



Education International

THE USE AND MISUSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL

An overview of cases in the developed world

Laura Figazzolo

Education International Research Institute Consultant



January 2013



Education
International

THE USE AND MISUSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL

An overview of cases in the developed world

Laura Figazzolo

Education International Research Institute Consultant

JANUARY 2013

CONTENTS

List of Acronyms	4
Foreword by Fred van Leeuwen	5
Summary of main findings	6
1. Background	8
1.1. Rationale.....	8
1.2. EI's involvement on the OECD's Survey on Teacher Appraisal.....	9
1.3. Aim of the research work	10
1.4. Methodology.....	10
1.5. Timeline	11
2. Overview of teacher assessment among OECD countries	12
2.1. Teacher appraisal in selected OECD countries	12
2.2. Broad picture	39
3. Emerging trends and concerns	41
3.1. Value-added evaluation methods	41
3.2. Comprehensive approaches	45
4. Conclusion	48
References	49
Annex I - Questionnaire for Teacher Summit	51

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AEU	Australian Education Union
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
AIPTF	All India Primary Teachers Federation
APPR	Annual Professional Performance Review
ASTI	Association of Secondary Teachers Ireland
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CTF	Canadian Teachers' Federation
DLF	Danish Union of Teachers
EFTO	Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (Canada)
EI	Education International
ETUI	European Trade Union Institute
EU	European Union
FDSZ	Trade Union of Employees in Higher Education (Hungary)
GEW	Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (German Education Union)
GL	Gymnasieskolernes Laererforening (Denmark)
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INTASC	Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
ISEA	Independent Schools Education Association Inc (New Zealand)
ITU	Israel Teacher Union
JTU	Japan Teacher Union
KÍ (ITU)	Kennaraamband Islands (Iceland)
KPT	Workers Councils' Teacher Branch (Hungary)
KTU	Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union
LCH	Swiss Teachers' Association (Dachverband Schweizer Lehrerinnen und Lehrer/ Association faîtière des enseignantes et des enseignants suisses)
NASUWT	National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers
NEA	National education Association
NUT	National Union of Teachers
NZEI	New Zealand Educational Institute - Te Riu Roa
MET	Measure of Effective Teaching
OAJ	Opetusalan Ammattjärjestö (Trade Union of Education) (Finland)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PACT	Performance Assessment for California Teachers
PAR	Peer Assistance and Review
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PRSD	Performance Review and Staff Development
NZPPTA	New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association,
SNES-FSU	Syndicat national des enseignements de second degree (France)
SNUipp-FSU	Syndicat national unitaire des instituteurs, professeurs des ecoles et PEGC (France)
SLO	Student Learning Objective
STPCD	School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document
TALIS	Teaching and Learning International Survey (OECD)
TAP	Teacher Advancement Programme
TED	Teacher Evaluation and Development
TUAC	Trade Union Advisory Committee (to the OECD)
UEN	Union of Education Norway
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
VAM	Value Added Method

FOREWORD

This year's International Summit on the Teaching Profession focuses on how teachers are evaluated or appraised. It is an issue which is fundamentally at the heart of teachers' professionalism and of young people's learning. While there are many teachers who find appraisal supportive, there are many others who distrust it.

'The Use and Misuse of Teacher Appraisal' is Education International's analysis of the debate around teacher appraisal and the teacher unions' experiences of appraisal in different OECD countries. Distributed to all participants and observers at the Summit, it is the only analysis currently of how teachers view appraisal.

Teaching in the 21st Century requires teachers to be equipped with a wide set of skills and capabilities that can be used not only in classrooms but also in professional and continuous dialogue with colleagues, parents and the wider community. Appraisal is at its best when it enhances teacher learning and confidence. This requires quality feedback and mutual reflection as in any interactive and collaborative work. For appraisal to have any positive impact, it has to be seen by teachers as a process which supports them in their daily working lives. Above all, appraisal is a process which must be trusted by teachers; otherwise, it will completely fail to enhance teacher self-efficacy and effectiveness.

The evidence from this study is that for every jurisdiction which sees appraisal as developmental, there is another which sees appraisal as coercive. Education International believes that it is vital that, within teacher policies, appraisal is developed in collaboration with teachers and their organisations and that all involved in appraisal agree on its purpose.

I would like to thank OECD for consulting EI on its background document for the Summit and for agreeing to its teacher appraisal survey instruments being used for our analysis. I believe that 'The Use and Misuse of Appraisal' will give teachers and policy makers alike invaluable information when considering how to develop appraisal.



Fred van Leeuwen

General Secretary
Education International

SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Teacher appraisal takes place on a regular basis in many countries, and has become increasingly common in the last few years. According to information provided by Education International (EI) affiliates in Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries, teacher assessment methods generally encompass self-assessment; peer and school leader evaluation; student and, less frequently, parent surveys; external assessment through inspectors, inspection authorities, and assessment centres; and, recently, student performance test scores. Appraisal methods range from a more formal, objective approach (e.g. as part of a formal performance-management system, involving set procedures and criteria), to a more informal, subjective one (e.g. informal discussions with the teacher, interviews, and definition of individual professional development plans). Criteria typically include the subject and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher, some assessment of teaching methods, levels of in-service training and, increasingly, measures of student performance through standardised tests. School evaluation systems tend to be centred mainly on local authorities, responsible for evaluating their own educational provision and assessed by central education authorities or agencies. Teacher appraisal is usually linked with career progression and changes in teacher responsibilities (although to a varying degree), and connected to further opportunities for teachers' professional development. National schemes in jurisdictions with links between teacher appraisal and salary and pay progression are not common.

In spite of the widespread use of teacher appraisal, though, teachers have expressed concern about the methods used to carry it out, and, also, about its impact on their work and morale. They are also concerned about appraisal when evaluation appears to be linked to teacher performance and salary. Teacher unions frequently indicate that principals and other senior staff often lack the time, tools, or training to carry out teacher evaluations satisfactorily. Moreover, the choice of criteria and instruments for appraising teachers is a source of apprehension, particularly where 'innovative' value-added methods are being developed.

In particular, a number of teacher unions and their members have raised concerns about the validity of standardised tests of student performance as a basis for evaluation. In some countries (notably the United States [US]), current policies have prioritised test scores, ignoring evidence proving their instability. These policies tend to promote teaching to standardised tests, a narrowing of the curriculum, and a culture of competitiveness among teachers. Teachers' concerns are amplified when teacher rankings from test-based evaluations are published, as unsatisfactory rankings may have devastating consequences for teachers' reputations.

The evidence is that evidence needs to be taken into account in the appraisal of teachers. Student achievements are but one dimension – especially when these are evaluated purely on the grounds of standardised tests. Where they are based on professional standards, classroom observations, curriculum development, and a wide range of factors associated with teaching and teacher perspectives, comprehensive methods seem to be able to provide more valuable information. When teacher-appraisal arrangements and policies are conceived with the participation of teachers and their unions, comprehensive methods seem to be able to gain teachers' trust and provide valuable information. As such, they are gaining growing recognition in the debate on teacher appraisal.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Rationale

Teacher appraisal takes place on a regular basis in many countries and, in the last few years, has become increasingly common. In spite of the widespread application of teacher appraisal, sections of the teaching profession have raised concerns about its use. There are concerns not only about the methods used to perform appraisal but also about its impact on teachers' work and morale and, where it occurs, on teachers' salaries.

During its most recent Congress in Cape Town, in July 2011, EI agreed a resolution on the Future of the Teaching Profession, identifying the evaluation of teachers as one of the key elements defining the broader context in which education workers will be operating in the future. Specifically, EI has called for the evaluation of teachers to be based on feedback that identifies teachers' strengths and development needs.

Teachers should feel that they can be honest about their professional needs, as well as their strengths, without being penalised. There is no evidence that individual financial incentives, such as performance-related pay, works in schools. There is a great deal of evidence that evaluation linked to identifying and providing high-quality professional development for teachers has positive effects.

(EI Resolution on the Future of the Teaching Profession, 1.1.2 E, July 2011)

Putting aside education policy-making per se, a quick search on Twitter shows how critical the issue of teacher evaluation is at a broader level. It is a debate which involves students, parents, teachers, principals, and professionals engaged in education as well as a significant segment of well-informed public opinion. The topic is mentioned in more than 100 tweets per day, in its various labels of 'teacher evaluation', 'teacher appraisal', 'teacher feedback', 'teacher assessment'. Similarly, a Facebook search yields a range of results connected to groups or pages focusing on teacher appraisal and assessment.

With teacher appraisal such a popular topic for discussion on Internet, a social network such as Twitter could represent the ideal platform for finding information on appraisal methods across OECD countries. For EI, it could provide an up-to-date and innovative overview of good and bad practices.

1.2. A note from EI on the relationship between the OECD's Background Report for the 2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession and EI's study, "The Use and Misuse of Teacher Appraisal".

In October 2012, the OECD consulted the Summit Planning Committee including EI on the drafting of a survey on teacher appraisal and professional standards. The OECD, through its survey, asked Education Ministries of OECD countries to gather information on teacher evaluation policies, in order to provide additional evidence for the OECD's background report for the 2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession - a report which is being written in consultation with the Summit stakeholders including EI. Since the survey was sent to government participants in the Summit, it was felt that a perspective from teacher unions was important in informing the evidence for the OECD background report. John Bangs, Senior Consultant at EI and a member of the Summit planning group, sent the survey to EI affiliates for completion.

The survey questions were based on the three agreed 'theme' questions addressed by the 2013 Summit on the Teaching Profession. They are set out below :

- How is teacher quality defined by policy makers, the teaching profession and society? What standards are set and by whom?
- How is teacher quality evaluated? What systems are in place and how are the evaluations carried out?
- How do evaluations contribute to school improvement and teacher self-efficacy? What impact can be expected on teaching and learning from teacher evaluation?

Subsequently, EI decided to conduct a separate analysis of the OECD surveys returned by EI affiliates. Laura Figazzolo, a consultant with the EI Research Institute (EIRI), was asked to analyse the surveys and the additional comments within them. Her analysis is included in this study of teacher appraisal which was commissioned by the EIRI. The additional comments from EI affiliates have varied in volume with a number of teacher unions such as those in the US and the United Kingdom (UK) providing the greatest amount of information. Survey forms were returned from 27 EI affiliates in 19 OECD member countries.

This report is entirely separate from the background report presented by the OECD to the 2013 Summit on the Teaching Profession. EI believes that both its report and the OECD background report will be a valuable resource for policy makers and teachers alike. EI is grateful to the OECD for its co-operation in enabling the joint use of its survey forms.

1.3. Aim of the research work

The intention of this paper is to inform the policy debate on teacher appraisal, with the specific purpose of providing EI and its affiliates with a powerful advocacy tool. To this end, teacher appraisal methods were researched on digital and virtual platforms. Research results were then analysed with the intention of sharing them with the Summit participants, teacher unions and the OECD.

1.4. Methodology

The study focussed on two strands.

First, it used social platforms (chiefly *Twitter*) to find relevant information for compiling a critical search and subsequent analysis of cases of use and misuse of teacher assessment, highlighting key emerging trends. In this search, unions represented the main sources of information. To this purpose, a special account (@*EI_Research*) was created and used on *Twitter*, and the topic #*Teacher_assessment* was launched for discussion.

Twitter has proven a useful yet challenging source of information (see Box 11 at the end of the paper). It has proven quite difficult to obtain continuous and prompt feedback from unions, either because only a few of them actually use *Twitter*, or because, even when they do have a *Twitter* account, they use it very sporadically. At the same time, though, *Twitter* has been a source of tremendously valuable input from other stakeholders (journalists, practitioners, teachers, students themselves, academics and researchers). More than 200 articles have been collected.

Second, the work is based on an analysis of EI's affiliates' replies to the OECD *Summit questionnaire*, as these provided the direct perspective of unions on the issue. Specifically, 28 replies were received from 19 OECD countries (see Table 1 below). One extra reply has been collected, showing the situation in a non-OECD country: India.

Table 1. Received replies

UNION	COUNTRY
AEU	Australia
CTF	Canada
EFTO	
DLF	Denmark
GL	
OAJ	Finland
SNES-FSU	France
SNUipp-FSU	
GEW	Germany
KPT	Hungary
FDSZ	
Kí	Iceland
<i>AIPTF</i>	<i>India</i>
ITU	Israel
ASTI	Ireland
JTU	Japan
KTU	Korea
ISEA	
NZPPTA	New Zealand
NZEI	
UEN	Norway
Solidarnosc	Poland
Läraryförbundet	Sweden
LCH	Switzerland
NUT	UK
NASUWT	
NEA	US
AFT	

1.5. Timeline

The study was developed from the beginning of October 2012 to the end of January 2013. Its results reflect up-to-date information and opinions on the topic as of the beginning of January 2013.

