An Analysis of Teacher's Performance Evaluation at Private Schools: Kahramanmaraş and Gaziantep Sample

Zerrin Önen[1], Mehmet Sincar[2]

Abstract

This study aims to determine the views of administrators working at private schools in Kahramanmaraş and Gaziantep on evaluating teacher's performance and to make some recommendations for an effective and sufficient teacher evaluation accordingly. This study explores questions such as what administrators think about implementing the evaluation results, whether there should be an evaluation system that diffrentiates by teacher competencies or not and how teacher's performance evaluation systems contribute to teacher's professional development. The data were gathered through semi-structred interview forms and analysed through the content analysis method.

Keywords: Evaluation, teacher's performance, evaluating teacher's performance, administrators

[1]Teacher, Doctoral student, Inonu University, Malatya-Turkey, zonen83@hotmail.com, [2]Assoc. Prof. Dr., Gaziantep University, Gaziantep-Turkey, mehmetsincar@yahoo.com

Introduction

In our daily lives we always evaluate everything we come into contact with. But have you ever thought about it? What is evaluation? Actually evaluation is not a new term. Together with being more discussed in studies lately, research on evaluation go back to 1900s (Daley and Kim, 2010; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Toch and Rothman, 2008) and as a new technical term applied to education goes back to 1950s (Boykin, 1958). When these studies are examined it is seen that there have been various definitons for evaluation. For instance, Patton (1987) described evaluation as a process requiring collecting and analysing the information about a specific programme to be able to decide the degree of its effectiveness and to provide improvement. In another article, Sanders (2001, p. 363) defined the term as "a means to strengthen development, whether it is human, economic or other forms of development". Kurban and Tok (2018, p. 3) intrepreted evaluation as a term that is comprised of discovering the facts about the current situation, assessing and correcting-improvement. Docekal and Dvorakova (2015, p. 3743-3744) stated that "Evaluation is understood as the act of assessing value of an educational activity according to specific criteria, as well as collecting and analysing the information, based on which such assessment may be carried out." Helvacı (2002) explained the term of performance evaluation as a systematic process which evaluate the successful and unsuccessful sides of the performance together. When educational organizations considered, it is clear that the term of development lies in the core of evaluation. Stronge and Tucker (1999, p. 356), for example, related the evaluation and development as "evaluation can be an important tool for supporting and improving the quality of teaching." Stronge (2006, p. 1) stressed that "Teacher evaluation is, first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountability for their work". Educational organizations come into existence with people-administrators, teachers, students- so it would be wrong to evaluate these organizations in one-dimensional way. Regarding to the evaluating of educational organizations, Docekal and Dvorakova (2015, p. 3749) pointed out that "evaluation's individual phases or levels are interconnected just as with other factors out of the educational development programs". Tamani, Talbi and Radid (2015) stressed that evaluation should be carried out with all parameters – administrators, teachers, other human reseources. Among these, teachers play a key role in achieving school's goals as the policy practitioners. In this sense, evaluating teachers become even more important because teachers are important in students' education (Daley and Kim, 2010) and the purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve the quality of teaching (Daley and Kim, 2010; Feeney, 2007; Peterson, 2004; Stronge, 2006).

In literature there are a lot of studies about evaluating teachers' performance from the aspects of content, policies, challenging, differentiated system by teacher competiencies and implementing the results (Altun and Memişoğlu, 2008; Akşit, 2006; Balkar and Şahin, 2010; Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Daley and

Kim, 2010; Danielson, 2001; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Erkurt, 2017; Kurban and Tok, 2018; Marshall, 2005; Peterson, 2004; Reinhorn, Johnson and Simon, 2017; Sayın and Arslan, 2017; Stronge, 2006; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Taylor and Tyler, 2012; Zhang and Ng, 2017). This article takes a look at the views of administrators working at private schools in two cities in Turkey -Gaziantep and Kahramanmaraş- on evaluating teachers' performance. It can be said that there is not any effective and sufficient teacher evaluation system carried out by school administrators working at Turkish state schools (Erkurt, 2017). According to the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) Regulation on Being Appointed and Replacement (2015), performance of every teacher who works at every type and degree of educational instutiton is evaluated to assess her/his efficiency, efforts and success in the end of each academic year by administrators of institutions (MoNE, 2015); however, it is not possible to observe application of an effective evaluation sysytem in state schools. But the evaluation standarts in private schools are quite different than state schools. In addition to being evaluated by MoNE, private schools have their own performance evaluation system. That is why, it was, in this study, aimed to investigate the views of school administrators working at private schools on evaluating teacher's performance and to make some recommendations for an effective and sufficient teacher evaluation. Accordingly, the views of school administrators regarding (1) the content of the teacher evaluation system, (2) a system that differentiates by teachers' competencies, (3) its contribution to the teacher's professional growth, (4) implementing the results and (5) recommendations for a better evaluation system were examined.

We focused on analysis of interviews that were held with school administrators about evaluating teacher's performance. The sample of this study consisted of six school administrators working at private schools in Gaziantep and Kahramanmaraş during the 2017–2018 educational year in Turkey. We wanted to reveal the views of private school administrators' views on evaluating the performance of teachers. We tried to find an answer to questions such as what is/ should be the content of performance evaluation, should there be an evaluation system that differentiates by teacher competencies or not, what do they think about implementing the evaluation results, and how do teacher's performance evaluation systems contribute to teacher's professional development.

Theoretical-Conceptual Approach to Evaluation

Evaluation has been an important issue for policy makers and educators. Evaluating teacher has been a focal point of the education systems since 1900s (Daley and Kim, 2010; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Toch and Rothman, 2008). In the beginning, teachers' personal traits were at the center of the evaluation process (Daley and Kim, 2010) then it shifted to evaluating effective teaching methods in 1950s and 1960s. It followed a process towards professional growth and school improvement in 1990s and into the 21st century (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003). In additon to professional growth and school improvement, student achivement

has been a criterion in evaluating teachers (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Peterson, 2004). With such criteria, establishing an effective teacher evaluation system would be challenging in terms of accuracy of measurement and evaluation criteria (OECD, 2009).

