

A Discussion on Teacher Appraisal Policies: International Practices and National Context

Sudeshna Lahiri,

Ph.D; Assistant Professor;

Department of Education; University of Calcutta

Abstract

The University Grants Commission in India being the determining agency for standard of higher education does not shy away from its initiatives for quality education. . In this regard, developing appropriate ‘accountability measures for teachers’ which ensure positive actions as professionals and towards beneficiaries of the education system has been suggested as an important action by every committee appointed to review quality of education. Although ‘Teacher appraisal’ has been recognised as important measure in every committee to suggest reform in India since last four decades, however it could not be implemented as Indian psyche is embedded in keeping unquestionable faith on teachers. As a result, very few researches could be conducted on ‘Teacher appraisal’ in Indian campuses whereas the area has been frequently visited by Euro-American researchers since 1960s. The present article addresses the research questions of historical development of ‘Teacher appraisal’; the analysis of trends of researches for methodologies employed; identified appraisers for evaluating teachers; and researches describing processes of evaluation in India and overseas. The methodology for the present article is survey of related literature; articles and conducted studies. The implication suggested by the article reveals that more studies are required to be conducted in Indian educational system. Due to lack of scientifically developed model and well researched process, ‘teacher appraisal system’ is still an alien concept in India. Similarly, existing models and practices in Euro-American campuses needs more value based framework which thrives on mutual trusts among different components of the educational system where the teacher holds the pivotal position.

Keywords: *Teacher Appraisal Policies, teacher effectiveness, teacher evaluation, accountability measures for teachers, teacher appraisal system.*

Introduction

The formal educational system during history of modern India was largely delegated by British rulers. The Universities during colonial India was established on British reflections and followed the ‘Ox-bridge’ model of institution for higher education. If we compare the scenario of higher education in India and Britain simultaneously during 1919, which is the year when the University Grants Commission (UGC) was established in Britain, it was entirely different. The role of UGC in Britain was primarily to act as a buffer between state and Universities, precisely as an advisory body to the treasury. The state of education was differently managed India till 1919, controlled by the central government with the viceroy. The 1919 had been the landmark for both the countries as education was ‘reassigned’ to provinces of India and Central Advisory Board of Education was developed to coordinate among the education ministers. The British withdrew itself in 1947 and by the time, India was ready with Constituent assembly. It took India another few years to come up with the constitution of UGC. The UGC in India, established in December 28, 1953, is different from any grant giving organization in any country for exercising two powers simultaneously. One is to provide fund and another is to determine and

administer standards. It was soon realised that the roots of the problem of lack of accountability and poor motivation among teachers and local administrators lie in the peculiar trajectory taken by the education system. Despite the fact that India is a fast developing economy, the concern for Government of India is to prepare majority of the population for employment and taking part in the development of the country. This requires having education and training that equips them for the labour market. However, the government realizes that the system is not being able to appropriately respond to the needs of the labour market. A key issue, then, is what reforms/interventions are needed to improve the effectiveness of the system (World Bank, 2007). In this regard, World Bank (2007) realises that the India faces the future with its changing realities; on the other hand it must deal with the nature of its established traditions and structures where changing realities are Globalization, competitiveness and the knowledge economy. India's transition to a knowledge-based economy requires a new generation of educated and skilled people. Its competitive edge will be determined by its people's ability to create, share, and use knowledge effectively. A knowledge economy requires India to develop workers – knowledge workers and knowledge technologists - who are flexible and analytical and who can be the driving force for innovation and growth. To achieve this demand of skilled workers in workforce, India needs a flexible education system: basic education to provide the foundation for learning; secondary and tertiary education to develop core capabilities and core technical skills; and further means of achieving lifelong learning. The education system must be attuned to the new global environment by promoting creativity and improving the quality of education and training at all levels. The need of teacher appraisal gained its importance with the sudden surge in quantity of education mushrooming every corner hardly giving berth to the quality. Although it is hard to determine the factors responsible for 'Quality Education', however, without a competent teacher any educational system is futile. Studies focused on the characteristics of educational development in India suggest that there has been a 'positive spurt' in quantity and 'negative spurt' in the quality of overall education (Mishra, 1999). Advocating for teacher appraisal, almost every committee and consultations constituted for reforms in higher education in India have recommended student evaluation of teachers should be one of the parameter of 'Teacher Appraisal' along with inputs from Principal, self and peer. Moreover, to be a successful enterprise, it is required that every person should be accountable to the members of the group and every group to the other group. Students judge teachers through direct observation whereas colleagues infer about 'teacher effectiveness' through out of the class interaction and efforts taken for in-class interaction with students. Evaluation by peer conveys the message – from learning separately to learning together, in which practicing teachers are jointly responsible for their work in classrooms and their wisdom and experiences are perceived as professional resources. The present article addresses the research questions of historical development of 'Teacher appraisal'; the analysis of trends of researches for methodologies employed; identified appraisers for evaluating teachers; and researches describing processes of evaluation in India and overseas.