2. VIEWS FROM EI-COMMISSIONED RESEARCH AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)

As John MacBeath (2012:58) describes,

After decades of school effectiveness studies and the discovery that teachers make a difference, the focus of research turned to the teacher effect. Appraisal, evaluation and performance measures have been embraced by governments worldwide. But what distinguishes good teachers from bad and outstanding teachers from the merely good? What criteria is used, and in whose judgement – policy makers? Pupils? Or teachers themselves? With such knowledge, what purposes may it serve? What have we learned from inspection and self-evaluation that will prove helpful for the future of the teaching profession?

Bangs and Frost (2012:27) echo this question: Is teacher performance evaluation “seen as ‘performance management’ ... (and)... as *something done to teachers* rather than a reflection of shared accountability where teachers’ professional learning is nurtured?” [Italics inserted].

The ILO has expressed its preference for the second option. The ILO (2012) highlights, within a framework of autonomy and accountability, principles of teacher evaluation which should ideally focus on (1) normative and diagnostic evaluation in order to identify weaknesses in skills and competencies and improve professional practice – encourage freedom, initiative, responsibility and responsiveness to student needs, and on (2) being *accountable* to educational authority standards for teaching and learning outcomes.

2.1. Teacher appraisal in selected OECD countries

This section aims to provide an overview of existing systems and trends among OECD countries, on the basis of (1) the latest OECD reviews on the topic among member countries, and (2) replies to the EI questionnaire on teacher appraisal.

■■■ AUSTRIA

Formally, three methods exist (OECD, 2011/4): (a) Principals carry out performance evaluation; (b) in especially problematic cases (such as severe complaints by parents), an inspector is sent to the school to participate in the evaluation of the teacher; (c) it is the teacher's task to evaluate his or her instruction by him or herself. There are no

methods or procedures prescribed. In practice, though, a systematic evaluation of teachers does not exist. Apart from extremely problematic cases, which are triggered by reports from parents and which result in classroom observations by the school administration, a formal evaluation of teacher performance is very rarely initiated. Evaluation carried out by principals is sporadic.

■■■ AUSTRALIA¹

Teacher appraisal varies depending on the jurisdiction or school concerned. Commonly, the process includes elements of performance planning, personal development planning, recognition of achievement, feedback and review. This enables teachers and their line area managers to identify areas for improvement and development opportunities (OECD, 2010). Operational responsibility for conducting performance management processes in schools is generally delegated to principals and school leaders. While the actual appraisal process usually occurs between the teacher and their line manager or supervisor, the school principal may be responsible for ensuring that levels of compliance are reported to the relevant government department or system authority.

The **AEU** summarises the national picture as follows. Permanent teachers, teachers on fixed-term contracts, and teachers on probation are mandatorily evaluated annually. Evaluation is also used as a focus on teachers new to the profession. The approaches used for appraisal involve completion of probation, teacher registration or certification, and performance management. Teacher appraisal is developed by the State's authority for government schools (arrangements vary for non-government schools) and by industrial agreements, too – as such, some teacher appraisal approaches are incorporated into industrial awards/agreements. Appraisal may be carried out by other teachers (perhaps delegated by the school leadership) and, in other cases, by school leaders.

¹ For more information on Australia, please visit the following websites:

AUSTRALIA : <http://www.aussieeducator.org.au/teachers/teacherassessment.html> Very comprehensive overview for Australia nationally, and for each state and territory – with links to all relevant documents – policies, procedures, programs, reviews, reports etc.; All teachers to face annual performance assessments Canberra Times August 4, 2012 <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/national/all-teachers-to-face-annual-performance-assessments-20120803-2318n.html>

NEW SOUTH WALES : What Staff Need To Know About Social Media & Technology <https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/policies/technology/communication/techguide.pdf> [DET is the Education Department in NSW]; Teachers and Social Networking Sites: Think Before You Post <http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/publicspace/article/view/1493> [UTS is University of Technology, Sydney]; Teaching the Facebook generation SMH, February 28, 2011 <http://www.smh.com.au/technology/technology-news/teaching-the-facebook-generation-20110227-1ba19.html#ixzz2AwllNUCb> [SMH is Sydney Morning Herald]

VICTORIA : Using social media for learning and teaching Victoria University http://tls.vu.edu.au/portal/site/technology/resources/social%20media/Using_social_media_for_learning_and_teaching-Staff_Guide.pdf; Teenagers, Legal Risks and Social Networking Sites Monash University http://newmediaresearch.educ.monash.edu.au/moodle/pluginfile.php/2117/mod_label/intro/SNSandRisks_REPORT.pdf

Generally, those involved in designing and carrying out appraisals receive appropriate training for these tasks. Teachers are evaluated against central teaching standards in some jurisdictions, such as South Australia or Tasmania, and against state/territory teaching standards, which is the case for most jurisdictions. Although there is some variation between jurisdictions and schools, generally teachers are appraised on planning and preparation, instruction, classroom environment, completion of professional development, contribution to school development, and links to the community. There is considerable variation among the instruments and information sources used. However, the following are the most common: classroom observation, objective setting and interview/dialogue with the teacher, teacher self-appraisal (required in Western Australia), teacher portfolio and testing, student results and feedback (in Tasmania specifically), and parent feedback (in Tasmania specifically). Appraisal is designed to assist teachers to identify improvements and is used for teacher development planning; as such, it may inform professional development.

In the Northern Territory (NT), appraisal determines promotion, where teachers who wish to move to higher levels must undergo a performance review. It also influences the speed at which teachers' careers progress in the New South Wales (NSW), Victoria, and Tasmania government systems and in some non-government schools. Teacher appraisal does not have any impact in other state/territory government schools and in most Catholic schools. In some cases, appraisal affects a teacher's base salary (NSW, Victoria and Tasmania link performance reviews to salary increments). In NSW, NT, and Victoria, appeal procedures for those who disagree with the evaluation exist.

■■■ BELGIUM

Flemish Community

Flanders' teacher assessment process is intended as a positive process and is based on ongoing work. The criteria for assessment are based on individualised job descriptions, which are mandatory for all staff. Assessments must be conducted at least every four years. Each staff member has two evaluators, with the first evaluator being responsible for guidance and coaching. The government recommends and provides funding for the training of evaluators (OECD, 2010a).

French-speaking Community

In the French-speaking Community of Belgium, teachers belong to networks. Management personnel in these networks are responsible for developing teacher appraisals. Inspectors also play a role in the appraisal of teachers on the request of a school head (OECD, 2011).

■■■ CANADA

In Canada, the regulations for appraisal vary between jurisdictions. The **CTF** and **EFTO** provide the following broad picture:

In general, approaches to teacher appraisal consist of completion of probation, teacher registration or certification, and performance management. In Canada, this involves requirements for specified improvement goals and assistance at meeting those goals. Permanent teachers, teachers on fixed-term contracts, and those on probation undergo appraisal. This is mandatory every one to five years, before decisions on employment status (e.g. promotion, conversion or awarding of a permanent contract), or as a focus on teachers new to the profession. There is also voluntary evaluation in Canada. However, requirements vary between jurisdictions, and a number of jurisdictions use a growth model in which appraisal is not mandatory.

Appraisal is devised by central as well as by local authorities, teachers (and teacher unions) and school leaders. Professional standards are set and appraised by professionals who have received specific training. Teachers are appraised against school development plans and their own professional goals. Specifically, teachers are evaluated on aspects linked to their planning and preparation, instruction, and classroom environment. The instruments used involve classroom observation, objective setting and interview/dialogue with the teacher, teacher self-appraisal, and portfolio. Parent surveys exist for broader purposes, but the CTF and the EFTO emphasise that appraisal is not reduced to a popularity contest.

Appraisal can lead to the provision of further professional development activities for teachers identified as 'underperforming', involving extra opportunities for in-service professional development as well as changes in responsibilities. Appraisal also influences the speed at which teachers' careers progress.

Broadly speaking, the school climate in Canada is such that teachers are encouraged to help each other. Appraisal is not a competitive activity, but rather a measurement of acceptability against pre-determined standards of practice. This ensures that staff work together to secure the best performance for all students. Schools are not interested in ranking teachers, but in having a generally high quality of teaching. Indeed, student learning becomes the responsibility of all professionals, and the overall target is for the maximum improvement of all students. The process rests on several assumptions: a) no one teacher is best for all students; b) every student can be helped by some teaching practices, and c) popularity does not equal good teaching.

Box 1: Ontario's Teacher Voice on Assessment (TVA) Project

The Teacher Voice on Assessment (TVA) study was initiated by the Ontario Teachers' Federation with funding from the Ministry of Education. It set out to explore classroom assessment, evaluation and grading practices in Ontario's secondary schools. Nearly 6,000 high school teachers (members of AEFO, OECTA and OSSTF) were surveyed online in 2010 about classroom assessment. Teacher interviews were also conducted across the province.

The data from the surveys and interviews are being analysed in relation to questions and concepts such as :

- What is the context for teachers' decisions about classroom assessment in Ontario's secondary schools?
- What are teachers' beliefs about learning and assessment?
- What are the demographics of the respondents?
- What is the respondent's experience of professional learning in relation to assessment?
- What resources have teachers used, found useful?
- What are teachers' practices in relation to assessment purposes?
- What do teachers do in relation to strategies, creating assessments, reference points, feedback, marking, grading, recordkeeping and reporting?
- What are the issues that teachers are experiencing in relation to assessment, marking and grading?

In addition to producing a report, the survey results will be used to create an assessment, evaluation and reporting resource for teachers.

Sources: *Teachers surveyed on classroom assessment*, OECTA Agenda, Feb. 2011. Also, www.otffeo.on.ca/english/media_room/press_releases/report2010%20.pdf

■■■ CZECH REPUBLIC

There are no principal strategic documents which deal with the area of teacher evaluation. As a rule, teachers are evaluated when they are hired and in the course of their work as part of observations made by the head teacher. Evaluation results have an impact on the inclusion of teachers at different career and salary levels (OECD, 2011a). Inspections at individual schools are performed irregularly, usually at intervals of between three and five years. Moreover, not all teachers are evaluated. Evaluation is most frequently seen to have a check-up function, and the performance of a teacher is compared with a hypothetical standard performance. However, notions of what is "standard performance" are not generally shared within the education community as they differ among individual teachers and inspectors. National teacher-performance standards, which would serve as a guideline for evaluating the work of teachers and unify all concepts existing within the education community, have not yet been approved.

Thus, even if school heads are responsible for assessing teacher performance, there are no centrally set criteria or methods. Additional methods such as self- and peer assessment and assessment by students and parents are being encouraged.

■■■ DENMARK

According to the latest OECD review (OECD, 2011b), there is no formal evaluation of teachers once they have passed a two-year probation period (with the exception of *Folkeskole* teachers).

However, according to replies given by **GL** and **DLF**, permanent teachers undergo a personal interview for appraisal every year and before any decision on their career advancement. Appraisal is also carried out through a continuous dialogue between school leaders and teachers. Formal appraisal is a local responsibility. Devised by the school leadership, it is usually carried out with reference to the personal development plan of the individual teacher, through personal interviews, classroom observation, and students' results. Through these instruments, appraisal covers instruction, planning and preparation, classroom environment, completion of professional development, and contribution to school development. Appraisal informs teachers' professional development activities, but it does not impact on teachers' career advancement or salary. For most teachers, it involves further opportunities for development when needed, and changes in responsibilities, for example through temporary allocation of special duties.

■■■ FINLAND

Teachers are not formally evaluated, a fact confirmed by **OAJ**. However, most schools have quality systems that include annual development discussion and appraisals.

■■■ FRANCE

National inspectors have primary responsibility for the evaluation of teacher performance. The inspector gives every teacher a mark, based on educational and administrative criteria. Teachers are assessed approximately once every four years (OECD, 2011/4).

