EFL Teacher Performance Evaluation in Iranian High Schools: Examining the Effectiveness of the Status quo and Setting the Groundwork for Developing an Alternative Model

Hossein Navidinia[1], Gholam Reza Kiani[2], Ramin Akbari[3], Reza Ghaffar Samar[4]

Abstract
Performance evaluation is one of the important components of each organization, and educational organizations are not the exceptions. Teachers are believed by many researchers as the single most important factor influencing student academic success or failure. Therefore, they need to be at the center of attempts to improve or reform the educational system of any country. Considering the pivotal role of teachers, educational systems need to be assured that teachers perform their best to enhance student learning, and also they should try to improve by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of teachers' practice for further professional development. The present study tries to examine the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system in Iran from EFL teachers' perspectives. For that matter, a survey consisting of both Likert-scaled and open-ended questions was developed based on theoretical underpinnings of purposes for teacher evaluation, experts' views, and the purposes of foreign language education as stated by the National Curriculum. 423 English language teachers were asked to answer the questions included in the survey. The results indicated the current teacher evaluation system did not contribute to teacher professional development nor could it assure teacher accountability. The results of the study as well as the

1. PhD Student, Department of ELT, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Department of ELT, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, rezakiany_gh@modares.ac.ir.
3. Associate Professor, Department of ELT, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
4. Associate Professor, Department of ELT, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

requirements for developing an alternative model for EFL teacher evaluation are discussed.

Keywords: Educational Evaluation; Teacher Performance Evaluation; EFL Teachers; EFL Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Evaluation Models.

1. Introduction

One of "the most oft-expressed statements about teaching is that nothing is more central to student learning than the quality of teacher" (Galluzzo, 2005: 142). Marshall (2009) refers to a number of studies (Fergusson & Ladd, 1996; Sander & Rivers, 1996; Haycock, 1998; Rivkin, Hanuschek, & Kain, 2005; Whitehurst, 2002; Hattie, 2002; Rice, 2003; Nye, Hedges, & Konstantopolos, 2004; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2007) showing that "the quality of instruction is the single most important factor in student achievement" (p. xiv). Furthermore, according to Sanders and Horn (1998), "the teacher effects on student achievement have been found to be additive and cumulative with little evidence that subsequent

effective teachers can offset the effects of ineffective ones" (cited in Rushton, Morgan, and Richard , 2007, p. 32). Similarly, Mendro (1998) claims that "the least effective teachers have a long-term influence on student achievement that is not fully remediated for up to three years" (cited in Stronge and Tucker, 2000:3).

According to Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) "teachers are professionals most directly responsible for helping all students to learn, and students benefit or suffer from the quality of the teaching they receive" (p. 82). In language teaching context, referring to a number of studies, Freeman and Johnson (1998) put the importance of language teachers in this way: "lagging behind by almost a decade,

language teacher education has begun to recognize that teachers, apart from the method or materials they may use, are central to understanding and improving English language teaching" (p. 402). Overall, it seems that there is a general consensus among researchers that among other factors influencing students' achievement, teachers have more pivotal role and, therefore, they "are at the core of attempts to expand, improve, and reform the education system of any country" (Shohel and Banks, 2010: 5483).

Considering what was said about the importance of teachers, the importance of teacher evaluation cannot be understated. "Educational evaluation, assessment and accountability systems are considered increasingly important in many countries in an effort to increase educational achievement, quality and equality" (Kellaghan,

2008 cited in Taut, Santelices, Araya, and Manzi, 2010: 477). Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) put the importance of teacher evaluation in this way: "any society is at risk when its schools fail to educate its children and youth"; therefore, "clearly, effective teaching must be assured; and the teaching profession, school boards, school administrators, and school faculties must recognize that teacher evaluation is a key means of providing that assurance" (p. 82).

Also, it has been claimed that teacher evaluation if built on a foundation of cultural values that reflect mutual respect among administrators, teachers and students can be a vehicle for improving instruction and, subsequently, student learning (Rosenholtz, 1991). According to Lam (2001), "to have effective teaching cadre, we cannot rely solely on pre-service training programs or recruitment mechanism.