Teachers exercise the highest position in Indian social ladder and the NPE 1986 devotes a section on "The Teacher":

"The status of the teacher reflects the socio-cultural ethos of a society; it is said that no people can rise above the level of its teachers. The government and the community should endeavour to create conditions that will help motivate and inspire teachers on constructive and creative lines. Teachers should have the freedom to innovate, and to devise appropriate methods of communication and activities relevant to the needs, capabilities and concerns of the community." The policy again states "Systems for teachers' evaluation – open, participative

and data based – will be created and reasonable opportunities of promotion to higher grades provided. Norms of accountability will be laid down with incentives for good performance and disincentives for non-performance. Teachers will continue to play a crucial role in the formulation and implementation of educational programmes.” (National Policy on Education 1986 (with modification undertaken in 1992), MHRD, GOI, 1992, part IX, pages 43-44).

Origin of the Research Problem

"The destiny of India is being shaped in her classrooms" remarked Education Commission in 1966. The shape, undoubtedly, will depend on what goes on in the classrooms and how does it go on? It can be concluded that quality of teaching will be determined by quality of teacher behaviour featuring in the classrooms. The quality of teacher behaviour on the other hand depends upon the competencies of teachers who are well equipped with the necessary skills in designing and handling the classroom interactions. The Education Commission (1966) also says, "Of all different factors which influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality, competence and character of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant". Indian educational system keeps high esteem for educators and thrives on unquestionable faith on educators since time immemorial; however, 'Teacher Appraisal' has been practiced and well researched in Euro-American campuses from long since. The evaluation of teachers has gone through three historical stages. In 1920s, the concern was primarily whether a given teaching style correlated with the philosophy and psychology of William James and John Dewey. In 1940s and 1950s, certain personality traits were related to excellence in teaching. The 1960s saw the development of the final stage, emphasized teaching behaviours. The last five years have ushered in a dramatic change in evaluation procedures. The traditional concept of teacher evaluation that has been replaced by the broader concept of appraisal management or performance management, in which the employee is evaluated in terms of how much certain pre-established objectives have been achieved. A significant aspect of this process is measuring an employee's performance against job responsibilities as outlined in a job description. The reasons for establishing and implementing an appraisal process for all institution district employees include: to foster self-development, identify staff- development needs, improve employee performance, determine if an employee should be retained and what his and her salary increase should be, and help in the proper placement or promotion of an employee.

Teacher Effectiveness

The evaluation of teacher starts with the fundamental question of: Evaluation of what? Thus evaluation of teachers starts with the measurement of 'Teacher Effectiveness'. As defined by El- Haji (2010) that teacher effectiveness is an amalgamation of both cognitive and non-cognitive attributes like academic qualification and distinctions, clarity of thought and expression, fluency, teaching strategy, charisma, experience and socio-personal interactions. Campbell, Kyriakides, Muijs & Robinson (2003) reports that there is the narrowness of the operational definition of effectiveness, usually restricted to the teacher's classroom instructional behaviour and its association with pupil cognitive outcomes. Clearly effective instruction is a major dimension of teaching, but the work of teachers is substantially broader than classroom performance. Teaching in modern societies has been analysed by a variety of supra-governmental agencies (e.g. OECD, 1990; ILO, 1991). These show that under modernising tendencies and as societies become more secular Under these trends the role of teachers is expected to be broad; affective, moral and welfare in orientation as well as cognitive. A model of teacher effectiveness might therefore be required to incorporate measures of effectiveness across these different roles

rather than as now be limited to aspects of the cognitive. Despite reservations about the underlying consequences of such a shift in terms of control and workforce flexibility (Merson, 2000), an evaluation of teacher effectiveness concentrating exclusively on the teacher's ability to instruct classes directly, looks inappropriately narrow, if not anachronistic. There is the problem of generic effectiveness and differential effectiveness. Much of the earlier research, and the policies for teacher appraisal that claim to be connected to it, have tended to identify a general set of characteristics that define the effective teacher; they provide a profile of teacher behaviour, knowledge and beliefs assumed to be generic, irrespective of age of pupil, ability of pupil groups, social and organisational context, or even the subject being taught. Effective teaching was thereby constructed as a Platonic ideal, free of contextual realities. With a focus on social class, American research has drawn attention to the different behaviours or characteristics needed for effectiveness in different contexts. Borich (1996) concluded that different classroom behaviour in low and high social class contexts were needed for teachers to be effective. Thus any model of teacher effectiveness needs to incorporate what Hopkins and Reynolds (2001) call 'context specificity'.

Interdisciplinary Relevance

Globalization has created a fenceless society which means coexisting and collaborating harmoniously. This has imposed serious challenges in front of Indian educational system that we cannot remain aloof from rest of the world. Thus, the challenges raised by globalization of educational process would mean integration of new sources of information to the needs of the different socio-cultural groups and to keep pace with the world market. In this regard, teacher is the key figure in the educational process, be it a teacher of Science, Arts or professional courses. They are architects of the nation. A teacher has to be sensitized to understand the changing role of education, identification and characteristics of values, their relevance and suitability in the present day context. Sensitization has to be in social, economic and industrial context. He must understand what the benefit of cooperation and community spirit is. Need for accountability of teacher is recognized by every committee responsible for quality education that can be in the streams of engineering, arts, humanities, medicine and sciences. The development of the appraisal system is definitely important when we are living in and approaching towards WTO regime. Its importance can be understood by its relevance with sociological, psychological and political scenario with the dilution in the teaching profession. Let, in-service and prospective teachers should understand that this is not the dumping ground for those who could not make out in administrative services, medicine and engineering. Rather, it is like any other as well as very special profession where quality has to be delivered with emotions. So, it is felt necessary that educator's role should be accountable.