School achievement and indirectly student achievement are closely related to the quality of teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Heck, 2007; Stronge, Ward, Tucker and Hindman, 2007). When viewed from this aspect, the term of good teaching comes to the fore. What really makes a good teacher? Is it teacher's personal traits, his/her attitudes towards teaching or knowledge of major? Researchers expressed different opinions about what specific points should be observed during the evaluation. For example, Ellett and Teddlie (2003) stated that teachers were at first evaluated on their personal traits such as being honest, respectful, fair and now evlauation systems are focused on teacher's behaviour and performance. Toch and Rothman (2008) pointed out that while observing a lesson, teacher's abilities such as working with their students, teaching techniques, types of homework they assign should be evaluated. Bas Collins (2002) stated that supervision should lead to teacher's teaching performance by demonstrating methods, giving suggestions, issuing specific instruction, evaluating results and assessing teacher's performance. Recent studies underlined that evaluating teacher's performance should not only be handled with the individual level but also with the organizational level (Ellett and Teddlie 2003, Köse, 2017; Stronge, 2006; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Zhang and Ng, 2017). For instance, Stronge (2006) claimed that if the evaluation is initiated on both individual and organisational level, it is better for students and community. Reinhorn et al. (2017) highlighted that when evaluations conducted by the principals were mostly situated cognition- the context in which they worked- rather than the individual cognition – teacher's or principal's beliefs and knowledge-, evaluation would be more effective for teachers. Stronge and Tucker (1999, p. 348) emphasized that "Personnel performance should be linked with the organisation's mission." Çelikten and Özkan (2018) stated that increasing the efficiency of the organisational behaviour is closely related to teacher's performance. Thus, it can be said that content of the evaluation can not be isolated from the institution; on the contrary, it should be related to the organisation's goals. Since the success of students are considered as the fundamental goal of schools, it would not be surprising to see the studies about teacher's performance and student's achievement. Studies about teacher's performance evaluation have been mostly carried out via classroom observations (Danielson, 2001; Peterson, 2004; Sawchuk, 2015; Toch, 2008; Zhang and Ng, 2017); however, most of these studies have highlighted that visiting only a lesson is not a sufficient way for evaluating teacher's performance (Akşit, 2006; Altun and Memişoğlu, 2008; Bas Collins, 2002; Başar, 1988; Danielson, 2001; Docekal and Dvorakova, 2015; Goe, Biggers and Croft, 2012; Marshall, 2005). Docekal and Dvorakova (2015, p. 3749) explained that "it is not sufficient to perform the evaluation only during the learning and development process. It is necessary to evaluate before the begining of education and

development and after it has been completed, in order to define its contributions for the corporation or stakeholders." Toch (2008) claimed that test scores are not the only solution because students have very different background –privileged or less privileged backgrounds and suggested that multiple resources such as portfolios, videos should be performed in evaluating teacher's performance. Similarly, Stronge (2006) emphasized that using of multiple data source provides a fuller view of performance.

It is often said that teachers are evaluated to be judged. Traditionally evaluating teacher was administered to teachers but today it is seen as an activity with them (Aslanargun and Tarku, 2014; Memişoğlu, 2004) and makes teachers more active during the evaluation process (Danielson, 2001). In addition to the studies emphasizing that different methods should be applied in evaluating teacher's performance (Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Daley and Kim, 2010; Danielson, 2001; Goe et al., 2012; Peterson, 2004; Sayın and Arslan, 2017; Stronge, 2006; Toch, 2008; Zhang and Ng, 2017), there have been also studies stating that practices have not served as part of an effective system (Altun and Memişoğlu, 2008; Daley and Kim, 2010) and so evaluation systems have had significant changes in recent years (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Sawchuk, 2015; Toch and Rothman, 2008). For instance, Danielson (2001) proposed a differentiated approach and announced that teachers should not be evaluated by only a classroom visit; rather, some applications such as differentiated systems, multiyear cycle, active teacher roles, portfolios, professional conversations, student achievement should be employed. According to Danielson (2001, p. 13) "A differentiated approach is about relying on different activities, procedures and timelines for different groups of teachers." The term of a differentiated system has attracted the educators' attention too. For instance, in the Global Education Monitoring Report (2017, p. 71) it has been emphasized "No single measurement strategy can capture the full range of teacher performance or the composition of qualities important for effective teaching". Likewise, Peterson (2004, p. 63) uttered that "No signal data source is valid for every teacher in a school and no individual data source is available for each teacher." Similarly, Daley and Kim (2010) concluded that in spite of all criticisms such as being one-dimensional, undifferentiated, it is possible to design a new system that is multi dimensional, differentiated, objective and supportive for teacher's personal growth. Danielson (2001) discussed a differentiated system which consists of different strategies for experienced or tenured teachers and novice teachers. Toch and Rothman (2008) stated that it is not a destiny to use the system that have been applied so far in evaluating teacher and also claimed that multifaceted evaluation models works better than the traditional evaluation methods because they are one-dimensional. Zhang and Ng (2017) expressed that it would be unfair to evaluate all teachers by using the same list criteria. From these points of views, it can be said that teacher should and can be evaluated by their competencies.

As discussed above, visiting only a lesson is not sufficient for an effective evaluation. In addition to all other negative criticisms about evaluating a teacher's

performance, such a formal process creates a tension in the classroom, makes teacher feel nervous and impedes teacher's professional growth too (Marshall, 2005). At this point the relationship between evaluation and professional growth attracts the attention.