In an era of knowledge explosion, teachers must keep up with the over changing society with continuous learning and adaptation" (p.161). Therefore, staff development for teachers is an important component of quality education, and staff appraisal is another essential mechanism to "ensure teachers' competence and conscientiousness" (Lam, 2001: 161).

Now, while many studies have shown the importance of teachers and the necessity of teacher evaluation for quality assurance and its potential contribution to teacher professional development and consequently student learning, evidence for the effectiveness of current EFL teacher evaluation system in Iran is lacking. In fact, despite the effort made, no study could be found that addressed this topic in Iranian EFL context. Furthermore, compared with other ELT issues, it seems that teacher evaluation has not been adequately addressed by the researchers

worldwide. According to Murdock (2000), in ELT programs around the world the main focus has been on issues such as material development and curriculum reform and "teacher evaluation matters are often perceived to be of secondary importance, and as a result, tend to be poorly developed in many institutions" (p. 54). To fulfill such a need, this study tries to address the notion of ELT teacher evaluation in Iranian context by examining the effectiveness of the current teacher evaluation system from EFL teachers' perspectives and shedding light on the requirements for developing an assessment procedure for EFL teachers. After a brief review of the purposes of teacher evaluation, we will elaborate on the methodology and discuss the results.

Purposes of Teachers' Evaluation

The teacher evaluation has got two main important purposes: On the one hand, "it is aimed at ensuring that

teachers perform at their best to enhance student learning" (summative), and on the other hand "it seeks to improve the teacher own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development" (Isore, 2009: 6).

Summative teacher evaluation is for making decisions such as promoting the effective teachers and dismissing the ineffective ones. Stronge and Tucker (2003) emphasized the necessity of such a quality assurance mechanism by saying that "[t]he accountability purpose reflects a commitment to the important professional goals of competence and quality performance. This accountability function (…) relates to judging the effectiveness of educational services" (cited in Isore, 2009: 6).

Apart from accountability and quality assurance purposes, teacher evaluation can be conducted in order to improve teacher performance.

Formative teacher evaluation refers to "a qualitative appraisal on the teacher current practice, aimed at identifying strengths and weaknesses and providing adequate professional development opportunities for the areas in need of improvement" (Isore, 2009: 7). According to Stronge and Tucker (2003), the performance improvement purpose of teacher evaluation is related "to the personal growth dimension and involves helping teachers learn about, reflect on, and improve their practice. This improvement function generally is considered formative in nature and suggests the need for continuous professional growth and development" (Isore, 2009: 7).

Reviewing a number of teacher evaluation models, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) believe that many of them implicitly or explicitly emphasize the improvement of instruction. They further observe that "almost all teacher evaluation

systems adopted (or adapted) by school districts have a strong component of teacher professional development" (p. 173).

According to Isore (2009), the results of teacher formative assessment can help schools and other institutions in charge of professional development programs to adapt their program according to teachers' needs. Besides, these results can be helpful and beneficial for institutions in charge of teacher education in order to change or reexamine their programs to train and educate teachers more efficiently.

Beare (1989) believes that the followings are the common purposes of teacher assessment:

- Assessment of the teacher for professional development.
- Assessment to determine the teacher's fitness for promotion.
- Assessment of the teacher to improve the school.

- Assessment to satisfy accountability requirements.
- Assessment of the teacher's performance in order to improve learning outcomes (p. 12).

According to Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984), teacher evaluation and supervision may serve four basic purposes: "individual staff development, school improvement, individual personnel decisions, and school status decisions. The first two purposes involve improvement; and the second two accountability" (p. v). They also believe that for accountability purposes, "teacher evaluation processes must be capable of yielding fairly objective, standardized, and extremely defensible information about teacher performance", and for the purposes of improvement, "evaluation processes must yield descriptive information that illuminates sources

of difficulty, as well as viable courses for change" (p. v).

While many researchers believe that teacher accountability and professional development are the two main purposes of teacher evaluation, there is disagreement regarding the extent to which each of these purposes should be emphasized in an evaluation system. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) there need to be an 80/20 quality rules in teacher evaluation: "when more than 20 percent of supervisory time and money is expended in evaluation for quality control or less than 80 percent of supervisory time and money is spent in professional development, quality schooling suffers" (p. 221). Scriven (1989) does not agree with this idea. He believes that between the two purposes of teacher evaluation i.e. summative and formative, "the primary one is the summative one;

the icing on the cake is the formative one" (p. 1).

