment is effectively modified to meet the needs of varied learning activities. Students’ work is displayed, as well as students’ contributions of exemplary work that serve as models for other students.

D: The teacher implements effective classroom procedures to maximize student learning.

U: Significant instructional time and momentum is lost through inefficient routines and procedures. There is little to no evidence that the teacher manages instructional grouping, material handling, or student transitions to facilitate learning.

NI: There is evidence that some routines and procedures are structured to preserve instructional time. Students require multiple prompting and guidance to follow common routines and procedures. There is evidence that the teacher manages some instructional groupings, material handling, and student transitions, but the results are not consistent and instructional time and momentum is still lost.
E: There is evidence that effective routines and procedures are used, and very little instructional time is lost. Students require little to no prompting to complete common routines and procedures. The teacher consistently manages instructional groupings, material handling, and student transitions to preserve maximum instructional time and momentum.

HE: There is evidence of maximum utilization of instructional time due to effective use of routines and procedures. Students contribute to and actively participate in the management of instructional groups, material handling, and transitions. Common routines and procedures are well understood by students and occur with minimal prompting or teacher guidance.

E: The professional teacher effectively and skillfully manages student behavior, to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment and to maximize student learning and achievement.

U: There is very little to no evidence of established behavioral expectations for students. Misbehavior is ignored. There is little to no evidence of teacher support for positive behavior; teacher response to misbehavior is inappropriate, repressive, and disrespectful of student dignity. Students challenge behavior standards and repeatedly disrupt the learning process.

NI: There is evidence of established behavioral expectations for students, but implementation is not consistent or is poorly established. Teacher attempts to deal with misbehavior, but does so inconsistently and with uneven results. There is some evidence of positive behavior support. Some students challenge behavior standards, and the learning process is sometimes disrupted.

E: There is clear evidence of established behavior standards; implementation is consistent. Teacher monitors student behavior and holds students accountable in respectful and effective manner. There is clear evidence for the use of positive behavior support. Student behavior is generally developmentally appropriate, and any disruption is handled with minimal impact to the learning process.

HE: There is clear evidence of established behavior standards; implementation is consistent. Teacher monitors behavior subtly and proactively. There is clear evidence for the use of positive behavior support. Student behavior is entirely developmentally appropriate and any disruption is handled efficiently and without loss of instructional momentum.

Domain II: Lesson Planning and designing instruction and assessment for Student Achievement:

The professional teacher demonstrates a deep understanding of subject content/s and plans rigorous and relevant lessons that are aligned to the school’s achievement data profile, district’s curriculum goals, and state performance standards and instructional models. Lesson plans reflect planning required for implementation of high-yield teaching strategies, instruction designed to meet the needs of all learners, and use of traditional and non-traditional assessments to measure student knowledge and to adjust lessons to meet the needs of individual learners.