History of Teacher Appraisal Researches in Overseas Campuses

Indian educational system keeps high esteem for educators and thrives on unquestionable faith on educators since time immemorial, however, 'Teacher Appraisal' has been practiced and well researched in Euro-American campuses from long since. The evaluation of teachers has gone through three historical stages. In 1920s, the concern was primarily whether a given teaching style correlated with the philosophy and psychology of William James and John Dewey. In 1940s and 1950s, certain personality traits were related to excellence in teaching. The 1960s saw the development of the final stage, emphasized teaching behaviours. The last five years have ushered in a dramatic change in evaluation procedures. The traditional concept of teacher evaluation that has been replaced by the broader concept of appraisal management or performance management, in which the

employee is evaluated in terms of how much certain pre-established objectives have been achieved. A significant aspect of this process is measuring an employee's performance against job responsibilities as outlined in a job description. The reasons for establishing and implementing an appraisal process for all institution district employees include: to foster self-development, identify staff- development needs, improve employee performance, determine if an employee should be retained and what his and her salary increase should be, and help in the proper placement or promotion of an employee. The disclosure of Campbell, Kyriakides, Muijs & Robinson (2003) says that over the last 70 years, researchers, especially in the USA, the Netherlands and the UK, systematically investigate teacher effectiveness using pupil learning outcomes as the significant indicator of effectiveness. This further constructs a four-phase, largely chronological, loose classification of studies using the principal criteria being investigated in the researches,

- I. Presage-product model (1930s-1940s): in which the psychological characteristics of teachers were identified and investigated for their effect on learning. The characteristics included personality (e.g., authoritarianism) attitudes and experience (Rosenshine & Furst, 1973; Borich, 1996).
- II. Experimental studies (1940s-1960s): in which the effects of different teaching styles upon learning were investigated (Medley, 1979). The styles included rather vaguely formulated polarities such as formal and informal, progressive and traditional, open and closed.
- III. Process-product model (1960s-1980s): in which the behaviour of teachers in classrooms, such as the quantity of instruction-focused interactions, and the pacing of instruction, was the focus of investigations into factors influencing pupil attainment and progress (Everston et al., 1980; Brophy & Good, 1986; Doyle, 1986; Galton, 1987).
- IV. Teacher knowledge and beliefs model (1990s-present): in which teachers' subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge (Fennema & Loef-Franke, 1992), and their beliefs such as self-efficacy or expectations (Dempo & Gibson, 1985; Anderson et al., 1988; Askew et al., 1997) were investigated to explore the relationship between these factors and pupil attainment and progress.

While narrating the short history of evaluation of University teachers, Casey, Gentile & Bigger (1997) sketches, in recent times, teaching quality has been duly acknowledged by the Australian Government via its Department of Education, Employment and Training which published a paper on performance indicators in higher education (DEET, 1991; Lindsay 1992; Bowtell 1994) and also by the Higher Education Council which published a guide to achieving quality in higher education (NBEET 1992). Furthermore, the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC) released a document which sets certain guidelines for effective university teaching (AVCC, 1993). Teacher appraisal or evaluation schemes have become popular in recent years, and there are many reasons why this is so. There is strong Australian government pressure to introduce procedures for regular appraisal of academic staff, while tertiary institutions are embracing appraisal as a tool for ensuring effective and efficient use of staffing resources. Nevertheless, the Australian experience has not been particularly successful, possibly because of an emphasis on efficiency and links to external rewards and sanctions.

The Teacher appraisal practice in Higher education institutes of **United Arab Emirates** is due to huge influx of academic staffs who are expatriates from English- speaking countries such as Britain, Ireland, USA, Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand , employed on fixed term (Mercer, 2005). Hence, appraisers and appraisees are both from the countries where 'Teacher appraisal' is prevalent and are working temporarily within the institutions located in an Arab- Islamic state. Mercer (2005) cites the examples of Al Fanar and Rihab

University. At both sites, supervisors watch faculty teaching lessons and provide written feedback at least once a year, and usually once a semester. The feedback forms contain a list of statements and against each one, the supervisor writes a number from one to five, and then adds comments. Supplementing this, student evaluations are sought every semester, using an on-line questionnaire with a Likert scale. Element of self-evaluation, focussing on teaching philosophy, at Rihab and on goal –setting, at Al Fanar. The primary purpose of appraisal in UAE higher education is to ensure certain standards of performance are maintained. The article argues that the purpose is fulfilled with ease because institutions have the money to attract more teachers than they need, and the legal right to dismiss anyone for any reason.