SNES-FSU and **SNUipp-FSU** provided a comprehensive picture of teacher appraisal within the country. All teachers are appraised and the evaluation is usually carried out using a scale with 100 as the maximum grade. The administrative grade is given each year to the teacher by the school leader (the school head, *chef d'établissement*). The pedagogical grade (*la notation pédagogique*) involves an assessment through a personal interview (and sometimes on the basis of documents attesting teacher work in the class) by a school inspector who evaluates the curriculum and pedagogical methods being used against centrally developed standards and each teacher's responsibilities and tasks. This grade has an impact both on teachers' careers and salary development. While the pedagogical element of the overall grade determines a teacher's career progression, it is reported that there are not enough pedagogical inspectors. According to the OECD (2011/4), at the primary level, there is approximately one inspector per 350 teachers;

at the secondary level, the ratio is 400 teachers to one inspector. As such, secondary education teachers may have their “job performance” is assessed once every seven (or even ten) years by an inspector. As far as the administrative grade is concerned, it is reported that there are a relatively small number of conflicts with school leaderships, although, in the past five years, both unions report that more and more school heads have put pressure on teachers to increase their administrative activities, including participation in meetings within the school, for instance.

A school director in France is not entitled to make any judgment on a teacher’s performance in terms of pedagogical skills and on the taught curricula. He/she can only provide an assessment against the three following criteria: radiance (*rayonnement*); punctuality (*ponctualité*); assiduity (*assiduité*). In other words, appraisal requires the teacher to teach all of his/her classes, be on time, and attend compulsory meetings at school (teamwork, general assessment of pupils three times a year in December, March, and May/June).

Under President Sarkozy’s government, the teacher unions report that the Minister of Education attempted to change the teacher assessment plan by proposing that teachers’ evaluations should be carried out solely by school leaders. On 15 December 2011, SNES-FSU called a strike to protest against such a plan which they believed, if implemented, would lead to a discretionary system. The strike led to the plan being withdrawn – a decision confirmed by François Hollande when he became President.

■■■ GERMANY

Teachers are appraised before changes in their civil servant status at regular intervals. Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs in the *Länder* set out appraisal guidelines for assessing teachers. Teacher appraisals must involve assessment and assessment criteria.

GEW reported that all permanent teachers, teachers on fixed-term contracts, and those on probation undergo appraisal based on completion of probation and peer review. There is both mandatory (periodical) and non-mandatory appraisal. Broadly, appraisal is carried out before decisions are taken on employment status and after a complaint. The appraisal arrangements are devised by the state authority and carried out by trained school inspectors and leaders. Evaluation is carried out against teachers’ job descriptions, the school’s development plan, and the school’s internal regulations. The following aspects are evaluated: instruction, planning and preparation, classroom environment, completion of professional development, contribution to school development, and links to the community. The instruments for appraisal are: classroom observation, personal interview and objective setting, teacher self-appraisal, and portfolio. Appraisal informs teachers’ professional development activities, and may involve sabbatical periods and changes in responsibilities. It does not affect teachers’ pay.

■■■ GREECE

The evaluation of the education system is linked mainly to the evaluation of teachers and students. Data collection focuses on input, processes – including pedagogical practices – and results.

■■■ HUNGARY

Until recently, according to the OECD (2010b), there was no central regulation governing teacher appraisal. In the past few years, though, two major changes took place. An amendment to the Public Education Act stipulates that institutions' quality management programmes should include criteria related to teacher appraisal and defines the rules of the appraisal procedures. Secondly, the majority of teachers in schools run by the state or a local government now qualify as public employees. Teachers' work is governed by the Act on Public Education and other legislation on education including, for example, a decree regulating the operation of educational institutions. Certain aspects of teachers' employment are governed by legislation although, in general, it addresses the legal status of public employees. The classification of teachers as public employees led to changes in the system of teacher appraisal, although schools' freedom in teachers' appraisal still remained considerably significant.

According to **KPT** and **FDSZ**, all teachers in Hungary currently undergo appraisal, either yearly, or once every four or five years. This covers performance management, rewarding excellence, completion of probation, and teacher registration or certification. Teachers also undergo evaluation if there is a complaint and when a decision about their employment status is to be taken. Formal appraisal, devised by school leaders, teachers, local authorities, and parents, usually refers to the personal development plan of the teacher, his/her responsibilities, and refers to locally set standards and the school's internal regulations. The instruments used are classroom observation, teacher self-appraisal, students' results, and surveys. These evaluate instruction, planning and preparation, classroom environment, completion of professional development, contribution to school development, and links to the community. Appraisal informs teachers' professional development activities, but it does not impact on their career advancement or salary. It involves further opportunities for development and, in cases of outstanding performance, public recognition or awards.

■■■ ICELAND

According to **Ki (ITU)**, in Iceland, teacher appraisal is mandatory (prescribed by law since 1996). All teachers receive two types of evaluation: self-evaluation and evaluation by an external body (the latter being the responsibility of the Ministry of Education

and Culture every five years). Self-evaluation (devised centrally) is the responsibility of the head of each upper secondary school in Iceland (which number just over 30).

The teachers' union reports that, although the legislators' original aim was probably to set out an evaluation of school work and performance from a variety of angles, due both to the lack of funding and to the shortage of experts today, most schools carry out teacher appraisals via electronic surveys filled in by students once a year or every two or three years.

According to the union, the positive aspect is that such evaluations are free of "a punitive character" and do not carry with them an atmosphere of threat or anguish. The head and or his/her deputies are supposed to interview teachers on the basis of his/her results and this is meant to have a supportive objective, in the sense that the teacher is made aware of her/his strengths and weaknesses. However, the union believes that the appraisal results are not always handled professionally enough by the school heads – sometimes due to a lack of expertise or experience in this field. The union believes that the mandatory external evaluation is somewhat fragmented and struggling with a serious lack of expertise. Overall, the dynamics highlighted above have reduced the credibility of evaluation as an important factor for improving the quality of teaching.

■■■ IRELAND

Two modes of evaluation are reported by the OECD (2011/4): (1) Inspectors may evaluate and report on teachers' work (most commonly practised at primary level); (2) at the post-primary level, inspections focus on whole-school evaluations.

The **ASTI** has provided a description of the appraisal arrangements in Ireland.

The statutory regulatory body for the teaching profession, the Teaching Council², is responsible for teachers' induction, probation, and registration. In 2013, it will introduce a national procedure for induction and probation. At present, primary teachers undergo a professional probation process, while second-level teachers undertake an employment probation process. School self-evaluation was introduced for primary and second-level schools in 2012. Schools received guidelines and have the flexibility/choice about which instruments to use, including peer review. At the request of teacher unions, the term 'peer review' is not used; instead, the guidelines refer to a "professional collaborative review of teaching and learning". *The School Self-Evaluation Guidelines* contain the statement that, "over time, as the practice of

professional collaborative review becomes more mainstream in schools, this practice will evolve to include a wider range of colleagues, including the principal or deputy principal, engaging in collaborative review in accordance with procedures”.

All teachers are covered by the approaches described above, although the terminology “teacher appraisal” is not used, as it is not described as such in the evaluation procedures used in schools. However, as noted above, there are statutory procedures to respond to concerns about professional competence or conduct. Also, the Teaching Council will commence the Fitness to Practice section of requirement next year, which will have a model to assess/appraise teachers’ professional competence and conduct against the required standards set out in the published Codes of Professional Conduct. Technically, teacher appraisal is not being developed as it is not referred to as such in the arrangements. However, teacher unions and school management bodies operate the procedures described above. Twenty-two of the Teaching Council’s thirty-seven members are teachers. A partnership model of external consultation involving unions, management bodies, parents, teacher educators, and school-leadership professional bodies is the norm.

The operational procedures do not contain a definition of what constitutes professional incompetence or misconduct. The Teaching Council’s Code of Conduct is the only formal definition of benchmarks/indicators/references of expected professional conduct and competence. Under agreed operational procedures, teachers are encouraged and advised to undertake relevant professional development.

■■■ ISRAEL

According to the **ITU**, completion of probation, teacher registration or certification, and schemes for rewarding excellence (only for high schools – not for elementary schools and/or junior high schools) define teacher appraisal in Israel. One of the main aims of teachers’ appraisal is to increase connections between performance measurements and teachers’ training processes, guidance, and in-service training throughout their professional careers.

Teachers on probation are evaluated, as well as all teachers who want to advance up the grades after three or thirteen years. They are mandatorily evaluated up to three times a year, but also before decisions on their employment status are taken, when they are new to the profession, and as a result of a complaint.

Appraisal is designed by the Ministry of Education for elementary and junior high schools, and by the local authorities and school boards for high schools. Evaluators are the principal, a pedagogical supervisor, and a professional supervisor of the specific teaching subject.

Teachers are appraised against a description of their professional duties (e.g. job description), the school development plan, and their own professional goals. Aspects of teacher appraisal include planning and preparation, instruction, classroom environment, completion of professional development, contribution to school development, links to the community, specific knowledge of the teaching subject, and integrative attitudes towards various population groups of students. Instruments and information sources which are used consist of classroom observation, objective setting, and interview or dialogue with the teacher, teacher self-appraisal, a teacher's portfolio, and students' results. Moreover, performance is also appraised on the basis of specific subject guides.

Appraisal determines promotion and influences the speed at which teachers progress, leading in some cases to public awards. In some outstanding cases, inspectors encourage teachers who have achieved a high appraisal to seek a transfer to more significant roles/jobs.

Under the new educational reform in Israel, *New Horizon*, there is consensus about the use of a common measurement that defines a "good" teacher. This measurement informs both the appraisal procedures and teachers' in-service training. Measurement No. 1, on the perception of role and professional ethics, includes components dealing with identification with the teaching role and commitment to the organisation and to the system. Measurement No. 2, on knowledge, deals with knowledge of the teaching subject. Measurement No. 3, on learning and educating processes, deals with planning and organising, teaching methods, learning and appraisal of the learning-supporting environment. Measurement No. 4, on partnership with the professional community, concerns the school professional community and the broad professional-knowledge community

■■■ ITALY

Teachers are assessed at the end of the initial induction period, if a permanent teacher requires an assessment, and in the context of a disciplinary procedure or release of service due to poor performance (OECD, 2011/4).

■■■ JAPAN

The **JTU** reported that all permanent teachers are mandatorily appraised once a year, by the school board and principal or vice-principal, for teacher certification and performance management. Teachers are evaluated against their responsibilities and their professional goals, on the basis of instruction, planning and preparation, completion of professional development, and their links to the community. The instruments which are used involve classroom observations, objective setting, and personal

interviews as well as self-appraisal. Appraisal affects opportunities for teachers' professional development, their career, their basic salary as well as pay allowances (for good performance), and may involve public awards for outstanding performances.

■■■ KOREA

According to the OECD (2010c), Korea's teacher-appraisal framework consists of the arrangements set out below.

- a) Teacher Appraisal for Performance - this refers to the assessment of a teacher's qualities, attitudes and work performance and is conducted by the principal, vice-principal and peer teachers. Appraisal is carried out regularly and systemically, so as to provide data for fair and accurate personnel administration and to promote quality in teaching and learning. The system provides basic data for personnel management and offers material for the development of realistic personnel policies. In terms of teaching goals, the system provides teachers with information for self-examination, presents material and instructional guidance to promote the quality of teaching practices, and sets forth directions and standards for qualitative teacher improvement. The appraisal system applies to national and public schools only.
- b) Performance-based Incentive System – within this system, wage rates are decided by the standard of a teacher's actual output, rather than his/her potential ability or possibility of contribution to the school organisation. The results of this performance evaluation are taken into consideration when teachers re-examine their roles and functions undertaken at school over the past year.
- c) Teacher Appraisal for Professional Development - the core intent of appraisal is to offer feedback so that teachers may enhance their professional ability. It also increases the instructional ability of teachers and the managerial ability of school administrators, vice-principals and principals, as well as teachers. All are subject to evaluation. A multi-dimensional appraisal method involves the input of the whole education community (students and parents provide information on satisfaction levels by filling in questionnaires).

According to the **KTU**, all teachers are annually evaluated as part of performance management which involves rewarding excellence and teacher-peer review. The appraisal is devised by the Ministry of Education and regional authorities, and is carried out by school leaders, teachers themselves, and students, benchmarked against central teaching standards focusing on planning and preparation, instruction, and general classroom discipline. Evaluation is based on different instruments: parent and student surveys, peer review, and consultations with the school leadership. Appraisal influences the speed at which teachers progress and involves pay allowances

for high-performing teachers, as well as extra opportunities for in-service professional development. There are procedures for appealing against evaluation if it is perceived to be unfair. However, the KTU states that 'tremendous courage is needed' to actually appeal.