The perception of evaluating teacher's performance has changed and accordingly the purpose of the evaluation has naturally changed as well. The evaluation that was done to judge teachers previously shifted to an activity that is done to increase the degree of teacher's effectiveness and professional growth (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003). Regarding this, there are those who aggree that professional growth and evaluation are closely related to each other and evaluation can contribute to teacher's development (Akşit, 2006; Çelikten and Özkan, 2018; Danielson, 2001; Danielson, 2011; Duke, 1990; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Erkurt, 2017; Konan and Yılmaz, 2018; Stronge, 2006; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Taylor and Tyler, 2012; Zhang and Ng, 2017). Development is usually considered as a bureaucratic work, not a vehicle for improvement by school administrators (Stronge and Tucker, 1999) so they rarely share the results of evaluation with teachers to help them improve their performances (Bas Collins, 2002; Daley and Kim, 2010; Toch, 2008). However, the purpose of evaluation is to provide improvement (Bas Collins, 2002; Daley and Kim, 2010; Peterson, 2004; Stronge, 2006; Feeney, 2007). Evaluation results should be used for improvement. When the studies in the literature are examined it could be concluded that the term of feedback has come to the forefront (Erkurt, 2017; Feeney, 2007; Goe et al., 2012; Reinhorn et al., 2017). So, the answer of the question "what is feedback? is important. Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 23) defined the term as "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding". Considering the research with the study focused on teacher's giving feedback to improve teaching and learning conducted by Hattie and Timperley, it can be said that this agent is the administrator as the person who evaluates teacher's performance. In this sense feedback that is provided by administrators gains more significance because it is expected to contribute to teacher's professional growth. Bas Collins (2002) uttered that first purpose of supervision is to give feedback because it contributes to the professional development. Similarly, Reinhorn et al. (2017) concluded from their studies that feedback that was given by the administrators helped teachers to improve. Çelikten and Özkan (2018) claimed that performance evaluation has two objects. One of them is to get an idea about job performance of the personnel and the other one is to give feedback to the person. They also highlighted that since the evelaution is a process of feedback, this let teachers learn about positive and successful sides of their current performances, determine deficient sides of their performances and so they can get greater gains in terms of self-development. Tylor and Tyler (2012) noted that teachers who receive critical feedback learn new information about their performances, develop new skills and become more successful. So, it can be inferred that evaluation is not a procedure that must be completed. On contrary, findings from evaluations should be used for

promoting and sustaining professional growth (Danielson, 2001; Feeney, 2007; OECD, 2013; Stronge, 2006; Sawchuk, 2015) because evaluation results guide teachers in their professional growth and in the improvement of student achievement (Davis, Ellett and Annunziata, 2002; Stronge, 2006).

Finally, evaluation is a term including the process (formative) and the results (summative) phases (Bas Collins, 2002; Tylor and Tyler, 2012). Formative evaluation is the phase that is conducted during the year and contains the data collection, classroom observation, feedback, write-ups and plan stages of professional progress (Bas Collis, 2002). All these activities including classroom observations, providing feedback, having meetings just before and after the evaluation can be considered as a part of formative evaluation. Besides formative evaluation, other type of evaluation- summative evaluation- marks the end of evaluation. It consists of review and integration of formative evaluation, summary of teacher's performance and administrator's views (Bas Collins, 2002; OECD, 2009). Summative evaluation is mostly conducted at schools and results are guided in two ways- for punishment and for rewards. The way of implementing the evalutaion results is a current-debated topic (Adnot, Dee, Katz and Wyckoff, 2017; Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Çelikten and Özkan, 2018; Peterson, 2004; Reinhorn et al., 2017; Toch, 2008; Toch and Rothman, 2008; Vaillant and Gonzalez-Vaillant, 2017). It is known that punishment does not work in increasing the frequency of desired behaviour, it just supresses (McLeod, 2007; Mill, 2009) so punishment methods should not be employed; but, on the contrary, punishment methods such as removal or dismissal of teachers may work at schools in terms of school's success. Adnot et al. (2017), for example, emphasized that provided schools identify the low-performing teachers accurately, dismissal of teachers can reverse and replace them with more effective teachers and conclude with a positive reflection on students' achievement. However, it is also highlighted that punishing teachers and schools for their low performance after evaluation is not a solution (Çelikten and Özkan, 2018; Reinhorn et al., 2017; Vaillant and Gonzalez-Vaillant, 2017). Vaillant and Gonzalez-Vaillant (2017) noted that evaluation systems that benefited from the results positively rather than punishing the schools and teachers have been more successful in the USA. Reinhorn et al. (2017) who focused on improvement claimed that policies that are centered on teachers' development get more appreciaiton. It is known that reinforces should be used in increasing the frequency of intentional behaviour. Motivational impacts that are given to the teachers related to the evaluation results can be considered as a reward. These impacts or rewards can be tenure, merit pay, promotion or differentiated compensation. For instance, Toch (2008) reported that if teachers get paid the same, it would be meaningless to evaluate teachers carefully. Similarly, according to Toch and Rothman (2008) single salary schedule may prevent to conduct better evaluations. Some modifications like performance pay to the single salary schedule may work in making evaluations stronger. That is, evaluation should be incentive and encouraging. Consequently, studies supporting that motivational impact such as merit pay, promotion, compensation should be avoided are also

available in the literature. For instance, in the Global Education Monitoring Report (2017) it was stated that linking student performance to teacher's salary is not acceptable because it diminishes the motivation and creates unfairness. Peterson (2004) asserted that applications like merit pay prevent cooperation.

Method

Qualitative research aims to explore the detailed understanding of meanings, attitudes, and intentions expressed by those who experience the studied phenomenon (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). Since qualitative research gives the detailed picture of people's perceptions, interactions and experiences (Springer, 2010) a qualitative research procedure was employed in this study. Research data were collected through semi-structured interviews. To have richer and deeper knowledge purposeful sampling method was preferred; so, six private school administrators working at different levels of school -pre-school, primary school, secondary school, high school-in Kahramanmaraş and Gaziantep, Turkey, during the 2017-2018 educational year were chosen as the participants. Participants were informed via phone calls about the study before the interviews. The interviews were taped, deciphered, and sent them to confirm. The interview protocol was sent by email before conducting the interviews. All participants preferred to participate in the interview at their schools.

Participants were coded by numbers. For example, participant 1 was coded as P1, participant 2 was coded as P2… Their characteristics are shown in table 3.1.