Teaching is more than the formal transmission of expert, disciplined knowledge: it is both an invitation to, and a support for, independent critical learning by both the student and the teacher. For developing an appraisal process, a board of experts should establish a policy on employee appraisal that will give direction to the various divisions to the within the site of Higher Education. These divisions are responsible for developing objectives aimed at implementing the goals of the institution board. Each employee is then responsible for developing personal objectives that further the divisional objectives. Feedback data are then available to analyse if divisional objectives have been reached. The actual appraisal procedures for implementing this process are best developed by involving representatives of the employees who will be evaluated (Rebore, 1985). Stronge (2006) argues: why does teacher evaluation matter? Because teaching matters: “Without capable, high quality teachers in America’s classrooms, no educational reform effort can possibly succeed” (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). And the response is: “without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers” (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). Teacher evaluation is, first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountability for their work. Teacher appraisal in **Singapore** is done by Heads of Departments as their reporting officers and the Vice Principals or Principals are the counter-signing officers. Using appraisal ratings on teachers' teaching skills (skills in curriculum planning and implementation, pedagogy, and assessment) by their principals as a reference criterion, these ratings are compared with those of the teachers' self-ratings which are based on their perceptions of their own teaching skills (Lee & Goh, 2010). Maiwada (2001) presses the view that the inability of stakeholders in education to evaluate the standard of classroom teaching has contributed to the falling standard of education in **Nigeria**. Students are stakeholders in education. Haefele (1992) and Darling-Hammond, Wise and Peace (1983) state that there are really many questions about the reliability, validity and utility of student evaluation of teachers, especially when they are for personnel decision and other summative purposes. Whether the situation in **Nigerian Universities** is the same as other parts of the world is also part of the concern of this study. Isiaka (1998) shows that lecturers in selected Colleges of Education in Ghana and Kenya accepted found out that teachers in most American Colleges are disposed to student evaluation. The lecturers' acceptance cuts across gender (males and females). Isiaka's work emphasises the use of student evaluation for formative purposes only. In his study, teachers' opinions were not dependent on gender, but on seniority (teaching experience), as more experienced lecturers were found to show more preference for student rating of teaching effectiveness than their junior counterparts.

Teacher Appraisal in India

The University Grants Commission in India being the determining agency for standard of higher education does not shy away from its initiatives for quality education. . In this regard, developing appropriate 'accountability measures for teachers' which ensure positive actions as professionals and towards beneficiaries of the education system has been suggested as an important action by every committee appointed to review quality of education. For example, in 1971, the S.R. Sen Committee while recommending higher pay scales also added the need for a code of conduct (Professional ethics). Pay scales were revised but code of conduct proposals could not be implemented. Emphasizing the need for teacher accountability in India, the Rastogi Pay committee instituted by the University Grant Commission (UGC) and Mehrotra committee (1987) stress student appraisal of teachers: however, when the revisions were implemented teacher appraisal was very much in the background. The National Policy of Education, NPE (1986) observed a comprehensive open participatory database system of teacher evaluation. It included self, peers, heads of institutions/departments, *students* and others in the process. All the recommendations of policy report were implement except evaluation of teachers by pupils and peers. In December 1988, the University Grants Commission (India) issues a notification regarding 'Accountability in Higher Education' for all the Universities that Self Appraisal Performance of the teachers is to be made mandatory as a requirement of Career Advancement Scheme(CAS) for the award of new pay scales and be implemented within a year. Self- evaluation is carried out in a prescribed format before every periodic and time bound promotion which give determines the number of classes taken, dissertation supervised, paper published, projects taken, Honours, patent, membership in academic bodies, seminar- conferences- workshop attended, etc. This system is seem to be effective for University teachers and may provide a model for institution-based teacher appraisal.

The committees which also recommend student evaluation of teachers (SET) as an integral part of appraisal system are Prof. Amrik Singh Committee, Ashok Mitra Education commission during early 1990s and recent 'Perspective Plan' by Higher Education Commission of West Bengal. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) of India, established by University Grants Commission in 1994 to initiate quality management procedure, has made the institution of higher education to introduce student evaluation of teachers as one of the criteria for assessing teaching quality. The guidelines given by NAAC for Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) questionnaire for collecting feedback from students in structured way. Teacher evaluation by the Principal of the institution has become ritual which is performed at the end of every academic session in private and public institutions, however, there is very little evidence of the impact on improvements in teacher performance. Similarly, the Technical Education Quality Improvement Programme (TEQIP) of the Government of India (consequent to implementation of reforms derived from National Policy of Education - 1986 as revised in 1992) included establishing the practices of student evaluation of teachers' performance. Again this has become a ritual and often just before the visit of the accreditation agency a hurried student evaluation is taken in the prescribed format. National Knowledge Commission (2006) submitted its report to Ministry of Human Resource and Development (India) mentioning mentioned-Measures taken to evaluate a teacher's performance and to promote the effectiveness of his/her teaching merit. Chadda Commission (2008) constituted for UGC's Pay Review Committee recommends for multiple parameters. The outcomes of this commission have just been implemented for salary revision, but again there has been complete silence on teacher appraisal systems. In 2008 again, UGC' s latest Pay Review Committee headed by Prof. G K Chaddha recommended "Multiple parameters like regularity in class room teaching, holding tutorials, availability to

students for consultations, participating in faculty meetings, guiding and carrying out research and participating in other academic activities like seminars etc. should be taken in to consideration while assessing a teachers academic accountability”. The recent Sixth Pay Commssion (2006) also emphasises upon ‘Teacher Appraisal’ and attempts to introduce ‘Academic Performance Indicator (API)’. The Academic Performance Indicator (API) and corresponding Weightage Points (WP) would develop Performance Appraisal Scoring System (PASS) for University and College teachers to decide upon the maintenance of standards, Career Advancement and appointments. A due berth of 150 Weightage Points have given to teaching related activities which includes allocation of teaching classes, tutorials/seminars, up to date teaching material and methods, development of new curricula and courses and examination methods. These enlisted activities are to be based upon faculty attendance, self evaluation and PASS which would be designed and conducted by University/College. This Performance Appraisal Scoring System does not mention even once about the points assigned for quality of teaching in the classroom. Ironically, these are the activities which are designed outside the classroom and fetch points to the teachers, hardly knowing how well teachers are executing within the classroom. The Sixth Pay commission has also mentioned about ‘Student Evaluation of Teachers’ to be procedure for teacher assessment. This leaves the questions: what are the criteria across which teachers will be evaluated? How would the outcome of the evaluation be utilised? Should evaluation design be different for different level of education? The question for differential evaluation structure for different levels of education arises there different nature of duties for primary, secondary/post secondary and college/ university teachers.