Although the purposes of summative and formative aspects of teacher evaluation are often seem to be conflicting, in practice, "countries rarely use a pure form of teacher evaluation model but rather a unique combination that integrates multiple purposes and methodologies" (Stronge and Tucker, 2003 cited in Isore, 2009, p. 8). In fact, an effective teacher evaluation needs to have multiple purposes. If a system overemphasizes control and accountability, it will neglect professional development, and if it takes professional development as its main concern, then, it may not be comprehensive enough to make sure that minimum standards are being met.

2. Methodology

2.1. Survey Development

A survey consisting of both Likert-scaled and open-ended questions

was developed based on the theoretical underpinnings of purposes for teacher evaluation extracted from the relevant literature, experts' views, and the purposes of foreign language education as stated by the National Curriculum.

The first section of the survey initially included 16 questions. These questions asked the participants to mark their perceptions regarding the current teacher evaluation system and the importance of each item to be included in an ideal system of teacher evaluation on a continuous scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. The second section of the survey initially included 4 Likert-scaled questions about some issues regarding the current teacher evaluation such as standards, principals' competency to evaluate English language teacher performance, and teachers'

satisfaction with the current teacher evaluation system. The third section asked teachers to rate the extent they believe the current teacher evaluation system can make them more effective teachers so that they can contribute more to the realization of the objectives of foreign language education as stated by the National Curriculum. This part initially included 4 questions. Furthermore, in order to obtain a deeper understanding of teachers' answers to Likert-scaled questions, the last section included 2 open ended questions.

The survey was studied by 25 university professors and post graduate students (for content validation); and based on their feedback and a pre-administration to 30 teachers, the wording of some questions were changed. Also from section 1, two items were believed to overlap with others and therefore they were deleted from this part.

Based on the feedback of the readers, 1 question was added to section 2 and one to section 3. 1 open ended question was also added to the last section, accordingly.

2.2. Participants

The survey described above was administered to a sample of 490 English language teachers (teaching in Iranian public schools), among them 451 ones responded. However, due to large number of unanswered items or predictable patterns in answering (such as all As or Bs etc), 28 surveys were discarded. Hence, 423 surveys were included in the analyses. From the final 423 respondents whose answers were included in this study, 238 (56.3) were male and 185 (43.7) were female. As regards the age of the participants, 118 (27.9) ones fell in the range of 20-29, 223 (52.7) respondents were in the range of 30-39, 78 (18.4) respondents fell in the

range of 40-49 and only 4 (.9) people fell in the range of 50-60. In terms of educational academic degree, 12 (2.8) respondents hold associate degree, 344 (81.3) ones had bachelor degree, 66 (15.6) teachers had master degree and 1 (.2) respondent had PhD. As regards the teaching experience of the participants, 35 (8.3) had 1-2 years experience of teaching, 51 (12.1) ones had 3-4 years teaching experience and 337 (79.7) respondents had 5 or more than 5 years teaching experience.

The official permission for gathering data was obtained. The hard copies of the survey were distributed among the participants, or emailed alternatively. Participants' answers to the Likert-scaled questions were analyzed using SPSS. The content of open ended answers was also analyzed and the important features were extracted. The results of both types of questions will be presented

in the following section.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Section One

As described in the previous section, the survey (the Cronbach's alpha coefficient=0.85) was consisted of 4 different sections. The first part included 14 questions. These questions asked the participants to mark their perceptions regarding the current teacher evaluation system and the importance of each item to be included in an ideal system of teacher evaluation.

It seems that there is a consensus in the literature among the researchers that the purposes of teacher evaluation should be teacher professional development and teacher accountability (or quality assurance) (Danielson, 2001; Danielson and McGreal, 2000; Duke and Stiggins, 1990; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1993; Stiggins and Duke, 1988; Wolf, 1996). The same questions regarding

the purposes of teacher evaluation were asked from 25 EFL experts. Their answers were in line with the related literature. Accordingly, the first part of the survey was consisted of 14 items. The seven odd questions were related to teacher professional development purpose of teacher evaluation and the seven even ones were about teacher accountability.