Table 1
Participants' Characteristics

Partici pants	Seniority			Type of School			
	Occupation (Year) 10+	Administration (Year) 1-10	Administration (Year) 10+	Pre-Primary	Primary	Secondary	High School
P1	X		X				X
P2	X	X					X
P3	X	X		X			
P4	X	X				X	
P5	X	X			X		
P6	X		X		X		

Data collection and data analysis

A semi structured interview form was used to reveal participants' views on evaluating teacher's performance. Interview questions were derived from the related literature. The interview form consisted of two parts. The first part included demographic questions such as rank, type of school and branch and a second part included five questions about performance evaluation such as what should the content of the performance evaluation be, how should the teacher's performance be evaluated, do the performance evaluation systems contribute to the professional development, if so, how?

The interviews were conducted at schools. A voice recorder was used with the consent of the participants to prevent data loss. Each participant was interviewed separately and each interview took about 45 minutes. Validity and reliability of the study were carried out through internal validity, member checks and inter-coder reliability process (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The interviews were transcribed and were sent to the participants through e-mail to confirm. After the confirmation, the data were analysed through the content analysis by carefully examining the transcriptions of the interviews, forming categories and codes (Boyatsiz, 1998; Cresswell, 2007; Patton, 2002; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Participants' statements were made into codes by keeping the original content of the transcriptions. Then these codes were integrated into categories with a holistic approach. In order to strengthen reliability, the analysis was conducted by the first and second authors independently then the conclusions were compared. These conclusions have been presented in following section.

Findings

This section presents the findings of the study and their subsequent analysis. The findings that were gathered at the end of semi-structured interviews are presented. The data are organised into six categories: individual context, organisational context, process, type of evaluation, feedback and implementing the results and thirteen codes. These categories and codes are presented in table 3.1.

Table 2
Categories and Codes

Category	Code	N
Individual Context	Having the capability of communicating	6
	Self-disciplined	4
	Being easygoing	2
Organisational Context	Knowledge of pedagogy	5
	Student's success	4
	Sense of belonging to the school	2
Process	A differentiated system	4
	An egalitarian approach	2
Type of evaluation	Formative+Summative	5
	Summative	1
Feedback	Encouraging development	6
Implementing the Results	Reward	6
	Punishment	6

Individual context

This category involves the views of participants about the content of evaluation. In the 'individual context' category, they highlighted that personal traits are very important and one's behaviour is not very different from her/his personal traits. That is to say, personal traits and displayed behaviour interact with each other. They stated that teacher's personal trait is one of the criterions that must be evaluated during the teacher performance evaluation. While this finding is consistent with the literature (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003) stating that a teacher must be honest, fair and respectful, in this study some personal traits such as as having a capability of communicating with people, being easygoing and self-disciplined were highlighted. Among these traits the code of having the capability of communicating with people was the most repetitive code under the individual context category. Participants underlined that teachers should have a good dialogue with students, parents, administrators and colleagues. One participant expressed his ideas as follows:

> As you know education is a tripodal structure. It is a triangle comprised of student, family and school. It forms as a result of mutual interaction. To be able to manage this interaction depends on the teacher's high ability of communicating. It is very important that she/he can communicate in a good way with both student and parent. (P3)

Other participants who expressed their opinions about this topic stated that communicating is a very important point, as explained by an administrator:

> Can teacher communicate with students, parents, administrators and other teachers at school? If she/he can, is it a true communication? These are important for us because teaching firstly is a communication profession. I mean if you can

not communicate you can not teach. We can also say that the quality of communication that the teacher has with her/his colleagues and administrators goes parallel with teacher's performance. (P5)

Participants expressed that teachers work with other people -teachers, administrators- to achieve the goals of the school. Regarding this, they stated that teachers should be easygoing because cooperation requires to work together. One of the participants explained:

> While evaluating performance it is important that whether she/he leads a team, is a part of the team or what kind of contributions she/he has made to her/his colleagues' development about her/his field and pedagogy while working. (P4)

Since teaching is a profession that is under the effects of teachers, students, parents, administrators, it is inevitable to work with people of different personal traits, to affect them or be affected by them during the process. Besides this, some participants underlinded that teacher must be self-disciplined and must have a task-oriented approach. For instance, a participant explained his understanding of performance evaluation as teaching the lesson, attendig the class on time and doing the tasks that are given to him.

Considering all these statements we can say that teachers are models for students especially in terms of personal traits so teachers and their personalities are very important. They have high or poor performance at working places depending on their personal traits.

Organisational context

This category contains the participants' views about the content of the performance evaluation as well. Participants who emphasized the reality of central exam highlighted the code of 'knowledge of pedagogy" under the category of organisational context. It is known that schools are organisations and so they have some goals. The reason for teacher to be at school is undoubtedly is to achieve the school's goals. Organisational success is directly related to what extend teacher acts in accordance with school's goals. Participants who view the content of teacher's performance evaluation from the organisation perspective highlighted that teacher's performance should be evaluated at organisational level besides the side of evaluation about his/her personal traits. As part of the organisational context, the codes of teacher's knowledge of pedagogy, student's success and sense of belonging under organisational context came to the forefront. The knowledge of pedagogy that was uttered by five participants became the most repetitive code.

> It is a must to be able to teach according to the student's level and know the characteristics of whole group such as physical development, social mental development, psychological development and physiological development. (P3)

> Teacher's performance should be evaluated according to the qualitative data rather than the quantitative data. Observations are very important. The teaching strategies, methods and techniques that are used by teacher should defi-

nitely be observed, evaluated and given to the teacher as a feedback. Teacher may have a very high level of knowledge but can she/he teach according to the student's level? Can she/he motive or lead students? (P5)

In addition to the knowledge of pedagogy, the findings in the literature pointed out (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Peterson, 2004) that student's success is a criterion on evaluating was uttered by the participants as the academic success of student performed in exams should be a criterion for performance evaluation. One of the participants expressed:

> 34 students at 8th graduated from our school last year. 10 of these students got accepted into science high school. We had 37 students at 8th two years ago and 14 of these students got accepted to the same schools. Is not this my teachers' success? This is my teachers' success; not mine. Of course, I will take into consideration this while evaluating their performance. (P6)

A participant who aggreed with the idea that the student's success should be a criterion distinguished the evaluation of core curriculum teachers from competency-based lesson teachers.