The National Knowledge Commission(2006 –09), Government of India in its full Report to the nation also clearly mentioned-Measures taken to evaluate a teacher’s performance and to promote the effectiveness of his/her teaching merit the attention of all concerned. Feedback information is intended to broadly serve the following purposes (i)To enable the teacher to know his/her strengths and deficiencies and use feedback information to improve his teaching and (ii)To give to the Head of the Department and the authorities of the Institute an indication of what the students feel about the performance of the faculty member as a teacher. It further added that in spite of inherent deficiencies, the exercise of student feedback and evaluation is an important and necessary one.

Teacher Appraisal Processes

For developing an appraisal process , a board of experts should establish a policy on employee appraisal that will give direction to the various divisions to the within a institution district. These divisions are responsible for developing objectives aimed at implementing the goals of the institution board. Each employee is then responsible for developing personal objectives that further the divisional objectives. Feedback data are then available to analyse if divisional objectives have been reached. The actual appraisal procedures for implementing this process are best developed by involving representatives of the employees who will be evaluated (Rebore, 1985). Stronge (2006) argues: why does teacher evaluation matter? Because teaching matters: “Without capable, high quality teachers in America’s classrooms, no educational reform effort can possibly succeed” (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). And the response is: “without high quality evaluation systems, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers” (Stronge & Tucker, 2003). Teacher evaluation is, first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountability for their work.

A conceptually sound and properly implemented evaluation system for teachers (and, indeed, for all educators) is a vital component for successful reform efforts. "A rational relationship exists between personnel and programs: If program effectiveness is important and if personnel are necessary for effective programming, then a conceptually sound and properly implemented evaluation system for ... education personnel are essential" (Stronge, 1993). Teacher evaluation is, first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountable for their work. "In recent years, as the field of education has moved toward a stronger focus on accountability and on careful analysis of variables affecting educational outcomes, the teacher has proven time and again to be the most influential institution-related force in student achievement" (Stronge, 2002, p. viii). The potential questions which should be the foundation of a successful 'Teacher Appraisal' are:

- Why is there a need for quality teacher evaluation?
- What are the basic purposes of a teacher evaluation system?
- What are obstacles to quality teacher evaluation systems?
- What are key features of an effective teacher evaluation system?
- How can a teacher evaluation system be designed for institution improvement and personal growth?
- How can self-reflection and feedback improve teaching?

To achieve a high quality teacher assessment and evaluation system built upon a dynamic balance between institution and teacher improvement, several key features are essential. Among these important concepts and criteria are mutually beneficial goals, emphasis on systematic communication, climate for evaluation, technical sound evaluation systems, and use of multiple data sources (Stronge, 2006). The Goals and Roles evaluation model reflects two phases with six distinct steps in the evaluation process:

Development Phase

Step 1: Identify System Needs

Each institution has specific needs that relate to its mission and that are met through the collective performance of all personnel (e.g., principal, classroom teachers, resource specialists, counsellors). A systematic examination of the needs of the of higher education institution constituents will help clarify its mission and purpose.

Step 2: Identify Teacher Roles and Responsibilities

Accurate and appropriate descriptions of the teacher's roles and responsibilities can be developed only from clear statements of institutions or district goals and philosophies. Once goals of educational institutions are determined, then it is only sensible to relate program expectations to position expectations. Typical areas of responsibility might include: instructional planning and delivery, assessment, management, and professionalism. These areas of responsibility can serve as a framework for the categorization of more specific responsibilities (or "duties")

Step 3: Set Performance Standards

Setting standards involves determining a level of acceptable performance. It also may entail determining performance that exceeds acceptable expectations. Because of institution needs, available resources, the purpose of a specific position, and a variety of other factors, standards of performance may vary from organization to organization. Although operational definitions for standards may vary from organization to organization, they must be standard and consistently implemented within the academia or district of educational institution in order to ensure fairness and legal defensibility.

Implementation Phase*Step 4: Document Job Performance*

Documentation is the process of recording sufficient information about the teacher's performance to support ongoing evaluation and to justify any personnel decisions based on the evaluation.

Step 5: Evaluate Performance

Evaluation is the process of comparing an individual teacher's documented job performance with the previously established roles and responsibilities and acceptable performance standards.

By providing feedback throughout the evaluation cycle, the teacher is supported in his/her ongoing efforts to fulfil performance expectations and is able to identify areas of performance that need attention while there is still time to improve.

Step 6: Improve/Maintain Professional Service

With an emphasis in the evaluation process on both improvement (i.e., formative) and accountability (i.e., summative) purposes, the Step brings the Goals and Roles Evaluation process full circle. Formative aspects of evaluation, intended to provide recognition for noteworthy performance, along with immediate and intermediate feedback for performance improvement and correction where needed, should be ongoing throughout the evaluation process and are implicit in this model.