A: The teacher evidences a systematic and meaningful process for developing lesson plans. Lesson plans are aligned to instructional delivery, the school’s achievement data profile, the district’s curriculum goals and pacing guides, and the state’s performance
standards and instructional models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U:</td>
<td>There is little evidence that lesson planning takes place in a systematic and meaningful way. Lesson plans evidence no alignment to the school’s achievement data profile, the district’s curriculum goals and pacing guides, and the state’s performance standards and instructional models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI:</td>
<td>There is some evidence that lesson planning takes place. Planning may not be systematic and/or meaningful to instructional delivery. Lesson plans are not well aligned to the school’s achievement data profile, the district’s curriculum goals, pacing guides, and the state’s performance standards and instructional models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E:</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates and provides evidence of effective lesson planning. Lesson planning is systematic and meaningful to instructional delivery. Lesson plans are aligned to the school’s achievement data profile, the district’s curriculum goals and pacing guides, and the state’s performance standards and instructional models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE:</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates and provides evidence of effective lesson planning. Planning is systematic and is meaningful to instructional delivery. Lesson plans consistently align to the school’s achievement data profile, the district’s curriculum goals and pacing guides, and the state’s performance standards and instructional models. The teacher uses current student data to develop the lesson objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The teacher’s lesson plans incorporate a variety of resources and reflect planning for use of high-yield teaching strategies and differentiated instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U:</td>
<td>The teacher’s lesson plans demonstrate no evidence of incorporating into lessons resources and strategies that support improved student engagement, student understanding of lesson/s objective/s, and student mastery of lesson objective/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI:</td>
<td>The teacher’s lesson plans demonstrate limited evidence of incorporating into lessons resources and strategies that support improved student engagement, students understanding of lessons objectives, and student mastery of material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E:</td>
<td>The teacher’s lesson plans evidence incorporation of a variety of high-yield teaching strategies (such as CRISS strategies, Kagan structures, and Marzano strategies). Lessons are designed to support student engagement, student understanding of lesson objectives, and student mastery of material. The teacher’s lesson plans reflect planning with relevant and current resources that align to the instructional objective/s and reflect preparation necessary for implementation of the Gradual Release Model of instruction and differentiation to reach all learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE:</td>
<td>The teacher’s lesson plans consistently reflect incorporation of high-yield teaching strategies (such as CRISS strategies, Kagan structures, and Marzano strategies). Lessons are designed to support student engagement, student understanding of lesson/s objective/s, and student mastery of material at the highest levels. Lesson plans consistently reflect preparation necessary for implementation of the Gradual Release Model of instruction and differentiation to reach all learners. The teacher consistently develops lesson plans that expand content knowledge through use of current references, technologies, and materials that provide high expectations and relevance to the lesson objective/s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. The teacher plans and designs instruction that demonstrates knowledge of his/her students, including levels of development, skills, background, culture, interests, and special needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>The teacher plans and designs instruction with little or no understanding or regard for how students learn nor the students’ background, culture, skills, and special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>The teacher plans and designs instruction with some understanding and regard for how students learn and for the students’ background, culture, skills, and special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The teacher plans and designs instruction with understanding and regard for how students learn and for the students’ background, culture, skills, and special needs. Lesson plans provide evidence of strategies that meet the individual needs and interests of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>The teacher actively seeks out knowledge of the learning style of his/her students and utilizes that knowledge to plan and design instruction with an understanding and regard for that information. Consistent consideration is evident in plan and lesson design for knowledge of the students’ background, culture, skills, and special needs. Lesson plans provide strategies that meet the individual needs and interests of all students. Lesson plan and design includes provisions to address all learners regardless of motivation, level, and skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domain III: Instruction and Assessing for Student Achievement:

The professional teacher demonstrates a deep understanding of subject content and uses highly effective instructional practices, which sustain instructional momentum and include meaningful, concise, and coherent instructions to students. Instruction includes quality questioning and discussion techniques that encourage higher-order thinking (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation). Instructional technology is utilized effectively as a component of instruction. The professional teacher modifies and adjusts instruction (differentiates) to meet the ongoing needs of individual students; includes remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons; and guides students in goal setting and student self-assessment and self-monitoring.

A. Teacher demonstrates knowledge of pedagogy and subject content area/s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>The teacher makes errors in content delivery and/or does not correct student errors. Instruction displays little understanding of prerequisite relationships necessary to student learning of the content. Teacher displays little to no understanding of the pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>The teacher is familiar with important concepts in the discipline but lacks awareness of how concepts relate to one another. The teacher displays awareness of prerequisite relationships, yet some knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. The teacher’s practice reflects only a limited range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The teacher has solid knowledge of the discipline and of how concepts relate to one another. The teacher displays accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts. The teacher’s practice reflects a wide range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>The teacher has extensive knowledge of the discipline and of how concepts relate to one another. The teacher displays accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and concepts and he/she provides a link to necessary cognitive structures needed for student learning and understanding. The teacher’s practice reflects a wide range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content, and he/she anticipates and addresses student misconceptions.