> We have an indispensable reality: Exam. While evaluating the core curriculum teachers, you must consider in terms of the exam as well. The criteria that you are going to evaluate should be parallel with it. For example, while there are questions for a physics teacher to what extent students became successful in the exam at the end of the school year, about competency-based lessons there are some recordings such as to what kind of contests students attended both at city level and national level, what kind of success they made at sportive activities. Our main criterion for competency-based lessons is the rate of students who attended the contests. For core curriculum lessons we take account of the student's success. (P1)

During the process of evaluation, besides of academic success, it should not be forgotten that teachers are social beings. Then, if the teacher adopts the environment, she/he is in as a social being, she/he develops a sense of belonging to the school depending on this. It is known that a person who has developed a sense of belonging gives a good performance by embracing the job. Related to this, a participant clearly expressed that it is necassary to develop a sense of belonging to the school in evaluating teacher's performance.

> One of the factors that comes to the forefront at private schools while evaluating the teacher's performance is the degree of teacher's developing a sense of belonging to the school. (P2)

The findings in the organisational context indicate that the content of evaluating teacher's performance has been changed and denote that teacher's performance should be evaluated both at the organisational level and the individual level (Daley and Kim, 2010; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Stronge, 2006; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Zhang and Ng, 2017).

Process

This category is about the approaches that should be deemed within the period of evaluating teachers' performance. It reveals the views of participants to the question of "Can we say that there should be an evaluation system by teacher's competencies or a standardized evaluation system, why?" Related to the category of process, while some participants empasized that an egalitarian approach should be adopted in evaluating performance, some of the participants stated that a system that diffrentiates by teacher competencies should be adopted. The view of different methods should be adopted in evaluating performance (Akşit, 2006; Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Daley and Kim, 2010; Danielson, 2001; Goe et al., 2012; Kurban and Tok, 2018; Peterson, 2004; Stronge, 2006; Toch, 2008; Zhang and Ng, 2017) was implied in the present study as performance evaluation must be differentiated by type of course subject. For example;

> A criterion that you use while evaluating the performance of mathematics teacher should not be the same as you evaluate the performance of any physical education teacher, visual art teacher or music teacher. For example, we have a system called portal that we use at our school and it is different from e-school. While using portal, a mathematics teacher gives homework, follows it, sends messages to the parents, etc. If we take using such a system as a criterion for example while evaluating a physical teacher's performance, we will make mistake. The performance of core curriculum teachers must be evaluated differently. As I said before, the core curriculum lessons such as Turkish, mathematics, science and religion and moral must be evaluated separately and social lessons such as physical education, visual art and music must be evaluated separately. (P4)

Since the content of every lesson is different from each other it is important to keep in mind that all courses can not be evaluated by the same criteria. This finding supports the view in the literature (Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Kurban and Tok, 2018) that every branch teacher's performance should not be evaluated by the same way. In addition to this, regarding whether different applications should be adopted according to seniority or not, it was seen that participants expressed different opinions. For instance, while some participants remarked that a differentation according to the seniority should be made while evaluating the performance,

> Evaluating the performance of a novice teacher is done as a whole. You pay attention to her/his communication skills and tests how she/he uses her/his body language. One of the points that we put particular emphasis on novice teachers is that whether her/his pedagogy knowledge is enough or not. Pedagogy differences will come out while evaluating the performance of a novice teacher and a senior teacher. This is the first one. The second one is experience. I mean, because she/he has an experience in her/his field and produces for 10 years I can not evaluate such an experienced teacher's performance and a novice teacher's performance in the same category. So, the evaluation of experienced teachers should be different from the evaluation of novice teachers. (P2)

Another participant explained that:

It is not true to evaluate a teacher's performance by her/his seniority. Should we evaluate a 20 or 10-years experienced teacher's performance in the same way with a 5-years experienced one. I think they should not be gone through the same procedure. (P4)

Similarly, participants who stated that an egalitarian approach should be adopted in evaluating performance discussed this in terms of educational status and remarked that any differentation – having a MA degree or PhD- should not be applied.

I go through the same procedure with both teacher who has a master degree and does not have a master degree because both of them are teachers. Teaching is important here. Based on my experiences I think that a teacher with a master degree will be more succesful but still the working hours are the same, give the same lesson and do the same job; so, I think that all of them should be treated equally. (P6)

Participants expressions reveal that everyone has a different personality and background so the same performance can not be expected from all teachers. These expressions of participants also are not very different from the findings of the previous studies (Daley and Kim, 2010; Danielson, 2001; Goe et al., 2012; Kurban and Tok, 2018; Peterson, 2004; Sayın and Arslan, 2017; Stronge, 2006; Toch, 2008; Zhang and Ng, 2017). From the findings we could infer that all teachers' performance should not be evaluated by the same criteria and different methods should be used.

Type of evaluation

This category relates the participants' views about how teachers' performance should be evaluated. The codes of 'summative' and 'both formative and summative' were obtained related to the type of evaluation category. While only one participant stated that a summative evaluation should be conducted, five of the six participants stated that both a formative and summative evaluation should be conducted.

With reference to the view that the aim of the evaluation is to provide development (Akşit, 2006; Bas Collins, 2002; Daley and Kim, 2010; Peterson, 2004; Stronge, 2006; Feeney, 2007), participants highlighted the procedure by centering the development of the teacher on the performance evaluation. They also indicated that both procedure and result should be evaluated together. For example, while one of the participants expressed that:

There is such a teacher that she/he is very succesful during the term, manages the procedure very well but can not reach a conclusion. There is such a teacher that she/he is very passive and not very good during the term but she/he gets a conclusion. Both of them are not the ideal teachers. Teacher should both manage the procedurevery well and reach a succesful conclusion; accordingly, both of them should be evaluated together. (P4)

Another participant stressed that:

> In my opinion it is necesaary to make an evaluation between two period of time. I do that. The first one is during the year and the second one is at the end of the year. Not only will first evaluation make easier the second evaluation but also increase the teacher's performance and help teacher to see her/his deficiencies. (P2)

Participants' expressions that performance evaluation is a notion involving both procedure and the result are highly important in terms of referring to the studies which highlight the procedure and the result should be integrated while evaluating (Bas Collins, 2002; Tylor and Tyler, 2012).