Thus the process involves the developing a system where teachers themselves take part in appraisal. It is required that appraisers should know the purpose and importance of teacher appraisal so that it should not be done casually or becomes mere a formality to complete. It should be decided over what are the components across which teacher is appraised and how frequently the process should take place. Items should be selected carefully which should sample the need and criteria of appraisal.

Purpose of Teacher Appraisal

Appraisal has two fundamental purposes: an institutional purpose of staff appraisal is to assist in decision making about staff (promotion, tenure, dismissal) in order to improve the performance of the institution. For individuals, appraisal is about assisting individuals to make decisions about themselves and their work; to improve performance, for staff development, career development. Lonsdale et al. (1988) in their major review on academic staff appraisal in Australian higher education summarised many aspects of appraisal, including purposes and underlying principles which should govern appraisal. In particular, on the question of appraisal and the motivation of academic staff it has been suggested that an understanding of relationships between individual performance, motivation and appraisal is essential in the design of appraisal procedures.

Moreover, Casey, Gentile & Bigger (1997) states the numerous reasons for evaluating teaching and include: to diagnose and improve the course or teaching performance; to aid in personnel decisions regarding retention, promotion, tenure and salary adjustments; to help students choose courses; and to provide criteria for research on teaching itself. It is important to distinguish among the reasons, because decisions about sources of information, ways of collecting and presenting information, and the central focus of the evaluation will all depend on why the evaluation is being undertaken. Stronge (2006) appeals that teacher evaluation can and should be considered a vital part of the total improvement-restructuring efforts in education. Improvement can take numerous forms, including:

- I. improvement in performance of individual teachers, and other educators (administrators, support personnel);

- II. improvement of programs and services to students, parents, and community; and
- III. Improvement of the institution's ability to accomplish its mission.

There is room in teacher evaluation systems for both accountability and performance improvement purposes. In fact, evaluation systems that include both accountability and personal growth dimensions are both desirable and necessary for evaluation to productively serve the needs of individual teachers and the University and community at large. Performance improvement and accountability purposes are not competing, but supportive interests - dual interests that are essential for improvement of educational service delivery. These two roles are inextricably intertwined in the total evaluation process (Stronge, 1995). This conception of teacher evaluation ties evaluation not only to teacher improvement but also to University improvement. Thus, a comprehensive teacher evaluation system should be rooted in two broad purposes:

- I. It should be *accountability-oriented*, contributing to the personal goals of the teacher and to the mission of the program, the institution, and the total educational organization, and should provide a fair measure of accountability of performance (i.e., summative focus).
- II. It should be *improvement-oriented*, contributing to the personal and professional development needs of the individual [teacher] as well as improvement within the institution (i.e., formative focus). (Stronge, Helm, & Tucker, 1995)

Professional dialogue and collaboration are a critical part of the appraisal process and an essential part of a healthy institution culture. Experienced teachers can benefit from a constructive appraisal process that reflects their needs for growth and development, and in which both the teacher and the principal take an active role.

Instrument for Teacher Appraisal

The teacher evaluation system should be based on three core instruments: classroom observation, self-evaluation and the documentation of practices in a simplified portfolio. Teacher evaluation, both developmental and for career progression, should be firmly rooted in classroom observation, since this is where the key dimensions of teaching take place. Therefore, we concur with the Portuguese system in underlining the role of classroom observation. But there is a need to develop guidelines for observations. Again there could be a role for the Scientific Council for Teacher Evaluation and the Inspectorate in developing these guidelines. "Value-added" models have the potential to identify the contribution an individual teacher made to a student's achievement, but they would require a major additional investment in large scale national-level student testing across levels of education and subjects and would take years to develop. The task now for Portugal is to develop a road map and timeline for making adjustments to strengthen teacher evaluation to capitalise and consolidate the expertise already developed within the institutions, and manage the transition process towards a more robust model for career progression that has high credibility with teachers, parents and the general public.

The local education authorities (LEA) approach in UK to training was based to a certain extent on the model put forward by a range of writers on staff development, but encapsulated in the basic model put forward by Bollington et al (1990).

Evaluation Strategies employed:

- experienced classroom observation,
- completed a self-appraisal form,
- had appraisal discussion between teachers and Staff Development Committee (SDC)

Obstacles to Quality Teacher Evaluation

Major obstacle to effective teacher evaluation systems can be the influence of politics in educational settings. The process is described as both emotionally laden and politically challenging (Stronge & Tucker, 1999). The stakeholders involved in the development of the new evaluation system must buy in to the new system.

In a study of the evaluation practices in the 100 largest institution districts, the groups involved in the process represented both external and internal stakeholders (Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1996). Groups included business leaders, state department of education staff, central office staff, educational institution site administrators, teachers, teacher organization representatives, parents, and students. "These stakeholders often have conflicting expectations regarding what is good practice and effective reform and, yet, the input and support of these groups is an important aspect of gaining political support for a new evaluation system" (Stronge & Tucker, 1999). Thus, appraisal should not be used as abuse against teachers and penalising them.

Failures of Educational Reform

Experience in the UK, USA and Australia (McNaught and Anwyl 1992) with appraisal systems suggests that appraisal schemes can degenerate into worthless routines and rituals, particularly when adequate time, training and budgeting for follow-up actions are not associated with such programs.