The following 7 items are related to teacher professional development:

Teacher evaluation:

1. *Provides constructive feedback for teachers.*
2. *Improves teachers' practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses of their performance.*
3. *Emphasizes the professional growth of teachers.*
4. *Improves teachers' motivation.*
5. *Provides a process that allows and encourages evaluators and teachers to work together to improve and enhance classroom*

instruction.

6. *Causes and improves teacher reflection.*

7. *Improves teachers' teaching efficacy.*

Participants were asked to mark their perceptions about these statements regarding the current teacher evaluation system in Iran and also to determine the importance of each item to be included in an ideal system of teacher evaluation on a continuous scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

Table 1 shows teachers' perceptions regarding the contribution of the current teacher evaluation to their professional development. As indicated in this table, the means of all of these items (1 to 7), on average, are below two. This means that the teachers, in aggregate, either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the current teacher evaluation could contribute to their professional development.

Table 1 Teachers' Perceptions Regarding the Contribution of Current Evaluation System to Professional Development

Statistics

Questions	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7
N Valid	423	423	423	423	423	423	423
Mean	1.79	1.71	1.83	1.81	1.85	1.91	1.80
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 2 shows teachers' answers regarding the importance of including these items in an ideal EFL teacher evaluation system. As

indicated in this table, the means for all items is above 4. This means that, overall, the participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the inclusion

of these items in an ideal model of   teacher evaluation.

Table 2 Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Importance of Inclusion of Professional Development Items in an Ideal System of Teacher Evaluation

Statistics

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7
N Valid	423	423	423	423	423	423	423
Mean	4.46	4.35	4.44	4.40	4.14	4.25	4.18
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

The paired sample t-test conducted in order to compare the responses of the participants to these 7 items in current and ideal forms. As table 3 shows, there is a significant difference (*p<.005*) between teachers' perceptions regarding the current system of teacher evaluation and an ideal model as regards teacher professional development.

Table 3 Paired Sample t-test of Differences between Perception of Teachers regarding Current and Ideal Status of Evaluation

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences							
		Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean			Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 — Sumc pd. – sum ideal pd	-1.75	6.22	.30	-18.11	-16.92	-57.84	422	.000

The 7 even questions (included in the first section of the survey) were related to the accountability purpose of teacher evaluation. The related items were as follows:

Teacher evaluation:

1. Provides data for retention and dismissal decisions.

2. Contributes to student achievement.

3. *Assures the community that teachers are competent.*

4. *Provides data for teacher promotion.*

5. *Provides documentation for inappropriate teacher behavior.*

6. *Informs stakeholders (parents, students, principals etc) of teacher performance.*

7. *Provides data for salary decisions.*

Participants were asked to mark their perceptions about these statements regarding the current teacher evaluation system in Iran and also to determine their importance to be included in an ideal system of teacher evaluation from 1 to 5- (strongly disagree (1), disagree (2),

undecided (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5)).

Table 4 shows teachers' perceptions regarding the extent to which the current teacher evaluation system can provide appropriate data for accountability purposes. As indicated in this table, the means of 5 items (1, 2, 3, 6, and7), on average, are below two. This means that the participants, in aggregate, either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the current teacher evaluation could provide appropriate data for accountability purposes. The means of items 4 and 5 are still below 2.5 which means that participants, in general, do not agree with these items.

Table 4 Teachers' perceptions regarding the quality assurance capability of current teacher evaluation system

Statistics

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7
N Valid	423	423	423	423	423	423	423
Mean	1.88	1.94	1.85	2.09	2.48	1.99	1.83
Minimum							
Maximum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 5 shows teachers' answers regarding the importance of including teacher accountability items in an ideal EFL teacher evaluation system. As indicated in this table, the means for four items (2, 3, 4, and 6) are above 4. This means that, overall, the participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the inclusion of these elements in an ideal model of teacher evaluation. The means for the other three items (1, 5, and 7) are still high enough to claim that the participants agree with the importance of the inclusion of these items in an ideal model of teacher evaluation.