■■■ THE NETHERLANDS

School boards are responsible for recruiting, training, and assessing staff. Teachers are appraised in job-performance interviews with school heads (usually bi-annual) (OECD, 2011/4). The assessment includes classroom observations. In secondary schools, teachers' peers and students may also be consulted. Some schools conduct annual assessment interviews, which are separate from job interviews. The evaluations cover performance, as well as attitudes toward colleagues and professional development.

■■■ NEW ZEALAND

Responsibility for staff performance management is usually delegated to the principal (OECD, 2011c). School leaders, therefore, have a pivotal role in establishing the conditions for teacher appraisal, the quality and implementation of teacher-appraisal procedures, and the use of appraisal results for improvement. The outcomes of teachers' appraisals are used for different purposes. These purposes include: teacher registration, salary progression, and improving professional practice.

ISEA, NZEI and **NZPPTA** provide a comprehensive and detailed picture of the system in New Zealand, where all teachers are assessed annually against a set of standards in order to move up the pay scale. They are required to be evaluated against sets of criteria (instruction, preparation and planning, classroom environment, completion of professional development, contribution to school development, links to the community) in order to maintain certificates to practice. Schools are also expected to undertake annual performance management/appraisal processes. Generally, the 'standards/criteria' for these are based on the other sets of criteria that relate to pay progression and registration.

Most schools have moved to appraisal based on meeting agreed goals focusing on teacher development and student learning. According to the unions, this seems to have raised the quality of student learning over the last decade which, in turn, has been reflected in New Zealand's standings in international educational measurements such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). Teachers have strongly

resisted performance pay and charter schools - both of which continue to be promoted in New Zealand. There is no formal career progression linked to appraisal but, because schools establish their own career paths for teachers, appraisal outcomes may influence a teacher's career advancement. Formally, career advancement happens through teachers applying for advertised positions and schools making appointments based on their own requirements/criteria

■■■ NORWAY

The national regulations state that teacher appraisal must be implemented but the process for appraisal is not regulated by law and there are no national performance criteria or reference standards to guide it. Teacher appraisal is not considered to be part of the national quality assessment system (OECD, 2011d). As the employing authorities for teachers, school owners are free to establish their own frameworks for teacher appraisal but few of them have systematic frameworks in place to appraise the quality of teachers' practice. This limits the possibilities for teachers to receive professional feedback from their employer and a validation of their work by an external entity. The most common source of feedback for teachers in Norway is an annual employee dialogue, which normally takes the form of a conversation with the school leader.

According to the information provided by **UEN**, appraisal instruments consist of performance management (especially in Oslo), and pupils' assessment of teaching practices based on classroom dialogue, and questionnaires. Appraisal varies between counties/regions. Some have quasi-mandatory surveys answered by pupils, combined with classroom observation by school leaders, followed by dialogue and reflection. The surveys/questionnaires, however, are often designed by regional-level politicians and administration (counties) without teacher and pupil involvement. One exception is the county of Vestfold, where both teachers and pupils have been part of the process in designing a survey. Here, the inclusion of teachers in appraisal design is deemed to be essential to a successful evaluation process. In 2011, a national guide was agreed by The Directorate for Education and Training on the initiative of The Union of Education and The Norwegian Student Council, in collaboration with The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS), a researcher, and school practitioners (see Box 2 below) to promote a shared goal and a common approach to appraisal.

Since there is no formal system for professional career advancement, Norwegian teachers' pay is regulated by a central agreement which ensures teachers an automatic pay raise after four, eight, ten and sixteen years of experience. However, since part of the wage negotiations is carried out locally, appraisal results may be used as a criterion for local wage increases. These results may also be used as criteria in the competition for leadership positions in schools.

Box 2. Norway's national guide for pupils and teachers

In 2011, a national guide was agreed for pupils and teachers by The Directorate for Education and Training on the initiative of The Union of Education and The Norwegian Student Council, in collaboration with the Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS), a researcher, and school practitioners. While the guide and its procedures are not mandatory for counties/schools to follow, they represent an effective effort *to contribute to a dialogue-based appraisal where pupils and teachers together assess and work to improve teaching practices.*

The guide emphasises that feedback should focus on factors that pupils or teachers can actively change or influence, such as learning goals, learning strategies, the content and organisation of teaching. The purpose of “teaching assessment” is to contribute to better instruction and training, and, overall, to a better learning environment.

For more information download the guide (in Norwegian) http://www.utdanningsforbundet.no/upload/Grunnskole/Udir_Veileder_Undervisningsvurdering_8nov2011.pdf

■■■ POLAND

Teacher performance reviews are initiated by school heads, but may also be conducted on the request of the *kurator*, school council, or parents' council (OECD, 2011/4). The assessment may incorporate the views of students. Teachers receiving a negative appraisal may participate in further training, and request a follow-up assessment.

According to **Solidarnosc**, all teachers are subject to a system of mandatory examinations, specifically for promotion or a change in employment status. The examinations also give teachers the opportunity to gain a professional promotion and increased remuneration. The school head carries out the evaluation of teachers' professional performance at all levels of education (on teachers' own initiative; or on the request of the department of education, school council, or parents' council). During this evaluation, the school head may request the opinion of the student council. The period between the two consecutive assessments (including promotion-related assessment) cannot be shorter than one year. The school head is obliged to evaluate a teacher's performance within three months of the date of request.

The evaluation of teachers' professional attainments, related to their promotion, is carried out by the school head (on the basis of the teacher's professional development plan) in the following cases: (1) in the case of trainees and contract teachers – on the basis of an assessment by their 'tutor' and the opinion of the parents' council; and (2) in

the case of the appointed teacher – on the basis of the opinion given by the parents' council.

Teachers' achievements are evaluated by special committees that consist of specialists in a given school subject, teachers' employers (local authorities), and representatives of the supervising bodies (appointed teacher and diploma teacher). The final result is based on the evaluation of the documentation submitted by the teacher and on an interview (or exam) with the teacher. The documents, gathered in a file, have to meet the criteria specified in the Regulation of the Minister of Education. The file has to contain: the plan for professional development, a progress report, an evaluation by the headmaster, documents which confirm that the tasks mentioned in the plan of development have been performed (in a written, graphic or audio-video form), non-obligatory certificates which confirm that the teacher performed their functions, and certificates presented to the head teacher which confirm that the teacher attended courses and training sessions.

Teachers who apply for a degree or diploma must also include in their files: written reports of completing selected tasks, descriptions and analyses of diagnosed and solved educational issues with students, and documentation which confirms their participation in the tasks mentioned in the Regulation (e.g. preparing and implementing an educational programme, conducting open lessons, collaboration with the local community, preparing at least two publications or reports, performing the task of an examiner). The requirements for each step on the ladder of professional advancement stipulate an increase in teachers' professional competence. Professional competence involves contract teachers correctly performing educational tasks taking into account the specificity of a given school. This involves appointed teachers organising their own work, analysing and evaluating the effectiveness of their actions, correcting those actions accordingly, and applying the latest knowledge in their work, and applying the provisions of the law of education. Diploma teachers take actions which are aimed at improving the quality of school work, sharing their knowledge and experience with other school employees, publishing their work and collaborating with the local community.

■■■ PORTUGAL

Portugal's model covers the totality of teachers in the system, tenured and contract teachers at all levels of education, at all stages of teachers' careers, and teaching in all types of education system. Evaluation is carried out at the end of every two school years as long as the teacher taught for at least half of the period of time under evaluation (OECD, 2009).

There are, however, two special cases in Portugal: (1) the evaluation of teachers in their probationary year, which relates only to work carried out during the probationary year; and (2) the evaluation of contract teachers which should be carried out at the end of the respective contract (which can be less than one year) and before its possible renewal. Teacher evaluation is carried out at the school level and follows an internal approach mostly based on peer evaluation. The school takes responsibility for the process timeline, the design of specific evaluation tools and instruments, the distribution of evaluation duties, the identification of the evaluators' needs, and the follow-up of evaluation results. The intention of the evaluation process is that it suits the context of the particular school. The model breaks away from the current institutional culture and practice in that, for the first time, schools are required to construct evaluation instruments.

■■■ SLOVAKIA

Since 2003, school leaders have been required to conduct annual evaluations of educational and special employees (OECD, 2011/4). Assessments are based on methods developed for school inspections and focus on educational processes. Prior to 2003, teachers were assessed only at the end of the induction period.

■■■ SWEDEN

Teacher appraisal in Sweden is not regulated by law and no formal procedures exist to evaluate the performance of permanent teachers (OECD, 2011e). The main form of appraisal is a regular individual-development dialogue held between the school leader and individual teachers, but there is little guidance provided on how to appraise teacher performance. Overall, teachers have few opportunities for professional feedback.

According to **Läraryrket**, instead, some mandatory evaluation does exist. Approaches used for teacher appraisal include completion of probation, teacher registration or certification, and performance management, while a scheme for rewarding excellence is on its way. All permanent teachers and teachers on probation are mandatorily appraised, either when they are new to the profession or when a decision on their employment status must be taken. Evaluations are devised by the central authority and carried out by school leaders, with the involvement of the National Board of Educators. Appraisal is carried out against centrally set teaching standards, focusing on instruction, planning and preparation, completion of professional development, and contribution to school development, using classroom observations, objective setting, and interviews. Appraisal normally determines promotion, opportunities for professional development for underperforming teachers and for changes in their responsibilities, and influences teachers' basic pay.

■■■ SWITZERLAND

Appraisal varies from one canton to the other, according to **LCH**. Broadly speaking, all teachers are evaluated at different times (completion of probation, teacher registration or certification, performance management, scheme for rewarding excellence, or peer review). Appraisal is mandatory and periodic, although the cycle varies between once a year or once every four years. Appraisal informs salary promotion only in a minority of cantons. However, across Switzerland, it impacts on career changes, as well as the position of new teachers entering the profession. Appraisal is devised by local authorities, school boards and inspectorates and leaders – although the practice differs depending on individual cantons. Teacher unions normally influence the development of appraisal. The evaluators comprise inspectors, school leaders and boards, and other teachers, as well external evaluators. Regional standards and school regulations are the criteria against which teachers are evaluated. Evaluation focuses on instruction, planning and preparation, and completion of professional development as well as classroom environment. The appraisal instruments consist of classroom observations, peer review, objective setting and interviews, student surveys, self-appraisal, and portfolios. With the exception of secondary schools in a few cantons, appraisal does not inform teachers' pay progression.

■■■ TURKEY

School leaders approve teachers' annual plans, and monitor, identify and address weaknesses. They are also responsible for teachers' professional development (OECD, 2011/4).

■■■ UNITED KINGDOM

In England, revised guidelines on annual teacher-performance assessments were issued in 2012. Schools must develop pay and performance-management policies, which, among other requirements, must link teacher performance with plans for school improvement and school self-valuation, include classroom observations, and provide for training as the need arises (OECD, 2011/4). The NUT, the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, and the National Association of Head Teachers have issued joint guidelines on implementing the scheme.

In Wales, revised guidelines were issued in 2002 (OECD, 2011/4). The governing body of a school is required to establish the performance-management policy of the school, and to assess teachers annually. The policies must establish the school's performance objectives and monitoring process.

In Northern Ireland, teachers are reviewed annually, usually by a teacher with management or curricular responsibility for the teacher (OECD, 2011/4). The assessments are based on two classroom observations as well as on a review of objectives set out at the beginning of a period, and cover areas of practice, professional development, student and curriculum development. The reviews are expected also to link to school development plans.

Teachers in Scotland are not assessed individually.

NUT and **NASUWT** recruit in different jurisdictions in the UK and described the different approaches to appraisal which operate in each of the UK's nations.

ENGLAND

All teachers employed for at least one term in a maintained school (run by a local authority) and unattached teachers (not attached to a particular school) employed by a local authority are subject to School Teachers' Appraisal Regulations 2012. These give individual maintained schools scope to establish their own arrangements for appraisal. Academies and free schools may establish their own systems of appraisal or performance management. Appraisal is linked to pay progression in each school. The regulations replace performance-management regulations, which linked performance management to nationally determined pay and conditions set out in the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD).

The appraisal period usually operates in line with the academic year. However, it may be shorter if a teacher is employed on a short-term contract, in which instance it will last for the duration of the contract. Newly Qualified Teachers' Induction usually takes one year (or the equivalent of one year) to complete. In maintained schools, teachers are appraised by the school leader or by a teacher with delegated powers to appraise. However, the task may be delegated to the teacher's line manager. Head teachers are also appraised and the school's governing body must appoint an external adviser to provide advice and support. Academies or free schools are able to determine who will carry out their appraisals. There is no requirement for those carrying out appraisals to receive training, although schools/employers may provide some.