Too often, educational reform has produced disappointing results (Clark & Astuto, 1994) or outright failure (Pogrow, 1996). Fullan (1996) noted that one of the reasons for failure of systemic reforms is fragmentation: "Fragmentation occurs when the pressures - and even the opportunities - for reform work at cross purposes or seem disjointed and incoherent" (p.420). Other reasons for the failure of systemic reforms are that reform efforts are implemented too quickly, from too many directions, and without regard as to how the reform effort and the subsequent changes will affect teachers (Bascia & Hargreaves, 2000). Thus, reform efforts fail. One example of cross purposes, disjointed, and incoherent reform that is played out in institutions on a regular basis is as follows: 1) change institution policy for a given innovative teacher program, 2) provide some level of staff development on the prospective innovation, 3) ostensibly implement the innovative practice, and 4) continue to use existing evaluation practices. When reform efforts are disconnected from assessment, there is no way to measure success in the reform effort. Such a disconnect is a formula for failure.

A conceptually sound and properly implemented evaluation system for teachers (and, indeed, for all educators) is a vital component for successful reform efforts. "A rational relationship exists between personnel and programs: If program effectiveness is important and if personnel are necessary for effective programming, then a conceptually sound and properly implemented evaluation system for ... education personnel are essential" (Stronge, 1993, p. 445).

Teacher evaluation can and should be considered a vital part of the total improvement-restructuring efforts in education.

Improvement can take numerous forms, including:

- improvement in performance of individual teachers, and other educators (administrators, support personnel);
- improvement of programs and services to students, parents, and community; and
- improvement of the institution's ability to accomplish its mission.

Fostering improvement in teacher evaluation systems means balancing individual and institutional demands. Little (1993) stated that "the language of reform underestimates the intricate ways in which individual and institutional lives are interwoven" (p. 147) As Fullan (1991) noted, "Combining individual and institutional

development has its tensions, but the message ... should be abundantly clear. You cannot have one without the other" (p. 349). In order to accomplish personal and professional goals, the individual needs the institution. In order to accomplish organizational goals, the institution needs the individual.

Performance improvement and accountability purposes are not competing, but supportive interests - dual interests that are essential for improvement of educational service delivery. These two roles are inextricably intertwined in the total evaluation process. Moreover, a conceptual framework for [teacher] evaluation should emphasize the dynamic relationship between individual and institution where the needs and interests of one fuse with and support the other. (Stronge, 1995, p. 13).

McGreal (1988) argued that multiple purposes of evaluation can be met successfully with a single evaluation system when the system is viewed as one component of a larger mission - furthering the goals for the educational institutions. This conception of teacher evaluation ties evaluation not only to teacher improvement but also to institution improvement. Thus, a comprehensive teacher evaluation system should be rooted in two broad purposes:

- It should be *accountability-oriented*, contributing to the personal goals of the teacher and to the mission of the program, the institution, and the total educational organization, and should provide a fair measure of accountability of performance (i.e., summative focus).
- It should be *improvement-oriented*, contributing to the personal and professional development needs of the individual [teacher] as well as improvement within the institution (i.e., formative focus). (Stronge, Helm, & Tucker, 1996).

Discussion on Technically Sound Evaluation Systems

While a conceptually sound and technically correct teacher evaluation system will not guarantee effective evaluation, one that is technically flawed and irrational most assuredly will guarantee failure. Evaluation systems that are conceptually and technically sound promote the likelihood of achieving desirable outcomes such as those described in the guiding assumptions of the Personnel Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988) which is created in 1975, the Joint Committee is a coalition of major professional associations concerned with the quality of evaluation. The Joint Committee is housed at the Center for Evaluation and Assessment, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA. :

- to provide effective service to students and society;
- to establish personnel evaluation practices that are constructive and free of unnecessary threatening or demoralizing characteristics; and
- to facilitate planning for sound professional development experiences.
- Technically sound evaluation systems enjoy the benefits of the four basic standards espoused in the Personnel Evaluation Standards:
 - *propriety* (i.e., legally and ethically acceptable)
 - *utility* (i.e., useful, informative, timely, and influential)
 - *feasibility* (i.e., efficient, viable in the context of the organization, and relatively easy to use), and
 - *accuracy* (i.e., valid and reliable).

Proper use of the Standards can provide assurances of quality control to stakeholders and can support improvement in the overall personnel evaluation process (Stufflebeam & Brethower, 1987; Stufflebeam & Sanders, 1990). Major sources for teacher evaluation include:

- Observation (observation of teachers, e.g., formal classroom/work setting observation, ongoing anecdotal observation of performance, *and* observation of student work);
- Client feedback (i.e., client interviews or surveys for students, parents, subordinates, and peers);
- Student performance data (i.e., student achievement);
- Portfolios (e.g., actual materials and reflections on performance logs, case notes, lesson plans); and
- Self evaluation (i.e., self reflection and analysis of performance).

The need of the day and over emphasis on expansion of Higher education in India calls for quality education where teacher plays an important role. The society and academics in India engage in debate for last couple of decades whether the teachers in Universities should be evaluated or not. In spite of several recommendations, Indian Universities are still struggling for implementation of 'Teacher appraisal'. The success of 'Teacher appraisal' lies on the fact that assessment has to be done on 'Teacher' as profession rather than Teacher as person. The success of the "appraisal" lies on the premise that the process aims to give opportunity for professional improvement to teachers and also provides empirical base to make evident their effectiveness when challenged. The teacher appraisal in Higher education should not be with the spirit of "Hire and Fire" to create a vicious circle to penalise teachers. To sum up, a scientifically developed 'teacher Appraisal' would always promote delivery of quality education during teaching-learning process.