Feedback

Feedback can be defined as any kind of written or verbal information or criticism about teacher's performance provided by her/his administrator. The code of "encouraging development" was obtained related to the question of "Do you think that the performance evaluation systems contribute to the professional development? and if so, in what ways?" All participants aggreed that feedback may contribute to the development. In this study it has also been emphasized that teachers may improve themselves professionally if they receive enough positive feedback in the end of the evaluation procedure; however, it has also been highlighted that evaluation is not a judgmental notion; rather, it is a notion that encourages person to develop herself/himself. One of the participants explained that:

> When you evaluate a teacher's performance you have a meeting with her/him. You chat. You share your observations with her/him and advise about what to do to be beter. At the same time, you consolidate positive sides of her/his performance by verbalising good sides of the performance. (P2)

> We consult our teachers as well. We talk about the positive and negative sides of the performance frankly and honestly. By stating that the aim of the evaluation is to improve ourselves and taking into consideration this I evaluate the teacher's performance monthly. (P3)

Since the aim of the evaluation is to provide development participants'expressions about professional development are expected. Participants stated that insufficient sides of the performance should be detected and teachers should be guided at the end of the evaluation. Also, participants underlined that evaluation should enable teachers to develop themselves by giving information about their performances:

> Performance evaluation should encourage the person to develop oneself. I think teacher should be evaluated about her/his deficiencies. Informing the teachers about the deficiencies determined at the end of the evaluation is welcomed by the teachers. Also sharing our opinions with them about how they will be in their favour if they remedy those deficiencies makes our teachers be happier. Then the teachers try to do their best to remedy the deficiencies. (P1)

Actually, development and renewal occur at the end of an evaluation process. So, evaluating the performance of teachers working at educational organisations is important because teachers' improvement can be provided by giving feedback and so the number of succesful schools increases. Also, participants' statements about this point show parallelism with the views from the literature (Bas Collins, 2002; Çelikten and Özkan, 2018; Danielson, 2001; Davis et al., 2002; Erkurt, 2017; Feeney, 2007; OECD, 2013; Reinhorn et al., 2017; Stronge, 2006; Sawchuk, 2015; Taylor and Tyler, 2012) that feedback should/can contribute to the one's professional development. What emerges from this finding is that feedback should support the teacher's development especially professional development because the more one gets positive and developmental feedback, the more she/he becomes successful.

Implementing the results

In this section we present the answers of our participants to the question "What do you think about implementing the evaluation results? Regarding this category, all participants underlined the notions of rewards and punishment as it is presented in literature. Almost all stated that teachers should be rewarded at the end of the evaluation procedure; however, it was also stressed that punishment should be the last solution to the problem. For example, regarding the punishment, one of the participants pointed out that punishment is a very simple solution and should be the last solution. Another participant supported this and noted that punishment is not a preferred practice. He expressed:

> Punishment is always offensive. Negative things do not allow us to reach a succesful conclusion. The same thing is true for my teachers as well. (P4)

It was pointed out that if a punishment is administered then it results as not working with the same person following year. The statements of the participants are parallel to the findings of a study conducted by Adnot et al. (2017) that if a teacher with low-performance is dismissed and replace her/him with a more effective teacher, a positive reflection can be observed on students' success. All participants delivered their opinions about punishment and verbalised this as not working with them following year. For instance, participant 5 stated that

> If we think that we do not progress we annul the conract at the end of the school year. If the performance of my teacher is under the red line, we have to decide not to work with her/him for the following year. (P5)

Regarding the implemantations of the evaluation results the term of reward was given priority. For instance, while some participants evaluated the contract renewal as a reward, some participants evaluated merit pay, promotion or a ceritificate of apprecaiation or achievement as a reward.

> I think reagarding the successful teachers, continuing to work at the same school for the following year is her/his reward. (P5)

> There are a few evaluation criteria. We honour our teachers by giving her/him a certificate of apprecaitaion at ceremonies. While renewing the contract we increase the salary of our successful teachers. (P1)

We pay our successful teachers a bonus at the end of the school year. (P6)

These statements show that reward should be taken into account. The participants' emphasies on reward is parallel with the findings of the study conducted by Vaillantand Gonzalez-Vaillant (2017) that revealed that if the evaluation results are used positively then the school and teachers become more successful.

All these findings indicate that reinforces increase the frequency of intentional behaviour. When rewarding is considered as a reinforce paying bonus or giving a certificate of appreciation increase the person's motivation. As it is known motivation prods the person into action and directs the way. The energy of a person highly motivated reflects to the organisational applications and so organizational efficiency increases.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study reveals the views of the administrators working at private schools in two cities -Gaziantep and Kahramanmaraş- in Turkey about evaluating teachers' performance. The findings were consistent with the literature on this topic. For example, the finding that teacher's performance evaluation should be carried out at two levels –individual level and organisational level- was mentioned in many studies (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Köse, 2017; Konan and Yılmaz, 2018; Stronge, 2006; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Zhang and Ng, 2017); however, while personal traits evaluated at individual level were expressed as being honest, respectful and fair in the literature (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003), these personal traits were listed as having a high capability of communicating with people, being easygoing and self-disciplined in our study. Teachers deal with students, parents or administrators as a matter of course; that is to say, it is human that they deal with, not robot and so it can be said that participants' statements about communication are highly important. The view highlighted in literature that the content of performance evaluation has shifted from teacher's personal traits to the organisation's success since 1950s (Daley and Kim, 2010; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003) came forefront in our study as evaluation should also be conducted at organisational level. Regarding the organisational level, the terms of knowledge of pedagogy, student's success and sense of belonging to the school have been the most repetitive codes. While the views about knowledge of pedagogy and student's success support to many studies (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Heck, 2007; Peterson, 2004; Stronge et al., 2007) the view about sense of belonging to the school have been one of the findings that we reached at the end of the research, which slightly different from the literature. Findings have supported the view that the level of student's success is closely related to the quality of teacher's teaching ability (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Heck, 2007; Stronge et al., 2007) and indicated that student's success has become a criterion in evaluating the teacher's performance (Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Peterson, 2004).