Maintained schools must appraise teachers against the national teachers' standards, although objectives may include some other criteria: standards set locally, the teacher's job description, the school development plan, school policies, procedures and regulations, and professional goals either identified by the teacher and/or other teachers in the school. Almost every school uses classroom observation as part of the appraisal process. In such instances, the teacher being observed is likely to have

played an active role in identifying the things that will be focused on as part of the observation and the areas where they would like feedback and support. Students' test results are used to judge teachers' performance, with teachers being required to meet particular exam or test targets and demonstrate that pupils have made specific levels of progress. Some schools use student surveys and feedback as part of the performance-management/appraisal process.

Although there is an expectation that teachers should undertake continuous professional development (CPD), there is no explicit requirement in the new Teachers' Standards that teachers must undertake professional development. There is no automatic link between the appraisal system and career progression. Teachers are able to identify and apply for positions as they see fit, including movement from the main scale to the upper pay spine. Prospective employers are likely to take notice of the reference provided by the teacher's current employer. This reference may draw on the results of performance management/appraisal, although it would not be limited to it.

The STPCD applies to teachers working in maintained schools and to staff working in academies and free schools who have protection under the TUPE regulations. The STPCD sets out a nationally determined pay scale and teachers in these schools should progress up the pay scale and, subject to satisfactory performance, cross the threshold to performance-related pay. The pay and conditions set out in the STPCD are developed through a process of statutory consultation, which includes consulting teacher unions. Some academies choose to continue to use the STPCD terms and conditions. However, other academies will apply different terms and conditions to new staff. The new appraisal system allows schools to devise appraisal systems which make direct links between pay and performance.

The new appraisal regulations do not include a right for teachers to appeal against their appraisal outcomes. The previous performance-management arrangements did provide teachers with the right to appeal. However, individual schools may choose to operate an appeals process.

WALES

All teachers employed in maintained schools and teachers employed by local authorities are subject to the School Teacher Appraisal (Wales) Regulations 2011. The regulations do not apply to teachers who are undertaking induction (completing probation) or to teachers who are subject to capability procedures. Appraisal is not explicitly linked to pay progression. The School Teacher Appraisal (Wales) Regulations 2011 state that the appraisal cycle is a continuous cycle. The appraisal period can be shorter if a teacher is employed on a short-term contract and moves to a new school.

In Wales, there is an increasing focus on the use of performance data. The 2011 regulations make explicit reference to Pupil Performance Information and other references such as developing and improving teachers' professional practice. The practising-teacher standards should be considered within the context of information about pupils' performance.

The school's governing body, the local authority, and the head teacher must establish and maintain, at least annually, a School Performance Management Policy. This will set out the school's arrangements for appraisal. Where there is disagreement, the local authority must determine the school's performance-management policy. Before the start of the appraisal cycle, the appraiser and the appraisee meet to plan and prepare for the appraisal, seeking shared appraisal objectives and the support and training needed to achieve them. While the precise focus of an appraisal may be determined locally, the regulations require the objective to be set in the national context and in line with government priorities.

The appraiser is appointed by the head teacher. In most instances, this is likely to be the head teacher or the teacher's line manager. No particular training is required for conducting appraisals. Teachers are appraised against Pupil Performance Information and appraisal must relate to their job description, any relevant pay-progression criteria, whole-school or team objectives specified in the school improvement plan, professional standards specified by Welsh Ministers from time to time, the teacher's own professional goals, and any CPD undertaken.

The appraisal regulations require teachers to keep an up-to-date record of professional development activities undertaken or other support provided during the appraisal cycle and how this has impacted, or otherwise, on meeting the objectives. The requirements for CPD should be discussed at the planning meeting. There is no contractual entitlement to CPD and the teacher unions believe the funding to be inadequate. They believe that, in practice, competing priorities and the high-stakes nature of the accountability system mean that many schools do not prioritise CPD. There is a direct link between appraisal and pay progression for eligible teachers. Following the appraisal review meeting, appraisers are required to make a recommendation on pay progression for teachers who are eligible to progress along the upper pay spine. Information from appraisal statements can be taken into account when making determinations on pay and promotion.

Teachers who have been appraised have a right to appeal against an appraisal review. They also have the right for any points of disagreement to be recorded at the planning meeting and during the process.

SCOTLAND

There is no formal performance management system in Scotland. Nevertheless, following Provisional Registration, a newly qualified teacher is required to complete a probationary period and, by the end of their probationary period, must have demonstrated that they have met the Standard for Full Registration (SFR) in order to gain Full Registration. Teachers can either complete their probationary period via a one-year induction scheme or via a time-flexible route.

Throughout the induction period, information is gathered in a profile. Each probationer on the induction scheme will have a supporter or mentor to guide them through this process at school level as well as further support from the Probation Support Manager at Local Authority level. While the newly qualified teacher undertaking the flexible route must still gather evidence and complete a profile, there is significantly less support from their employer to do so. Once fully registered, a teacher is expected to maintain the professional standards of competence throughout their career. Teachers, other than short-term supply teachers, have a contractual entitlement to complete up to a maximum of 35 hours of CPD per annum. A teacher's CPD should consist of an appropriate balance of personal professional development, attendance at nationally accredited courses, small-scale school-based activities, and other CPD activities including development opportunities provided by unions.

NORTHERN IRELAND

All teachers employed in grant-aided schools, including those employed on part-time or temporary contracts, must participate in the Performance Review and Staff Development (PRSD) scheme, a performance-management scheme that aims to support the professional development of teachers. Some fundamental principles underpin the PRSD scheme: professionalism, confidentiality, sensitivity, openness and transparency, equity and fairness, and trust and confidence. The PRSD scheme involves a commitment by all those involved in the process to recognise that the fundamental purpose of the process is to promote and sustain professional development and continuous improvement in schools. It also requires them 'to accept and support an approach to performance review which is negotiated and agreed, evidence based and professionally focused, recognising teachers' commitment, strengths and good practice'.

The PRSD scheme is linked to school improvement and operates on an annual cycle, as a national scheme. However, the scheme links explicitly to school improvement and this means that the objectives that are included in an individual teacher's PRSD are set at school level. The expectation in the regulations is that teachers should be active participants in the objective-setting process.

The school principal or staff member designated by the principal undertakes teacher reviews (usually, the teacher's line manager). The principal's evaluation is reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers designated by the board of governors, following consultation with the employing authority. Each employing authority then appoints trained and accredited external advisors to oversee and advise on PRSD schemes locally. Objectives in the PRSD scheme should be linked to the school development plan, although other references may be used, such as professional goals identified by the teacher being appraised.

The regulations make explicit reference to classroom observation: two classroom observations of a maximum period of one hour in total should take place before the review discussion. Where teachers have substantial responsibility outside the classroom, one period of classroom observation may be replaced by observations of a task. The PRSD scheme is intended to support the professional development of teachers and the review process should include discussion about personal and professional development. However, there is no explicit requirement for the teacher to undertake or have completed CPD. Clearly, the link to capability means that this only applies to teachers seen to be underperforming. There is no explicit link between the PRSD scheme and career advancement. All posts should be advertised and applicants should compete on an equal basis. However, the PRSD process might help a teacher to gain the experience and evidence that will help them when they apply for other posts. There is no direct link between the PRSD scheme and pay progression. However, teachers are required to participate in the PRSD process in order to progress up the pay spine.

Teachers who have been appraised have an opportunity to comment on the statement and record any points of disagreement.

■■■ UNITED STATES

The No Child Left Behind Act defined the qualifications needed by teachers and para-professionals who work on any facet of classroom instruction. It required that states developed plans to achieve the goal that all teachers of core academic subjects be highly qualified by the end of the 2005/06 school year. Teacher appraisal policies vary by state (OECD, 2011/4).

NEA and **AFT** have provided the following summary:

In the US, education is a state mandate that permits states to establish their own laws and contracts that can result in a variety of approaches used within a state. Teacher certification is rarely used in teacher appraisal. However, there have been a growing

number of proposals to tie certification to appraisal. Under these scenarios, teachers lose certification with poor appraisals. Peer review has been part of appraisal in just a few places for many years, but is now a growing practice in developing new teacher-appraisal systems. Sometimes the approach is specified within the contract, not the state. For example, the state of Florida's Senate Bill 736 requires all different approaches except peer review. In New Jersey, connecting appraisal to compensation is not in the law, but it can be found in the Newark, NJ contract. The current effort across the country is to connect teacher appraisal to all of these.

All public classroom teachers are appraised. Private-school teachers are not required to follow the laws regarding teacher appraisals. However, there is a growing movement to develop and implement appraisal systems that assess non-classroom educators and education support personnel.

Most state legislations and other existing regulations require that probationary (non-tenured) teachers be appraised before they are awarded "tenure" or a continuing teaching contract. Teachers who have achieved "tenure" or other professional status tend to be appraised far less frequently. However, the appraisal process may differ across states and jurisdictions. The amount of time, frequency of observation, and the findings of a teacher's recent appraisal report can significantly impact the appraisal process. In some systems, this could mean five observations per year (DC schools); in others, as few as one. New (non-tenured) teachers are evaluated three times a year and veteran teachers between once and twice yearly. All laws require the school districts to give every teacher a final rating at the end of each school year. States are beginning to pass new legislation and regulations requiring more frequent or annual appraisals.

Most teacher appraisal systems or frameworks are developed by state authorities, while local districts often control the procedures and processes. In most parts of the US, the state sets basic parameters (by law) and the district works with the local union to develop a detailed system. In places that have collective bargaining, evaluation is part of those discussions. However, an ever-increasing number of places have made evaluation a prohibited subject for bargaining (e.g. DC, Tennessee, and Wisconsin). This means the teachers cannot be involved and the school district administration sets the rules.

Principals are the primary evaluators. Given that teacher appraisal systems are becoming more high-stakes, there is an increasing demand that evaluators be trained and can demonstrate reliability. In addition, with new legislation and regulations demanding annual evaluations, there is an increasing need to build capacity. More external evaluators and other teachers are being trained to serve as evaluators as the need for evaluators continues to increase. The quality and reliability of requirements for training evaluators vary widely among jurisdictions. According to the teacher unions in some

instances, evaluators are said to be “trained” even if this only means that they were given training manuals. In other places, evaluators must go through an in-depth training and certification process. Interestingly, the Gates Foundation recently conducted a large study³ that showed the vast majority of principals could not identify quality teaching.

Depending on the state, teaching standards are either created by local school districts or the state. For example, Colorado has teaching standards that districts can use or, if they don't, the local district must create standards for approval. Most teacher appraisal systems have incorporated teaching standards that have been adapted from research-based professional teaching standards such as the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), Danielson, or the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium's (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards. Most teacher appraisal systems consist of standards, components or elements that assess all the aspects of teacher performance mentioned above.

A number of authorities are moving to include student achievement as a significant factor in appraising teacher performance. This is calculated by using data from standardised test scores and other measures of learning (i.e. value-added methods (VAMs), within New York's Annual Professional Performance Review [APPR]⁴).

Within the US, traditional appraisal systems relied heavily upon classroom observations but new appraisal systems are now employing multiple instruments and multiple sources of information. Classroom observation and student growth and learning can be found in almost all recently developed appraisal systems. These comprehensive teacher appraisal systems include evidence of classroom practice, the contribution a teacher makes to his or her profession, professional growth, and a teacher's contribution to student growth and learning. The degree of alignment between teacher appraisal systems and professional development varies widely as does the quality of professional development activities offered. So far, appraisal arrangements have not been tied to professional development but this is now beginning to change (see Box 3 on teacher evaluation and development [TED] below).

Student learning objectives (SLOs) and student surveys are also being introduced across the country.