Table 5 Teachers' Perceptions Regarding the Importance of Inclusion of Teacher Accountability Items in an Ideal EFL Teacher Evaluation System

Statistics

		Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7
N	Valid	423	423	423	423	423	423	423
	Mean	3.82	4.07	4.15	4.19	3.68	4.02	3.65
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

The paired sample t-test conducted to compare the responses of the participants to these 7 items in current and ideal forms. As table 6 shows, the difference between the teachers' perceptions of the current and ideal forms is significant (*p<.005)*.

Table 6 Paired Sample t-test of Differences between Perception of Teachers Regarding the Current and Ideal Status of Teacher Evaluation about Accountability

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Sum current accountability – sum ideal accountability	-1.34	6.11	.29	-14.07	-12.90	-45.37	422	.000

Furthermore, comparing the responses of participants to all 14 items (for both purposes) regarding the status quo of teacher evaluation and the ideal model (as perceived by the participants) shows a significant difference (*p<.005*, see table 7).

Table 7 Paired Sample t-test of Differences between the Perception of Teachers Regarding the Current and Ideal Status of Teacher Evaluation **Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Sum current – sum ideal	-3.10	11.23	.54	-32.08	-29.93	-56.79	422	.000

3.2. Section Two

In the second section of the survey, first, EFL teachers were asked whether school principals have the competency and expertise to evaluate EFL teacher performance. It turned out that a large number of participants (90.3 %) believed that school principals did not have enough expertise to evaluate EFL

teacher performance (see table 8). In open ended questions, teachers maintained that EFL teacher evaluator(s) needed to know English language and had some familiarity with the methods of language

teaching while almost no school principals had this knowledge.

Table 8 EFL Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Principals' Competency and Expertise to Evaluate their Performance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	283	66.9	66.9	66.9
	2	99	23.4	23.4	90.3
	3	16	3.8	3.8	94.1
	4	14	3.3	3.3	97.4
	5	11	2.6	2.6	100.0
	Total	423	100.0	100.0	

Then, teachers were asked about their perceptions regarding the current standards for teacher evaluation. The following three items were raised:

1. *Current standards for EFL teacher evaluation can distinguish between qualified and unqualified teachers.*

2. *Current standards for EFL teacher evaluation helps teachers improve their practice by*

identifying the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching.

3. *Current standards for EFL teacher evaluation improve teacher motivation for teaching more efficiently.*

Teachers were asked to rate these items from 1 to 5-(strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5)). As indicated in table 9, the means for all of these items are below 2. This

means that, overall the participants either disagreed or strongly

disagreed with these items.

Table 9 Teachers' Perceptions about Current Teacher Evaluation Standards

Statistics

		item1	Item 2	Item 3
N	Valid	423	423	423
	Mean	1.77	1.65	1.70
	Minimum	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5

Finally, teachers were asked if they were satisfied with the current teacher evaluation system. As

indicated in Table 10, a large percentage of them (89.8) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this item.

Table 10 Teachers' Satisfaction with Current Teacher Evaluation System

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	298	70.4	70.4	70.4
	2	82	19.4	19.4	89.8
	3	14	3.3	3.3	93.1
	4	19	4.5	4.5	97.6
	5	10	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	423	100.0	100.0	

3.3. Section Three

For this part, first, the related section of the National Curriculum was studied and the implicit and explicit purposes of foreign language education in Iran were extracted. Teachers, then, were asked to

determine to what extent the current teacher evaluation system could help them to fulfill these purposes. Here are the items:

Current teacher evaluation system:

1. Helps EFL teachers improve the communicative skills of students.

43

2. *Helps EFL teachers to teach language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) more efficiently.*
3. *Helps EFL teachers teach students how to read and comprehend general and subject-specific texts.*
4. *Helps EFL teachers teach students how to write an essay in English.*
5. *Helps EFL teachers make students more aware of Iranian cultural values and beliefs.*

Teachers rated these items on a continuous scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. As indicated in table 11, the means of all of these items, on average, are below two. This means that the participants, in aggregate, either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the current teacher evaluation could help them actualize more efficiently the purposes of foreign language education as stated in the National Curriculum.