185

The point that the pedagogy and knowledge can be evaluated (Rothman, 2008) through the classroom observation -one of the techniques that are used while evaluating the performance (Danielson, 2001; Peterson, 2004; Sawchuk, 2015; Toch, 2008; Zhangand Ng, 2017) has been another finding in our study. However, it has also been found out in our study that the criteria of pedagogy and knowledge will be unsufficient while evaluating the performance (Akbaba Altun and Memişoğlu, 2008; Bas Collins, 2002; Başar, 1998; Danielson, 2001; Docekal and Dvorakova, 2015; Goe et al., 2012; Marshall, 2005). Besides these criteria, developing the sense of belonging to the school should also be taken into consideration. Related to the performance evaluation, the view that different methods and techniques should be used by competencies during the process of evaluation (Akşit, 2006; Daley and Kim, 2010; Danielson, 2001; Goe et al., 2012; Peterson, 2004; Sayın and Arslan, 2017; Stronge, 2006; Toch, 2008; Toch and Rothman, 2008; Zhang and Ng, 2017) was expressed in our study as a differentiated evaluation system can be adopted according to the teacher's branch.

Curriculum of all lessons are different from each other and different knowledge, skill and attitudes are taught in each lesson so it can not be said that there is a standard evaluation method including all lessons. It seems that evaluating the performance by the same criteria is true but it would be inaccurate to evaluate all teachers' performance by the same criteria since the content of the lessons, teaching methods and techniques are different from each other. Only standard criteria can be determined for common goals. Nonetheless, the view that teacher's educational background (MA, Phd) and seniority should not cause a differentation has been a finding as slightly different from the literature.

Participants expressed that evaluation should be conducted both in a formative and a summative phase way; however, the formative phase was mentioned in the study more than the summative phase. In formative phase, the picture of current situation is drawn in evaluation and accordingly deficient aspects are determined and development process is formed. Participants stated that the aim of performance evaluation is not to judge the person; on contrary, to pave the way to the development. This point is important in terms of referring to the studies in literature (Stronge, 2006; Bas Collins, 2002; Çelikten and Özkan, 2018). For instance, Stronge (2006) summarized the evaluation process as firstly determining the quality of teacher's performance and then helping her/him with developing her/his performance. Thus, it can be said that performance evaluation system should have both a formative and summative phase.

As revealed in this study, participants highlighted the relationship between feedback and evaluation. The view that evaluation should be supportive of development was interpreted by the participants as professional development and in this regard, the finding that performance evaluation can contribute to the teacher's professional development concurs with previous studies (Akşit, 2006; Bas Collins, 2002; Danielson, 2001; Davis et al., 2002; Duke, 1990; Ellett and Teddlie, 2003; Erkurt, 2017; Sayın and Arslan, 2017; Feeney, 2007; Konan and

Yılmaz, 2018; OECD, 2013; Stronge, 2006; Sawchuk, 2015; Stronge and Tucker, 1999; Taylor and Tyler, 2012; Zhang and Ng, 2017). For instance, Bas Collins (2002) claimed that the first purpose of the evaluation is to give feedback because it contributes to the professional development. Similarly, Ellett and Teddlie (2003) asserted that performance evaluation is an activity which is conducted to increase the teacher's performance and efficiency. In parallel, it has been underlined that performance evaluation results guide to the teachers' professional development and accordingly to the improvement of student's success (Davis et al., 2002; Stronge, 2006).

Although there are some studies in the literature that have revealed divergent opinions about rewarding or punishing the teachers (Adnot et al., 2017; Bozan and Ekinci, 2018; Çelikten and Özkan, 2018; Peterson, 2004; Reinhorn et al., 2017; Toch, 2008; Toch and Rothman, 2008; Vaillant and Gonzalez-Vaillant, 2017). Participants in this study emphasized that successful teachers should be rewarded in the end of evaluating the performance. This finding supports the view asserted by Vaillant and Gonzalez-Vaillant (2017) that if evaluation results are used positively rather than negatively, teachers and schools will be more successful.

Finally, with reference to the view that motivation and reinforces are important in terms of increasing the frequency of intentional behaviour (Çelikten and Özkan, 2018), an incentive such as extra salary, a certificate of appreciation or achievement can be an instrument in increasing teacher's performance. In addition to giving a reward to the successful teachers, participants also announced that unsuccessful teachers should not be punished. Punishmnet is an offensive factor and causes lack of motivation. Regarding the punishment all of the participants remarked that they have to stop to work with the same person for the following year as one participant stated: "If we think that we do not progress, we annul the conract at the end of the school year." This perception is similar to the results of the study conducted by Adnot et al. (2017) who argued that if unsuccesful teachers are dismissed and replaced with more succesful teachers then student's success wil be higher.

Consequently, we claim that teacher's performance should be evaluated both at individual and organisational level. In addition to this, a system that differentiates by teachers' competencies should be created. Regarding the process of evaluation and implementing the results, rewarding should be brought forefront, not punishment. It should also be kept in mind that evalution should contribute to the teacher's professional growth.

References

Adnot, M., Dee, T., Katz, V., & Wyckoff, J. (2017). Teacher turnover, teacher quality, and student achievement in dcps. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 39*(1), 54-76.

Altun, A. S., & Memişoğlu, S. P. (2008). The opinions of teachers, administrators and supervisors regarding performance assesment. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 14*(1), 7-24.

Akşit, F. (2006). The views of teachers on evaluating the performance (Sample of Bigadiç primary school teachers). *Journal of Social Science Studies, 2*, 76-101.