B. The teacher demonstrates effective communication with students that facilitates learning.

U: The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students. Directions and procedures are confusing. The teacher’s spoken language and written directions contain significant errors. Vocabulary is inappropriate and leads to student confusion or lack of understanding.

NI: The instructional purpose of the lesson is communicated with limited success. Directions and procedures often need further clarification for student understanding. The teacher’s spoken language and written directions contain some errors and may be at times hard to follow. Vocabulary is limited or not fully appropriate to student age and ability level. Communication does not generally invite student intellectual engagement.

E: The teacher clearly communicates instructional purpose as well as links purpose to broader learning goals. Procedures and directions are clearly explained. Content explanations are clear, well-scaffolded, and connect with student knowledge and experience. Spoken language and written directions are clear and correct and vocabulary is appropriate for student level of understanding. Communication invites intellectual engagement, and some students may extend content.

HE: Instructional purpose is linked to student interests and prior knowledge. Procedures and directions are clear and the teacher anticipates possible student misunderstanding. Explanation of content is clear and designed to foster conceptual understanding through scaffolding and links to student interests. Students contribute to extending content and help explain concepts to classmates. The teacher’s spoken and written language is expressive and contributes to the expansion of student vocabulary.

C. The teacher uses strategies that support meaningful, concise, and coherent instruction that leads to student mastery of lesson objectives.

U: Provided learning experiences are poorly aligned with instructional objectives and outcomes. Strategies are incoherent. Activities are not designed to engage students in intellectual activity and/or have unrealistic time allocations. Instructional groupings don’t support outcomes and lack variety. Few students are intellectually engaged.

NI: Some learning experiences are aligned with instructional objectives and outcomes and represent a moderate cognitive challenge but with little to no differentiation for students. Strategies are mostly coherent and have a recognizable structure. Activities engage some students and time allocations are mostly reasonable. Instructional groupings support outcomes with some effort to provide variety. Many students are passively engaged or merely compliant.

E: Content, resources, and students are coordinated to create an aligned learning experience suitable for all learners. Strategies are coherent and structured. Students are actively engaged at a moderately high level. Activities represent a cognitive challenge, and time allocations are
reasonable. Instructional groupings support and enhance outcomes and are varied.

**HE:** Content, resources, and students are coordinated to create an aligned learning experience suitable for all learners and reflect in-depth teacher knowledge and understanding for different student's needs and available resources. Strategies are coherent and structured. Students are consistently engaged at a high level. Activities represent a significant cognitive challenge and are differentiated to meet individual needs. Time allocations are reasonable. Instructional groupings support and enhance outcomes and are meaningful.

**D. The teacher’s instruction includes high-quality questioning and discussion techniques and provides opportunities for students to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information in order to facilitate student mastery of subject material.**

**U:** Teacher questions are of low cognitive challenge. Responses require single correct answers and do not provide opportunity for application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation. Teacher/student discussion and interaction is characterized by recitation with teacher mediating all interaction. Questioning and discussion is dominated by a few students.

**NI:** Teacher questions lead students through a single path of inquiry. Responses are seemingly determined in advance with little opportunity for application, an analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation. Some questions may be designed to promote higher-order thinking, but only a few students are involved. The teacher attempts to engage all students in discussion but with uneven results.

**E:** The teacher uses a mixture of low and high-level questions. Some questions are designed to stimulate application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation. Most students are involved in responding to questions and in discussion, and the teacher utilizes a range of strategies to ensure participation. Genuine discussion is promoted and the teacher steps aside when appropriate to allow students to interact.

**HE:** The teacher uses a variety of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance higher-order thinking, and to promote metacognition. Students formulate questions, initiate discussion topics, and make thoughtful contributions. Students work together and all voices are heard in discussions.

**E. The teacher uses instructional technology resources as a component of instruction to enhance, engage, reinforce, and increase student understanding of the lesson objective/s and mastery of lesson objective/s.**

**U:** The teacher is unaware of school or district instructional technology resources for classroom use, for expansion of knowledge, and for use by students.