References

- Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, (1993). Guidelines for Effective University Teaching, Canberra, Australia.
- Bascia, N. & Hargreaves, A. (2000). 'Teaching and leading on the sharp edge of change', in N. Bascia & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *The sharp edge of educational change, teaching, leading and the realities of reform*, pp. 3-26, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. & West, M. (1990) *An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal*. Access: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_2_119/ai_n28719343/pg_6/
- Borich, G.D. (1996). *Effective Teaching Methods*, 3rd edition (New York, Macmillan).
- Bowtell, C. (1994). 'Employers show renewed interest in staff appraisal', *Nexus* 2(4), Victoria University of Technology, October, pp. 4-5.
- Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, R.D., **Robinson, W.** (2003) 'Differential teacher effectiveness: towards a model for research development and teacher appraisal,' in Markea, G. G. and Papanikos, G. T. (eds) *Global Issues of Education Vol. 2*, (Athens: Athens Institute for Education and Research).
- Casey, R. J., Gentile, P. & Bigger, S. W. (1997). Teaching Appraisal in Higher Education: An Australian Perspective. *Higher Education*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Dec., 1997), pp. 459-482. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3448140>.
- Clark, D. L., and T. A. Astuto. (1994). "Redirecting Reform: Challenges to Popular Assumptions about Teachers and Students." *Phi Delta Kappan* 75: 513–520.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A.E. and Pease, S.R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in organisational context: A review of literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 285-328.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training (1991). *Performance Indicators in Higher Education*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, Australia.
- El-Hajji, M.A. (2010). Teachers' Demographic Characteristics, Attributes and Students' Cognitive Dimensions : A Correlation Analysis. *International Journal of Educational Administration*, Volume 2, Number 4, (2010), pp. 603-608. ISSN 0976-5883. Access: <http://www.ripublication.com/ijea.htm>
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's Worth Fighting for in Your School...?* New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991a). The meaning of educational change. In M. G. Fullan, *The new meaning of educational change* (pp. 30-46). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goh, J.W.P., Lee, O.K., & Hairon S. (2010). Self-rating and respondent anonymity. *Educational Research*. 52(3), 229-245

- Haefele, D.L. (1992). Evaluating teachers: An alternative model. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(1), 21-31.
- Hopkins, D. & Reynolds, D. (2001). The past, present and future of school improvement: towards the Third Age, *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 459-476.
- International Labour Organisation (ILO) (1991). *Teachers in developing countries: a survey of employment conditions*. Geneva: ILO.
- Isiaka, B.T. (1998). Teachers' perception of students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness. *Lagos Journal of Education*, (Special Edition), 6-11.
- Lindsay, A. (1992). 'Performance quality in higher education', *Australian University Review* 35(2), 32-35.
- Little, J.W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of education reform. "Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15," 129-151.
- Lonsdale, A., Dennis, N., Openshaw, D. and Mullins, G. (1988). *Academic Staff Appraisal in Australian Higher Education. Part I: Principles and Guidelines*, Canberra, Australia: Department of Employment, Education and Training, Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Loup, K.S., Garland, J.S., Ellett, C.D., & Rugutt, J.K. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 10(3), 203-226.
- Maiwada, D.A. (2001). Non-evaluation of lectures, bane of education. In *Nigerian University System News*, 10, (3) 12-15.
- McGreal, T. L. (1988). Evaluation for enhancing instruction: Linking teacher evaluation and staff development. In S. J. Stanley & W. J. Popham (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success*. (pp. 1-29). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McNaught, C. and Anwyl, I. (1992). 'Awards for teaching excellence at Australian universities', *Higher Education Review* 25(1), 31-44.
- Mercer, J. (2005). Challenging Appraisal Orthodoxies: Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal Perspective Evaluation Education*, 18:273–287. DOI 10.1007/s11092-007-9024-9.
- Merson, M.W. (2000) Teachers and the myth of moderisation, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48, 2, pp. 155-169.
- Mishra, R.C. (1999). Research on Education in India . *Prospects*, Volume 29, Number 3, 335-347, DOI: 10.1007/BF02736959
- National Board of Education Employment and Training, Higher Education Council (1992). *Higher Education: Achieving Quality*, Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- OECD .(1990). *The Teacher Today: tasks, conditions, policies* (Paris, OECD).
- Rebore, Ronald W. (1985). *Educational Administration : A Management Approach*. Prentice – Hall, IWC., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632.
- Stronge, J. H. (1993). Evaluating teachers and support personnel. In B. S. Billingsley (Ed.), *Program leadership for serving students with disabilities* (pp. 445-464).
- Stronge, J. H. (1995). Balancing individual and institutional goals in educational personnel evaluation: A conceptual framework. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 21, 131-151.
- Stronge, J. H., & Helm, V. M. (1990). Evaluating educational support personnel: A conceptual and legal framework. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 4, 145-156.
- Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Handbook on teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Stronge, J.H. & Tucker, P.D. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(4), 339-360.
- Stronge, J.H. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ISBN- 10: 1416604618
- Stronge, J.H. (2006). *Teacher Evaluation and School Improvement: Improving the Educational Landscape. Evaluating Teaching*, (Edition 2nd), Sage Research Methods Online, DOI:10.4135/9781412990202, Online ISBN: 9781412990202
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Brethower, D. M. (1987). Improving personnel evaluations through professional standards. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 125-155.