³ *Gathering Feedback for Teaching*,
http://metproject.org/downloads/MET_Gathering_Feedback_Practioner_Brief.pdf

⁴ See http://www.nysut.org/bulletins_4933.htm for downloading the APPR, and *The Washington Post's* article *Principal: 'Kids, it's you and your teacher against the test'*
http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/principal-kids-its-you-and-your-teacher-against-the-test/2011/05/19/AF6QRU7G_blog.html from 20/05/2011

Box 3: The use of professional standards in the US

Professional standards defining accomplished teaching were first developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to guide assessments for veteran teachers. Subsequently, a group of states working together under the auspices of the Council for Chief State School Officers created the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), which translated these into standards for new teachers, adopted by over 40 states for initial teacher licensing. A recent revision of the InTASC teaching standards has been aligned with the Common Core Standards in order to reflect the kind of teacher knowledge, skills, and understandings needed to enact the standards. These standards have become the basis for assessments of teaching that produce ratings which are much more stable than value-added measures. At the same time, they *incorporate classroom evidence of student learning and they have recently been shown in larger-scale studies to predict teachers' value-added effectiveness*, thus grounding evaluation in student learning. Typically, the performance assessments ask teachers to document their plans and teaching within a unit of instruction which is linked to the state standards. Teachers are asked to adapt them for special education students and English language learners, videotape and critique lessons, and collect and evaluate evidence of student learning.

A number of studies have found that the National Board Certification assessment process identifies teachers who are more effective in raising student achievement than other teachers. Equally important, studies have found that teachers' participation in the National Board process stimulates improvements in their practice. Similar performance assessments, used with new teachers in Connecticut and California, have been found to predict their students' achievement gains on state tests. The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) has also been found to improve beginning teachers' competence and to stimulate improvements in the teacher education programmes that use it as a measure.

Source: Strauss, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2011

The appraisal impact varies across jurisdictions. It can affect career and leadership opportunities in some jurisdictions, whilst having little to no impact on career advancement in others. Linking teacher appraisal to teacher pay is just beginning to take hold in a small number of jurisdictions across the US, despite mounting opposition from teachers and researchers.

Most teacher appraisal systems in the US include appeal procedures, even if these may differ significantly depending on whether the appraisal systems are collectively bargained or whether they have come about as a result of 'meet and confer'. As jurisdictions seek to streamline the appeal process and make it transparent, teacher unions believe that some procedures are being eroded or eliminated.

Initially, teacher appraisal systems were more compliance-oriented, and teacher unions were focused on ensuring that the procedural aspects were fair and transparent. Today, the new teacher appraisal systems are focusing more on developing and supporting

the professional growth of the teachers. Indeed, the NEA has set out a comprehensive whole-system approach to teacher evaluation and assessment (2010).

Box 4. Teacher Evaluation and Development (TED) in NY State

TED, a system of Teacher Evaluation and Development, was created by six labor/management Innovation Teams across New York State to integrate evaluations in a continuum that advances teacher practice and student learning.

Supported by grants from the American Federation of Teachers and the U.S. Department of Education, TED is based on cutting-edge research, is aligned with New York State legislation and has been field-tested in districts whose visionary leaders committed immeasurable time and intellectual capital to this project. All involved are dedicated to “doing it right”, creating a quality system that will shape and inform the next generation of teacher evaluation.

The TED system is unique because it:

- Establishes teachers as *participants in*, not *recipients of*, their own evaluations
- Aligns with New York State Teaching Standards and the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (herein referred to as the Teacher Practice Rubric) to delineate multiple measures of teacher effectiveness
- Provides for evaluations to serve as stepping stones to meaningful professional dialogue and continued development
- Details a practitioner-developed and field-tested process for Peer Assistance and Review that seamlessly integrates evaluation and professional development
- Incorporates the necessity of documenting and addressing conditions of teaching and learning
- Requires training of practitioners and evaluators to optimize use of the system

Source: *TED Handbook - An integrated system for advancing teacher growth and student learning, developed by labor/management Innovation Initiative Teams* www.nysut.org/ted

Teachers’ unions have recently engaged in discussions on best practice in appraisals, whilst continuing to resist linking student achievement determined by standardised tests to high-stakes teacher appraisal systems.

Box 5. The Teacher Advancement Program

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), based on the standards of the National Board and InTASC, as well as the standards-based assessment rubrics developed in Connecticut, ensures that teachers are evaluated four to six times a year by master or mentor teachers or principals who have been trained and certified in a rigorous four-day training programme. Indicators of good teaching refer to practices that have been found to be associated with desired student outcomes. Teachers also study the rubric and its implications for teaching and learning, look at and evaluate videotaped teaching episodes using the rubric, and engage in practice evaluations. After each observation, evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the findings and to make a plan for ongoing growth. Ongoing professional development, mentoring, and classroom support are provided to help teachers meet these standards. Teachers in TAP schools report that this system, along with the intensive professional development offered, is substantially responsible for improvements in their practice and the gains in student achievement that have occurred in many TAP schools.

See also http://www.infoagepub.com/products/downloads/tap_overview.pdf

2.2. An overview of teacher appraisal arrangements.

In most jurisdictions, teacher appraisal methods encompass: (a) self-evaluation; (b) peer and school-leader evaluation; (c) student (and, less frequently, parent) surveys/assessment; (d) external evaluation through inspectors, inspection authorities, assessment centres; and, recently, (e) student-performance test scores. Among countries involved in the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), appraisal arrangements tend to be generated more often from within the school than from an external source. For instance, over three-quarters of teachers in Norway and Portugal do not normally receive feedback from an external agent. In Italy, external teacher appraisal is virtually non-existent (OECD TALIS, 2009).

Across countries, appraisal is carried out using a range of methods. These range from a more formal, objective approach (e.g. as part of a formal performance management system, involving set procedures and criteria) to a more informal, subjective one (e.g. informal discussions with the teacher, interviews and definition of individual professional development plans) (OECD TALIS, 2009). Criteria typically include the subject and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher, some assessment of teaching methods, levels of in-service training and, increasingly, measures of student performance through standardised tests.

In many European countries, teachers are not individually appraised through commonly set procedures within external school evaluation arrangements – a finding confirmed by Eurydice's latest key data on education in Europe. However, in several of these countries, teachers may be evaluated in specific circumstances (Eurydice, 2012). In Estonia, Ireland and Spain, teachers are assessed when applying for promotion or at the beginning of their career. In Ireland, the inspectorate also evaluates teachers at the request of the school management board. In the Nordic countries, teachers are not evaluated individually, or (in Denmark) not subject to external individual evaluation. Internal evaluation occurs in all the countries surveyed to a varying degree, but is not always mandatory. With the exception of a small number of countries such as England, Wales and Iceland, school evaluation systems are centred mainly on local authorities and boards, responsible for evaluating their own educational provision (for instance Denmark and Norway, where local authorities have a duty to evaluate each school individually).

Teacher appraisal is often linked with career progression and changes in a teacher's responsibilities (although to a varying degree), and connected to further opportunities for (in-service) professional development. The link with salary and pay progression is not homogeneous: the link exists in Sweden, the UK, the US, and Korea, but not in Italy, Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, France, or Norway, for example.

Despite the fact that teacher evaluation takes place on a regular basis in many countries, and appears to be increasingly common, teachers (and unions) frequently indicate that principals and other senior staff often lack the time, tools or training to perform these evaluations satisfactorily. Moreover, the increasing use of so-called value-added methods (VAMs) based on student test scores, is causing mounting apprehension.

Because a coherent and well-resourced system of teacher performance appraisal is absent in a number of countries, teachers run the risk of not receiving appropriate recognition for their work, and there is little systematic information to guide professional development priorities. In turn, these dynamics exacerbate their sense of professional isolation, and reinforce the perception that their efforts are not appreciated (OECD, 2005). In response, comprehensive methods for teacher evaluation are gaining growing recognition. These methods take into account multiple factors associated with teaching, and are conceived with teachers' involvement and cooperation. They are more practitioner-led, and, as such, more focused on teachers and their development.

Box 6. A look beyond OECD countries: India and China

1. India

According to AIPTE, in India, all teachers are evaluated on completion of probation by the state and the local authority. Appraisal is carried out against a teacher's professional goals, taking into account many aspects associated with their daily work: preparation, class environment, instruction, links to the community, etc. The instruments of appraisal focus on testing teachers themselves. Appraisal determines promotion, but does not impact on professional development opportunities, although it can justify the undertaking of sabbatical periods.

2. Teacher evaluation in rural China

Chinese schools are exceptional in conducting rigorous and systematic annual evaluations of teacher performance. Nationally mandated, these reviews include principal evaluations, student evaluations, publication counts, student test scores, the teacher's attendance record, and other aspects of teacher service. Principals evaluate the teacher's enthusiasm, use of innovative teaching methods, ability to maintain order, and manage student concerns and problems. The different aspects of the review are scored using a point system. Based on these scores and the teacher's educational background and years of teaching, the teacher may be considered for permanent ranking adjustments. For primary schools in Gansu, there are four quality rankings: intern (*jianxiqu*), second level (*xiaojiao erji*), first level (*xiaojiao yiji*), and highest level (*xiaojiao gaoji*). Because the official quality rankings integrate information on so many aspects of teacher performance, they provide a uniquely informative measure of teacher quality that is unavailable in other developing and developed countries.

Source: Park and Hannum (2011).

Do Teachers Affect Learning in Developing Countries?: Evidence from Matched Student-Teacher Data from China, by Albert Park, Department of Economics, University of Michigan, and Emily Hannum, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Paper prepared for the conference, *Rethinking Social Science Research on the Developing World in the 21st Century*, Social Science Research Council, Park City Utah, 7-11 June 2001, April 2002

3. EMERGING TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS

This section describes the latest trends and developments in teacher appraisal. Alongside more traditional methods, widely described above and used in the majority of countries, two trends seem to be emerging. The first trend is the use of so-called value-added methods (VAMs) which are tied to the publication of evaluation data. The second trend, which appears to be in contradiction to the first, is the growing support for comprehensive approaches to appraisal (Isore, 2009; MacBeath, 2012).

3.1. Value added evaluation methods

Value-added evaluation methods, where teacher effectiveness and compensation are increasingly being tied to student scores on standardised tests, have raised concerns among teachers, unions and practitioners in general. As Froese-Germain (2011) puts it, these methods originate from a highly charged climate of data-driven accountability, and are increasingly common across the US. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District is among a growing number of US school districts using the results of standardised tests to determine the “value-added” outcomes produced by the teacher (the value-added measure of teacher performance is related to gains in test scores in the teacher’s class over time)⁵. Other stories are reported from Chicago, where some reformers, such as Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, want as much as half of a teacher’s evaluation to be linked to student test scores⁶ (Strauss, 2012).

Rather than placing student results in context, these methods issue a comprehensive judgment purely based on data developed through standardised calculations. However, as Baker et al (2010) highlight, VAM estimates have proven to be unstable across statistical models, years, and teaching classes. Studies quoted in Baker et al (2010) prove in fact that a teacher who appears to be ineffective in one year may achieve dramatically different results the following year. VAM’s instability can result from differences in the characteristics of students assigned to given teachers in a particular year and from specific evaluation measures. Such factors include: small samples of students (made even less representative in schools serving disadvantaged students and which have high rates of student mobility), other influences on student learning both inside and outside school, and tests which are poorly lined up with the curriculum teachers are expected to cover, or which do not measure the full range of achievement of students in the class.

A number of non-teacher factors have been found to have strong influences on student learning gains. These include the influence of other teachers, tutors or

⁵ On NYC, see also *Queens parents demand answers following teacher's low grades*, by G Robert, 26 February 2012, www.edwize.org

⁶ *Meet Ashley, a great teacher with a bad 'value-added' score - The Answer Sheet - The Washington Post*, by Valerie Strauss, 13 September 2012, at http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/meet-ashley-a-great-teacher-with-a-bad-value-added-score/2012/09/13/27836e4e-fdb7-11e1-a31e-804fccb658f9_blog.html

instructional specialists; school conditions — such as the quality of curriculum materials, specialist or tutoring supports, class size, resources, learning environment; and other factors that affect learning.

A review of the technical evidence leads Baker et al (2010) and other sources (Burriss, 2012; Strauss, 2012) to conclude that, although standardised test scores of students are one tool school leaders can use to make judgments about teacher effectiveness, such scores can only be a part of an overall comprehensive evaluation. Any sound evaluation has to necessarily involve a balancing of all relevant factors in order to provide a more accurate view of what teachers do in the classroom and their contribution to student learning.

In addition, binding teacher evaluation and sanctions to test score results can discourage teachers from wanting to work in schools with the neediest students, while the large, unpredictable variation in the results and their perceived unfairness can undermine teacher morale (Baker et al, 2010). For instance, teachers show lower gains when they have large numbers of new English-learners and students with disabilities than when they teach other students. This is true even when statistical methods are used to “control” for student characteristics (Darling-Hammond, 2012). Surveys have found that teacher attrition and demoralisation have been associated with test-based accountability efforts, particularly in high-need schools.