Aslanargun, E. & Tarku, E. (2014). Teachers' expectations about supervision and guidance roles of supervisors. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 20*(3), 281-306.

Balkar, B., & Şahin, S. (2010). The opinions of secondary school teachers on teacher performance appraisal model and implementations. *Elementary Education Online, 9*(1), 396–412.

Bas Collins, A. (2002). School-based supervision at a private turkish school: A model for improving teacher evaluation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(2), 172-190.

Başar, H. (1988). Evaluating the performance of teachers. *Education and Science, 12*(70).

Boyatsiz, R. E. (1998). *Thematic analysis and code development: transforming qualitative information.* Thousands Oaks, London: Sage.

Boykin, L. L. (1958). What is evaluation?. *The Journal of Educational Research, 51*(7), 529-534.

Bozan, S., & Ekinci, A. (2018). Evaluation of principals and teachers' opinions related to teacher performance evaluation process: A qualitative study. *Mukaddime, 9*(2), 213-240.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Planning educational research: Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousands Oaks, London: Sage.

Çelikten. M., & Özkan, H. H. (2018). Teacher performance evaluation system. OPUS- *International Journal of Society Researches, 8*(15), 806-824. DOI: 10. 26466/opus. 418565.

Daley, G., & Kim, L. (2010). A Teacher Evaluation System That Works. Working Paper. National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.

Danielson, C. (2011). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational leadership, 68*(4), 35-39.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*, 1.

Davis, D. R., Ellett, C. D., & Annunziata, J. (2002). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*(4), 287-301.

Dočekal, V., & Dvoáková, M. (2015). Evaluation levels in education. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174*, 3743-3749.

Duke, D. L. (1990). Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote professional growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4,* 131-144.

Ellett, C. D., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness: Perspectives from the USA. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17*(1), 101-128.

Erkurt, H. (2017). *The perspectives of primary education teachers and inspectors regarding auditing and performance evaluation systems in primary schools* (Unpublished master thesis dissertation). Near East University, Lefkoşa, Cyprus.

Feeney, E.J. (2007) Quality feedback: The essential Ingredient for teacher success. *The Clearing Hous, 8*(4), 191-197.

Global Education Monitoring Report. (2017). Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments. Available from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002593/259338e. pdf, on 04/11/2017.

Goe, L., Biggers, K., & Croft, A. (2012). Linking Teacher Evaluation to Professional Development: Focusing on Improving Teaching and Learning. Research & Policy Brief. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77(*1), 81-112.

Heck, R. H. (2007). Examining the relationship between teacher quality as an organizational property of schools and students' achievement and growth rates. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(4)*,* 399-432.

Helvacı, M. A. (2002). The importance of performance appraisal in performance managament process. *Ankara University Journal of Educational Sciences, 35*(1-2), 155-169.

Konan, N., & Yılmaz, S. (2018). Öğretmen performans değerlendirmeye ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri: bir karma yöntem araştırması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 47*(219), 137-160.

Köse, A. (2017). Problematic course supervision within Turkish education system. *Çukurova University Journal of Education Faculty, 46*(2), 298-367. DOI: 10.14812/ cuefd.304234.

Kurban, C., & TOK, T. N. (2018). Assessment of the role of school principals in the performance audit system, based on teacher opinions. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences, 11*(1), 1-17.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(10), 727-735. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508601004

McLeod, S. A. (2007). BF Skinner: Operant conditioning. Retrieved September, *9*, 2009.

Memişoğlu, S. P. (2004). Perceptions of teachers in relation to the supervisoıy behaviours of primary education supervisors, *Edıcation and Science, 29*(131), 30-39.

Mill, P. (2009). Punishment doesn't work. 5 to 7 Educator, 2009(59), 20-22.

Ministry of National Education Regulation on Being Appointed and Replacement (2015, 17 April). Official Gazette (Number: 29329). Available from: http://www.hukukturk. com/en/official-gazette-of-tr?Tarih=17%2f04%2f2015, on 31/01/2019.

OECD (2009). Teacher Evaluation A Conceptual Framework and examples of Country Practices, Available from http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/44568106.pdf, on 03/11/2017.

OECD (2013). Teachers for the 21st Century: Using Evaluation to Improve Teaching, OECD Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *Qualitative research evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Variety in qualitative inquiry: theoretical orientations. In C.D. Laughton, V. Novak, D. E. Axelsen, K. Journey, & K. Peterson (Eds.), *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousands Oaks, London: Sage.

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on School Teacher Evaluation, *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79.

Reinhorn, S. K., Johnson, S. M., & Simon, N. S. (2017). Investing in development: Six high-performing, high-poverty schools implement the massachusetts teacher evaluation policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 39*(3), 383-406.

Sanders, J. R. (2001). A vision for evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 22*(3), 363-366.

Sayın, S. D., & Arslan, H. (2017). Determining the opinions of teachers and administrators about the multiple indicators through teacher performance assesment process and self-evaulation. *International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education (TLCE), 6*(2), 1222-1241.

Springer, K. (2010). *Educational research.* John Wiley&Sons, Inc. USA.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stronge, J. H. (2006). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: Improving the educational landscape. *Evaluating Teaching: A Guide to Current Thinking And Best Practice, 2*, 1-23.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*(4), 339-359.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., Tucker, P. D., & Hindman, J. L. (2007). What is the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement? An exploratory study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 20*(3-4), 165-184.

Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). Can teacher evaluation improve teaching?. *Education Next, 12*(4), 78-84.

Tamani, S., Talbi, M., & Radid, M. (2015). Evaluation of the Trainings in Higher Education: Case of the Faculty of Science Ben M'Sik. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191*, 1038-1042.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). Rush to Judgment: Teacher Evaluation in Public Education. Education Sector Reports. Education Sector.

Vaillant, D., & Gonzalez-Vaillant, G. (2017). Within the teacher evaluation policies black box: two case studies. *Teacher Development, 21*(3), 404-421.

Zhang, X. F., & Ng, H. M. (2017). An effective model of teacher appraisal: Evidence from secondary schools in Shanghai, China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45*(2), 196-218.