**NI:** The teacher is aware of school or district instructional technology resources for classroom use, for expansion of knowledge, and for use by students. Technology is used in the classroom and educational setting, but at a limited level. Technology integration into learning activities is at a basic level and is primarily teacher centered.

**E:** The teacher displays solid knowledge of technology resources, not only through the school or district, but through sources external to the school and through the internet. Technology is used regularly in the classroom, for expansion of knowledge, and for use by students. Technology
resources are integrated into some learning activities and students use technology resources to complete tasks, solve problems, and to otherwise facilitate learning.

HE: The teacher displays extensive knowledge of technology resources, not only through the school or district, but through sources external to the school and through the internet. Technology is used consistently in the classroom, for expansion of knowledge, and for use by students. Technology resources are integrated into many learning activities and students use technology resources to complete tasks, solve problems, and to otherwise facilitate learning.

F. The teacher establishes appropriate learning outcomes for individual and groups of students and modifies and adjusts instruction to meet ongoing needs. The teacher provides remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons, as determined by assessment and individual student data analysis.

U: Outcomes represent low expectations and/or reflect only one type of learning and group of students’ needs. Instruction evidences no modification and/or there is no adjustment of instruction to meet individual student needs. Remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons do not occur.

NI: Outcomes reflect limited expectations and may reflect more than one type of learning and group of students’ needs. Instruction evidences little modification and/or there is some adjustment of instruction to meet individual student needs. Remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons may occur but may be sporadic and not strategically targeted.

E: Most outcomes reflect high expectations and important learning objectives and are suitable for many types of learning and groups of students. There is evidence that modification and adjustment of instruction to meet individual student needs occurs regularly. Remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons occur and those activities are targeted to reach most students.

HE: All outcomes reflect high expectations, important learning objectives, and are suitable for many types of learning and groups of students. There is evidence that modification and adjustment of instruction to meet individual student needs occurs and is fully integrated into instruction. Remediation, re-teaching, and enrichment lessons occur as an extension of formative assessment and is strategically targeted to individual learners.

G. The teacher uses assessment to guide students in goal setting and self-assessment and self-monitoring in an effort to facilitate student’s reaching the next performance/achievement level/s.

U: Students do not appear aware of goals or assessment criteria. Students do not engage in self-assessment assessment (where developmentally appropriate). The teacher does not assess or monitor student learning and/or does not provide feedback to students on assessment to permit goal setting.

NI: Students appear partially aware of goals or assessment criteria. A few students engage in self-assessment (where developmentally appropriate). The teacher conducts sporadic assessments and rarely uses questions and prompts to assess student learning. Feedback to students is general.
E: Students appear to be aware of goals and/or assessment criteria. Students engage in self-assessment assessment (where developmentally appropriate). Assessment is used regularly by the teacher to monitor learning progress. Accurate feedback is provided to students in order to permit goal setting and advancement in performance/achievement levels.

HE: There is clear evidence that students are aware of assessment criteria and in some cases may have contributed to setting the criteria or goals. Students systematically assess and monitor their own progress (where developmentally appropriate). The teacher fully integrates assessment into the instruction in a variety of ways, and there is extensive use of formative assessment to inform specific feedback and to permit goal setting and advancement of performance/achievement levels.

Domain IV: Professional Commitment:
The professional teacher engages in continuous professional development aligned to specific goals, as determined by school and district needs, data analysis, and self-reflection. The teacher’s professional commitment is characterized by collaboration with colleagues to achieve school and district objectives and to foster mutual professional development. The teacher’s professional commitment includes developing positive community relationships and communicating effectively with students’ families as well as a commitment to school-related professional responsibilities.

A. The teacher engages in professional development designed to permit continuous growth. Growth and professional development is based upon self-reflection of teaching practice.

U: The teacher engages in little or no professional development. The teacher resists feedback on teaching and professional performance. The teacher makes no effort to seek knowledge or to share knowledge with others. The teacher does not engage in self-reflection on teaching practice.