The use of VAMS is also associated with a narrowing of the curriculum; a de facto curriculum whose subject matter is defined by what is tested. Teachers who rate highest on the low-level multiple-choice tests currently in use are often not those who raise higher scores in assessments of more-challenging learning (Darling-Hammond, 2012). Some believe that the pressure to teach “fill-in-the-bubble tests” will further reduce the focus on research, writing, and complex problem-solving; areas which students will need competence in to compete with their peers in high-achieving countries (Darling-Hammond, 2012).

Finally, as far as merit-pay systems are concerned, tying teacher evaluation and remuneration to test results is problematic on numerous levels, not least because it reinforces a competitive spirit that undermines teacher collegiality and teamwork (Froese-Germain, 2011).

Box 7. A valid way to use “value added” in teacher evaluation

Some believe that an approach based on VAM, if used as a screening method, could be an effective instrument to solve a host of problems. According to this view, the screening approach would represent a “feedback loop” in which both VAM and observations are used to ensure that the other is functioning well – i.e., observations are used to verify the identification of low-performing teachers based on value-added (and help them improve), while value-added is used to identify observers (e.g. appraisers) whose performance may be lacking.

This approach would also ensure that VAMs are not the primary determinants of high-stakes personnel decisions. Rather, in this alternative proposal, value-added would only serve to trigger a closer look at a teacher's performance, but the actual decisions would be based on classroom observations by experts.

The screening approach would help schools focus their evaluation resources where they count, i.e. on low-performing teachers and low-performing classroom observers. This is crucial in these tough economic and fiscal times, during which schools must allocate resources carefully.

The screening approach, working in all grades and subjects, would avoid the unfortunate response, in states such as Florida, of expanding testing to every grade and subject. Value-added could serve to test screeners even of non-tested grades and subjects as long as those same screeners have some teachers in tested classrooms.

The screening approach would also ensure that there is enough information to give educational leaders the confidence to know that they are making the best possible personnel decisions – that their tough choices will not be overturned by lawsuits alleging arbitrary and capricious firings.

Source: Abstract from D.H. Harris, *The Washington Post*, 4 December 4 2012; <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2012/12/04/the-future-of-teacher-evaluation-how-value-added-could-be-used/> Retrieved from Twitter on 5 December 2012

Box 8: New teacher evaluations start to hurt students

During the first two weeks of September, Principal Harry Leonadartis surveyed principals around the state of New York who had been implementing the new evaluation of teachers by student test scores, to find out if the ratings they received for their teachers appeared to be an accurate reflection of their teachers' skills. More than 500 New York principals responded.

Seventy three per cent of respondents said that the "ineffective" label assigned to some of their teachers was either not a very accurate or an inaccurate reflection of that teacher based on their observations and the performance of that teacher's students. A majority said that the scores overall were not a very accurate reflection of teacher ability. [...]

In the comments section of the survey, several principals reported having excellent special education teachers labelled as "ineffective". One principal wrote: "Two excellent teachers who volunteer to take on my toughest students got an 'ineffective'. Their hearts were broken. So was mine." Another principal remarked, "The teachers who were identified as ineffective...have been teaching for more than 15 years, and have cared for students in ways that no test can measure." [...]

Other principals remarked that teachers who received poor ratings were often praised by students and parents alike. Some principals stated that they would change their teacher's assignment next year and assign them less needy students so that they could protect these excellent teachers from the ineffective rating.

The unintended consequences to students are beginning.

Source: Burriss (2012). Abstract from V. Strauss and C. Burriss, *New teacher evaluations start to hurt students* - The Answer Sheet - The Washington Post – 30 September 2012. Retrieved from Twitter on 1 October 2012

The **publication of evaluation data** is a particularly controversial issue. In summer 2010, the *L.A. Times* published performance ratings for more than 6,000 Los Angeles elementary teachers, naming and ranking individual teachers as effective or ineffective on the basis of math and reading test scores. This had devastating consequences on teachers and generated widespread controversy among the public. Indeed, a study just published by the National Education Policy Center at the University of Colorado⁷

⁷ National Education Policy Center (8 February 2011). "Research study shows L.A. Times teacher ratings are neither reliable nor valid." [Press release] <http://nepc.colorado.edu/newsletter/2011/02/research-study-shows-l-times-teacher-ratings-are-neither-reliable-nor-valid>

has found serious flaws in the research used to determine the widely reported *L.A. Times'* ratings, stating that it was “demonstrably inadequate to support the published rankings” (Froese-Germain, 2011). More recently, the New York City Department of Education announced plans to release VAM scores for more than 12,000 public school teachers. A request by the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) to keep the teachers' names confidential has been denied by a Manhattan judge (Otterman, 2011).

Box 9. Value-added evaluation (and the publication of its results) hurts teaching

Here's the hype: New York City's “worst teacher” was recently singled out and so labelled by the *New York Post* after the city's education department released value-added test-score ratings to the media for thousands of city teachers, identifying each by name. Reporters chased down teacher Pascale Maclair, the subject of the “worst teacher” slam, bombarding her with questions about her lack of skill and commitment.

Maclair is an experienced and much-admired English-as-a-second-language teacher. She works with new immigrant students who do not yet speak English at one of the city's strongest elementary schools. Her school, PS 11, received an A from the city's rating system and is led by one of the city's most respected principals, Anna Efkarpidis, who declares Maclair an excellent teacher.

Most troubling is that the city released the scores while warning that huge margins of error surround the ratings: more than 30 percentile points in math and more than 50 percentile points in English language arts. Soon, these scores will be used in a newly negotiated evaluation system that, as it is designed, will identify most teachers in New York state as less than effective.

Everyone agrees that teacher evaluation in the United States needs an overhaul. Although successful systems exist, most districts are not using approaches that help teachers improve or remove those who cannot improve in a timely way. [...] Indeed, many states have adopted this idea in response to federal incentives tied to much-needed funding. However, previous experience is not promising. Recently evaluated experiments in Tennessee and New York did not improve achievement when teachers were evaluated and rewarded based on student test scores. In the District of Columbia, contrary to expectations, reading scores on national tests dropped and achievement gaps grew after a new test-based teacher-evaluation system was installed. In Portugal, a study of test-based merit pay attributed score declines to the negative effects of teacher competition, leading to less collaboration and sharing of knowledge. [...] Yet this has not stopped some policymakers in the United States from forging ahead. In Houston, where teachers are dismissed or rewarded based substantially on value-added scores, teachers can find little relationship between what they do and how they rate each year. [...]

So what's the alternative? As in other professions, *good evaluation starts with rigorous, ongoing assessment by experts who review teachers' instruction based on professional standards.* Evaluators look at classroom practice, plus evidence of student outcomes from classroom work and school or district assessments. Studies show that feedback from this kind of evaluation improves student achievement, because it helps teachers get better at what they do. Systems that sponsor peer assistance and review programs also identify poor teachers, provide them intensive help, and effectively remove them if they don't improve.

If we really want to improve teaching, we should look to such districts for models of effective evaluation, as well as to high-performing countries that have professionalized teaching by ensuring excellent preparation, on-the-job collaboration, and ongoing professional learning.

Source: Abstract from Linda Darling-Hammond, Education Week, 3 May 2012 http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/03/05/24darlinghammond_ep.h31.html Retrieved from Twitter on 2 October 2012

3.2. Comprehensive approaches

In contrast with VAMs, comprehensive methods for teacher evaluation are gaining recognition. They take into account multiple factors associated with teaching, and are more focused on teachers and their development.

First of all, these methods are based on a shared consensus on the involvement of teachers throughout the development of the process (Isore, 2009). In the US districts that use Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) programmes, highly expert mentor teachers conduct some aspects of the evaluation and provide assistance to teachers in need (Strauss, 2012; Newton et al, 2010). New York State's TED is another practitioner-developed instrument (Box 4), where teachers both devise and participate in their own evaluation. Key features of these systems encompass instruments used for evaluation together with the expertise of the consulting teachers or mentors – skilled teachers in the same subject areas and school levels who have been given time to serve as mentors to support their fellow teachers – and a system of due process and review involving a panel of both teachers and administrators in making recommendations. Many systems using this approach have been found to improve teaching and to successfully identify teachers for continuation and tenure as well as intensive assistance and personnel action.

Secondly, comprehensive methods such as TED, among others, are developed on the basis of professional standards that have been translated into teacher evaluation instruments (Box 4). They incorporate classroom evidence of student learning and they have recently been shown in larger-scale studies to predict teachers' value-added effectiveness. In short, they help ground evaluation in student learning in more stable ways compared to other systems of teacher appraisal. In many schools and districts, assessments of teachers are based on well-articulated standards of practice evaluated through evidence that includes observations of teaching along with teacher interviews and, sometimes, other elements such as lesson plans, assignments, and samples of student work (Strauss, 2011; Newton et al, 2010).

The Gates Foundation has launched a major initiative to find additional tools validated against student achievement gains, which can be used in teacher evaluation at the local level. The Measure of Effective Teaching (MET) Project has developed a number of instruments based on the standards-based assessments described above and new ones such as observations or videotapes of teachers, supplemented with other items of practice (lesson plans, assignments, etc.), which can be scored according to a set of standards which reflect practices associated with effective teaching (Strauss, 2011; Newton et al, 2010). Instruments also include student surveys about teaching practice, significantly related to student achievement gains.

Teacher collaboration can also be a key factor in teacher appraisal. Countries such as Singapore, for instance, put a great emphasis on such collaboration in their evaluation

systems. This approach is supported by studies which conclude that stronger value-added gains for students are supported by teachers who work together as teams and by higher levels of teacher collaboration for school improvement.

Some systems specifically ask teachers to assemble evidence of student learning as part of the overall judgment of effectiveness, drawing from classroom and school-level documentation, including pre- and post-test measures of student learning in specific courses or curriculum areas, and evidence of student accomplishments in relation to teaching activities. A study of Arizona's career ladder programme, requiring the use of various methods of student assessment to complement evaluations of teachers' practice, found that, over time, participating teachers demonstrated an increased ability to create locally developed assessment tools to assess their student learning gains; to develop and evaluate pre- and post-test measures; to define measurable outcomes in hard-to-quantify areas such as art, music, and physical education; and to monitor student learning growth (Strauss, 2011; Newton et al, 2010).

Moreover, a greater awareness of the importance of sound curriculum development, more alignment of curriculum with district objectives, and increased focus on higher quality content, skills, and instructional strategies, seem also to be very relevant. Indeed, some successful systems, such as TAP (see Box 5), involve expert evaluators using multiple classroom observations and multiple sources of data across the year which reflect teachers' instructional practices, and which provide timely and meaningful feedback to the teacher.

In summary, approaches that are designed with teachers and are able to consider the multiplicity of factors associated with teaching seem to provide a valuable method for effectively appraising teachers.

Box 10. Is there a place for 360° appraisal in assessing teacher performance ?

Broadly speaking, a 360° approach encourages a wider view of performance instead of a view of solely one person, typically a head. It would also boost collaboration where results-driven performance management tends to do the opposite. It would be a way of recognizing some of the invaluable qualities that can be harder to define but are essential to the morale of a staff body.

However, if a positive of a 360° appraisal can be an opportunity to praise, the negatives can be the potential for grievances to be aired in an unconstructive manner. Teachers' self-opinion is a curious thing: some of the best teachers are often the most self-deprecating, questioning their practice first. Unless the process is conducted in a sensitive manner, teachers' confidence could take an unfair battering.

Another concern could be that teachers comment favorably on peers they like just as students sometimes do when assessing their friends. This could be because they are afraid of causing offense or because they know their comments could determine pay. However, if the process is anonymous and a range of views is taken into account, this is less likely to be an issue. Part of the process should also be to provide clear examples that back up views of contributors too, be that peers, students or otherwise. Furthermore, if students' opinions are to be considered, then their responses must be focused on learning, not on teacher preference. Feedback should be carefully considered by the appraiser beforehand, and joint consensus should be reached on training needs and future targets to make the process mutually beneficial.

There are two main ways in which the 360° approach would benefit both the whole school community.

First, *there are potential opportunities for staff to take ownership of the implementation of the appraisal process.* It could be a way to gain whole staff consensus on what effective performance really is and how it can be assessed. A transparent implementation of 360° appraisal would enhance a sense of ownership amongst staff. If this approach is taken right from the start, staff would be much more likely to take responsibility for guiding their own CPD and targets once the appraisal process starts.