NI: Teacher participates in limited professional development activities. The teacher accepts some feedback on teaching and professional performance but may not alter behavior as a result. The teacher seeks some knowledge from colleagues and may share limited knowledge with others. The teacher engages in limited self-reflection and may be able to suggest methods and strategies for teaching practice improvement.

E: The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skills. The teacher welcomes feedback from both supervisors and colleagues through professional collaboration. The teacher actively shares knowledge with others. The teacher regularly engages in self-reflection and makes accurate assessments and suggestions for improvement of teaching improvement.

HE: The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development, within the district and/or from outside sources, to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skills. The teacher actively seeks feedback on practice from colleagues and supervisors. The teacher initiates important activities to advance and contribute to the profession. The teacher engages in a constant cycle of self-reflection, assessment of strategies for improvement, and application of reflection results to maintain professional improvement.

B. The teacher views himself/herself as a member of a professional learning
community (PLC) with a focus on collaboration with colleagues to support the continuous improvement of the school’s goals and outcomes and to foster mutual professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U: The teacher avoids participation in a professional community of inquiry and resists opportunities to be involved in school and/or district initiatives. The teacher does not maintain positive relationships with colleagues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI: The teacher seldom participates in a professional community of inquiry and in opportunities to be involved in school and/or district initiatives when invited to do so. The teacher maintains a cordial relationship with colleagues and assists when required to fulfill duties required by the school and district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: The teacher actively participates in a professional community of inquiry. The teacher maintains a relationship with colleagues characterized by mutual support and cooperation. The teacher participates in school and district initiatives and/or makes substantial contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE: The teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry. The teacher maintains a relationship with colleagues characterized by mutual support and cooperation and often assumes a leadership role among faculty. The teacher participates in school and district initiatives and/or makes substantial contributions and often assumes a leadership role in activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The teacher demonstrates a commitment to positive and continuous communication with his/her students’ families regarding individual student progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U: Teacher communication with families regarding instructional programs and/or individual students is sporadic or non-existent. Communication with families is culturally inappropriate. The teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program. Resources for communicating with parents are not used or rarely used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI: The teacher makes an attempt to communicate with families regarding instructional programs and individual student progress/successes but does so inconsistently. Communications may be culturally inappropriate and/or one-way. Sporadic communication is provided to parents regarding student progress through district technology resources and through other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: The teacher frequently communicates with families regarding instructional programs and regarding individual student progress and needs. An attempt is made to engage families in the instructional program. Parents are provided access to student progress monitoring through district technology resources. Parents are provided support for working with their children at home in order to enhance the classroom experience. Responses to family concerns are generally handled appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HE: The teacher has established regular communication with families regarding instructional programs and regarding individual student progress and needs. Thoughtful and successful strategies are utilized to regularly engage families in the instructional program. Parents are provided consistent and up-to-date access to student progress monitoring through district technology resources. Parents are provided support for working with their children at home in order to enhance the classroom experience. Responses to family concerns are consistently
D. The professional teacher demonstrates attention to professional duties, in accordance with district and school expectations and regulations; completes record-keeping and day-to-day responsibilities in an accurate and timely manner; displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality; and works to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.

U: The teacher displays a lack of attention to professional duties and district and school expectations and regulations. Record keeping and other day-to-day responsibilities are neglected. The teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with the public, students, and colleagues. The teacher disregards standards for confidentiality. The teacher is not alert to student needs and contributes to practices that result in students being ill-served by the school.

NI: The teacher minimally attends to professional duties and minimally meets district and school expectations and regulations. Record keeping and other day-to-day responsibilities are inconsistently handled. The teacher displays honesty in interactions with the public, students, and colleagues. The teacher meets basic standards for confidentiality. The teacher is alert to student needs but inconsistent in his/her response. The teacher contributes, perhaps unknowingly, to practices that result in students being ill-served by the school.

E: The teacher meets all professional duties and district and school expectations and regulations. Record keeping and other day-to-day responsibilities are generally handled in an appropriate and timely manner. The teacher displays a high standard of honesty and integrity in interactions with the public, students, and colleagues. The teacher maintains high standards for confidentiality. The teacher is alert to student needs and works to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. The teacher contributes to practices that result in students being well-served by the school.