Second, *just as a classroom atmosphere can reflect the teacher's manner, so a staff body can reflect the qualities of its leadership.* The 360° appraisal would be an opportunity for teachers to hold up a mirror to their own performance and ultimately, for a Leadership Team to do the same. And if the appraisal process is linked explicitly to CPD, it would become more meaningful. There would be scope for schools to tailor personalized CPD for staff and raise the status of CPD programs. This could lead to a resurgence in teacher portfolios, making them more than a tick box exercise: records of self-reflection, peer observations, trips, extra responsibilities and even parental feedback could all be resources to take into an appraisal meeting.

To enhance the sense of shared purpose and ownership, it's also vital that *the appraisal process is undertaken by all staff, regardless of seniority or length of service.* This includes the head teacher's appraisal with an external advisor similarly informed by 360° appraisal.

Source: Abstract from Anna Trethewey on www.lkmco.org/article/there?place?360a?appraisal?assessing?teacher?performance?07122012, retrieved from Twitter on 7 December 2012

4. CONCLUSION

There is currently a lively debate about teacher evaluation methods, particularly in jurisdictions which are developing value-added methods in contrast to the more traditional appraisal instruments used in the majority of OECD countries.

Many teacher unions have raised concerns about the validity of standardised tests of student performance if they are used for teacher evaluation. In some countries (notably in the US), current policies give test scores a prominent role, thus ignoring evidence of their instability. These policies tend to encourage teachers to teach to standardised tests (thereby narrowing the curriculum), as well as undermining teacher collaboration. The concerns of teachers and their unions are amplified when teacher rankings from test score-based evaluation are published, leading to often devastating consequences for teachers' reputations.

In addition, it appears that it is not essential to the quality of education in a jurisdiction that it should operate a formal teacher appraisal scheme. At least four countries surveyed by EI, which are in the top 25 of the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment, do not have jurisdiction wide formal schemes (for example: Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway). Neither is there any evidence that merit performance related pay schemes have any influence on the quality of education in jurisdictions. A range of countries in the EI survey, which are deemed by the OECD to be high performing, do not have such schemes.

The evidence from the EI survey is that, for appraisal schemes to have value and to contribute to the quality of education, teachers need to be able to trust them and to consider them fair. Teachers value appraisal if they see that it can yield positive outcomes such as high quality professional development and relevant professional and career advice.

In addition, the evidence is that for appraisal to be trusted and considered fair a range of evidence should be taken into account. When teacher appraisal arrangements and policies are devised with the participation of teachers and their unions, comprehensive methods seem to be able to gain teachers' trust and provide more valuable information. As such, these methods are growing in recognition in the debate about teacher appraisal, as a rising number of jurisdictions are showing an interest in introducing them as a response to the demands for high educational quality.

Indeed, to quote Isore, "an effective, fair and reliable evaluation scheme requires teachers' overall acceptance and appropriation of the system. [...] As such, developing a comprehensive approach may be costly but is critical to conciliate the demands for educational quality, the enhancement of teaching practices through professional development, and the recognition of teacher knowledge, skills and competencies" (Isore, 2009:32).

REFERENCES

- Baker, P., Barton, E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R.L., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R.J., and Sheppard, L.A. (2010), *Problems with the Use of student test scores to evaluate teachers* Economic Policy Institute http://epi.3cdn.net/b9667271ee6c154195_t9m6ij8k.pdf
- Bangs, J. And Frost D. (2012), *Teacher Self-efficacy, Voice and Leadership – Towards a Policy Framework for Education International*. Education International Research Institute and University of Cambridge Faculty of Education. Brussels: Education International
- Burris, C. (2011), The dangers of building a plane in the air, *The Washington Post* – The Answer Sheet. 30 September 2011.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012), *Value-Added Evaluation Hurts Teaching* http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/03/05/24darlinghammond_ep.h31.html Education Week, 3 May 2012. (Retrieved from Twitter on 2 October 2012)
- Education International (2011), *EI Resolution on the Future of the Teaching Profession*, 1.1.2 E, July 2011; <http://www.ei-ie.org>
- Froese-Germain B. (2011), *Weighing In On the Teacher Merit Pay Debate*, March 2011, CTF Notes
- Harris, D.H. (2012), *A valid way to use 'value added' in teacher evaluation* *The Washington Post*, 4 December 2012; <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2012/12/04/the-future-of-teacher-evaluation-how-value-added-could-be-used/> (Retrieved from Twitter on 5 December 2012)
- International Labour Organisation (2012) *Handbook of good human resource practices in the teaching profession*. Geneva: ILO
- Isore, M. (2009), *Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review*. OECD Working paper 23, Paris, OECD
- MacBeath, J. (2012), *Future of Teaching Profession* Education International Research Institute and University of Cambridge Faculty of Education. Brussels: Education International
- Newton, X., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., & Thomas, E. (2010), *Value-Added Modelling of Teacher Effectiveness: An exploration of stability across models and contexts*. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 18 (23). <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/810>
- NEA Approach to teacher evaluation and assessment (2010), www.nea.org/assets/docs/HE/TeacherAssmntWhtPaperTransform10_2.pdf
- OECD (2009), *Teacher Evaluation in Portugal*, OECD Review
- OECD (2010), *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for Australia*

- OECD (2010a)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for the Flemish Community of Belgium*
- OECD (2010b)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for Hungary*
- OECD (2010c)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for Korea*
- OECD (2011)**, *Cadres d'évaluation en vue d'améliorer les résultats scolaires. Etude thématique de l'OCDE, Rapport de base pour la Communauté française de Belgique*
- OECD (2011/4)**, *Integrating Formative and Summative Assessment: Progress Toward a Seamless System?* OECD Education Working Paper No. 58
- OECD (2011a)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for the Czech Republic*
- OECD (2011b)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Main Conclusions, Denmark*
- OECD (2011c)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for New Zealand*
- OECD (2011d)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Background Country Report for Norway*
- OECD (2011d)**, *Review on Evaluation and Assessment Frameworks for Improving School Outcomes, Sweden*
- Otterman, S. (2011)** Judge rules New York City can disclose names in teacher rankings; Union plans to appeal *New York Times*, 10 January 2011.
- Park, A., and Hannum, E. (2011)** *Do Teachers Affect Learning in Developing Countries?: Evidence from Matched Student-Teacher Data from China*. Paper prepared for the conference, *Rethinking Social Science Research on the Developing World in the 21st Century*, Social Science Research Council, Park City Utah, 7-11 June 2001, April 2002
- TED Handbook** - *An integrated system for advancing teacher growth and student learning, developed by labor/management Innovation Initiative Teams* <http://www.nysut.org/ted>
- Trethewey, A. (2012)**, *Is there a place for 360° appraisal in assessing teacher performance?* www.lkmco.org/article/there_place_360a_appraisal_assessing_teacher_performance_07122012, (Retrieved from Twitter, 7 December 2012)
- Strauss, V. (2012)**, *Getting Teacher Evaluation Right*, *The Washington Post* – The Answer Sheet, 15 October 2012 Annex I - Questionnaire for Teacher Summit

INTERNATIONAL SUMMIT ON THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Survey on Teacher Appraisal and Professional Standards

The theme of the third annual International Summit on the Teaching Profession, to be held in Amsterdam on 13-14 March 2013, focuses on teacher evaluation and professional standards. During the Summit, delegates will have discussions guided by the following questions:

- How is teacher quality defined by policy makers, the teaching profession and society? What standards are set and by whom?
- How is teacher quality evaluated? What systems are in place and how are the evaluations carried out?
- How do evaluations contribute to school improvement and teacher self-efficacy? What impact can be expected on teaching and learning from teacher evaluation?

As in previous years, the OECD will be preparing a background report to be published and distributed at the Summit and provided to Summit participants ahead of time. Much of the data for this year's report will be taken from the OECD's existing work on teacher appraisal and feedback including OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey. However, the OECD is interested in collecting data and examples from additional countries and regions that might not be part of our existing projects on teacher appraisal and standards. The OECD recognizes that some countries do not have national appraisal arrangements and that some also prefer the term 'teacher feedback' to 'appraisal.' The survey questions have been constructed to enable the widest range of information possible.

You are being asked to complete this short survey (15 questions) in order to provide additional data for the Summit background report. Examples provided in the text boxes after the questions below may be used as examples of best practice within the report.

For countries with multiple educational jurisdictions it is likely to be difficult to provide information at the country level. If it is at all possible, countries are asked to provide information about the average situation for the particular aspect being addressed. We understand, however, that averages will not be possible for some countries and we ask instead that these countries provide examples from individual educational jurisdictions that show the interesting practices within the country.

Please provide your answers in the fields of this document and return it by 1 December 2012 to John Bangs at john.bangs@ei-ie.org and copied to Guntars Catlaks at guntars.catlaks@ei-ie.org.

Thank you in advance for your time.

1. Which approaches are used for teacher appraisal? Please select all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Completion of probation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher registration or certification
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scheme for rewarding excellence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher peer review
<input type="checkbox"/>	None

Please provide additional detail (optional):

2. Which teachers are covered in the appraisal process? Please select all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	All teachers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Permanent teachers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teachers on fixed-term contracts
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teachers in irregular employment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Substitute teachers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teachers on probation

Please provide additional detail (optional):

3. Under which circumstances are teachers appraised, and how often?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory periodic
	<i>Please specify how often</i> <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory non-periodic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Before decisions on employment status (e.g. promotion, conversion or awarding of a permanent contract)
<input type="checkbox"/>	As a focus on teachers new to the profession
<input type="checkbox"/>	As the result of a complaint
<input type="checkbox"/>	Voluntary
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

If "Other" please specify:

4. Who conceives and develops teacher appraisal ? Please select all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/>	Central authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	State authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional/provincial authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermediate agency (e.g. school inspectorate)
<input type="checkbox"/>	School board
<input type="checkbox"/>	School leader
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teachers in the school
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teachers unions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Students
<input type="checkbox"/>	Parents
<input type="checkbox"/>	Business community

5. Who are the evaluators ?

<input type="checkbox"/>	School inspector
<input type="checkbox"/>	School board
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other evaluator external to the school
<input type="checkbox"/>	School leader
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other teachers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Students
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

If "Other" please specify:

--

6. Do those involved in designing and carrying out appraisals receive training to prepare them for these tasks?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not relevant

7. Against what references are teachers appraised? Please select all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Central teaching standards
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional/local teaching standards
<input type="checkbox"/>	A description of professional duties of teachers (e.g. job description)
<input type="checkbox"/>	School development plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	School internal regulations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher professional goals

Please provide additional detail (optional):

8. What aspects of teacher performance are appraised ?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning and preparation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Instruction
<input type="checkbox"/>	Classroom environment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Completion of professional development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contribution to school development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Links to the community
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

If "Other", please specify:

9. What instruments and information sources are used ?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Classroom observation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Objective setting and interview / dialogue with the teacher
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher self-appraisal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher portfolio
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher testing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student results
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student surveys
<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent surveys
<input type="checkbox"/>	Peer review/consultation

Please provide additional detail on what information is used and how (optional).

10. Does the appraisal inform teacher's professional development activities?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, for all teachers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, for teachers identified as underperforming only
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not

11. Does the appraisal impact on career advancement?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, appraisal determines promotion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, appraisal influences the speed at which teachers progress
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

12. Do the results of teacher appraisal impact on pay?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, appraisal affects the base salary
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, a pay allowance is provided for good performance
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

13. What other outcomes may stem from teacher appraisal? Please select all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Sabbatical periods
<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunities for school-based research
<input type="checkbox"/>	Support for post-graduate study
<input type="checkbox"/>	Extra opportunities for in-service professional development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public recognition / award
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in work responsibilities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

If "Other" please specify:

14. Is there an appeals procedure for teachers who disagree with their appraisal outcomes?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not relevant

15. Please use the space below to provide any characteristics or examples from your country's national (or a regional) teacher appraisal system that you think might be interesting for other countries to learn from. In your response, you might consider discussing the link in your country/region between teacher appraisal and the quality of student learning.





Education International

5, boulevard du Roi Albert II
B-1210 Brussels
www.ei-ie.org

Education International is the global union federation representing more than 30 million teachers, professors and education workers from pre-school to university in more than 170 countries and territories around the globe.

ISBN 978-92-95100-38-1 (Paperback)
ISBN 978-92-95100-39-8 (PDF)