HE: The teacher exceeds expectations in attention to professional duties and district and school expectations and regulations. Record keeping and other day-to-day responsibilities are entirely handled in an appropriate and timely manner. The teacher displays and consistently models for others high standards of honesty and integrity in interactions with the public, students, and colleagues. The teacher maintains high standards for confidentiality. The teacher is alert to student needs and is proactive in seeking out resources to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. The teacher contributes to practices that result in students being well-served by the school.

U: Unsatisfactory; NI: Need Improvement; E: Effective; HE: Highly Effective
APPENDIX B
TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RUBRIC IN TURKEY

1. Lesson Planning and Designing Instruction
   - Lesson plans are designed in consideration of the learning environment.
   - Lesson plans are designed comprehensibly.
   - Lesson plans are designed for the knowledge of the students’ background plans.
   - Lesson plans are designed in consideration of individual differences.
   - Lesson plans are updated when needed.

2. Creating a Learning Environment
   - The learning environment is aligned with knowledge of individual differences.
   - The physical environment is arranged for safety.
   - The learning environment is aligned with instructional standards.
   - The learning environment is organized in consideration of various learning activities.
   - The learning environment includes appropriate technology that supports instruction.

3. Use of Effective Communication
   - The teacher has exhibited proficiency in the Turkish language.
   - The teacher uses nonverbal communication and intonation.
   - The teacher establishes effective communication with colleagues and administrators.
   - The teacher establishes effective communication with families.
   - The teacher establishes effective communication with students.

4. Student Motivation in Accordance with the Instructional Goals
   - Readiness level of the students is determined.
   - The students are informed about instructional goals.
   - The connection is built with students’ prior knowledge during instruction.
   - The activities are differentiated to ensure that all students can be successful.
   - The teacher uses teaching techniques and methods that help students who achieve instructional goals to develop advanced skills.

5. Effective Usage of School Facilities
   - School facilities are used to support instruction.
   - School facilities are used effectively to reach instructional goals.
   - Co-operation with institutions and organizations is established to improve the quality of instruction.
   - The teacher encourages parents to be involved in their children’s education.
   - The teacher makes an effort to improve school facilities.
6. Time Management
   • The teacher fulfills his/her duties and responsibilities in a timely manner.
   • The teacher is punctual in classroom hours.
   • The teacher is good at time management during the instructional process.
   • The instructional process is completed according to the plan.
   • Technology is incorporated into the instructional process for time management.

7. Effective Use of Teaching Methods and Techniques
   • The teacher uses appropriate teaching methods and techniques to reach instructional goals.
   • The teacher uses appropriate teaching methods and techniques in accordance with the developmental stages of students and students’ readiness.
   • The teacher provides opportunities for students to discover their individual abilities.
   • The teacher gives examples from daily life during the instructional process.
   • The teacher uses experiential learning methods.

8. Assessment of Instruction
   • Assessment is utilized for instruction.
   • The assessment process is performed fairly and transparently.
   • The teacher resolves students’ concerns related to the assessment process.
   • The teacher uses a process-oriented and complementary approach for assessment.
   • The teacher gives regular feedback to stakeholders about the assessment process.

9. Adaptation and Contribution of School Education Programs
   • The teacher takes into account the decisions of the board of teachers and the coterie of teachers.
   • The teacher participates in projects and/or suggests projects for improvement.
   • The teacher cooperates with his/her colleagues for improvement.
   • The teacher shares knowledge about improvement with his/her colleagues.
   • The teacher shows innovative thinking for improvements.

10. Exhibition of Appropriate Behavior as a Teacher:
    • The teacher behaves in a respectful manner to others.
    • The teacher participates in activities for professional development.
    • The teacher pays attention the dress code.
    • The teacher protects and promotes children and human rights.
    • The teacher protects national, moral, ethical, and universal values.
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