Table 11 Teachers' Perceptions Regarding the Contribution of the Current Teacher Evaluation System to the Actualization of Purposes of Foreign Language Education as Stated in National Curriculum

Statistics

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5
N Valid	423	423	423	423	423
Mean	1.79	1.74	1.93	1.58	1.98
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5

3.4 Section Four

In this section, teachers were asked 3 open ended questions. These questions were included in the survey in order to obtain a deeper understanding of teachers'

perceptions regarding teacher evaluation. The open ended questions were as follows:

1. *How teacher evaluation is practiced in your school?*

1.1. *Who evaluates EFL teacher performance at your school?*

1.2. *How often teachers are evaluated in your school?*

2. *What aspect(s) of teacher evaluation in your school would you most like to see changed or eliminated? Why?*

3. *What aspect(s) of teacher evaluation in your school would you most like to see continued? Why?*

The general themes extracted from teachers' responses are as follows:

1. Teacher evaluation process "does not exist". Many teachers maintained that there was no such thing as a real teacher evaluation system in their schools. What exists is actually a form that

should be completed "very subjectively" by the school principals once a year.

2. The assigned score is not based on the evaluation of teacher performance in the classroom using method(s) of teacher evaluation such as classroom observation and the like, but mostly based on the "subjective impressions" of school principals. Also, the assigned score is sometimes influenced by "the teacher's personal relationship with the school principal".

3. "The whole procedure for evaluating teachers should be changed" and "it would be more effective if an evaluation procedure is developed just for EFL teachers".

4. Conclusion

Education does matter. It is incumbent upon each society to

educate its children and prepare them for living in this globally competitive world. Among other factors influencing student learning, teachers are believed to be the single most important ones. Therefore, teacher does matter too. At the same time teachers are professionals who should be accountable for their performance and assure other stakeholders that they do their best. Being professional also means that teachers need to be lifelong learners and update their knowledge. That being said, we come to the third concept that does matter which is teacher evaluation, because, if developed and implemented appropriately, it can satisfy the quest for both quality assurance and teacher professional development. Therefore, it is not surprising that Bears (1989) maintains that "[n]o professional educator in his or her right mind would advocate that there should be no teacher assessment" (p.

10). He further says that "[t]eacher assessment will always be needed; any enterprise or activity needs assessment, review, and constant searching for better practices; any professional operator needs that kind of informed feedback too" (p. 10).

The results of this study indicated that the current EFL teacher evaluation in Iran is perceived by EFL teachers to be ineffective and useless. Also, in other educational contexts, current teacher evaluation methods have been criticized by many scholars for being not effective and having little contribution to instructional improvement (McGreal, 1983; Prybylo, 1998; Peterson, 2000; Aseltinet, Faryniarz, and Rigazio-Digilio 2006; Toch and Rothman, 2008).

Although most scholars agree that the purposes of teacher evaluation are accountability and professional development (Danielson, 2001;

46

Danielson and McGreal, 2000; Duke and Stiggins, 1990; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1993; Stiggins and Duke, 1988; Wolf, 1996), McLaughlin (1990) and Walen and DeRose (1993) believe that the teacher evaluation systems employed in most school districts accomplish neither of these purposes. According to Aseltine, Faryniaarz, and Rigazio-Digilio (2006), the traditional methods of teacher evaluation rarely help teachers make a link between their professional growth and student learning needs. The paradox of teacher evaluation according to Stiggins and Duke (1988) is that "it holds the potential to help nearly every teacher improve, yet in actual practice, it helps almost no one" (p. 1).

Apart from the criticisms raised against teacher evaluation in the mainstream education, in ELT contexts, it has been a neglected issue. Murdoch (2000) criticized the status quo of teacher evaluation in English language teaching context, maintaining that in many ELT programs around the world lots of "time and resources are regularly spent on such vital activities as revising curricula and teaching materials, ensuring that the evaluation of students' progress keeps pace with course developments; providing opportunities for professional development, and introducing new technology"; however, "teacher evaluation matters are often perceived to be of secondary importance, and as a result, tend to be poorly developed in many institutions" (p. 54). In many ELT contexts, systematic teacher evaluation has been hardly existed, and when "exists at all, it is based largely on irregular observations conducted by an over-burdened director of studies or senior teacher who does not have sufficient time to prepare for, and follow up on, classroom visits"

(Murdoch, 2000:54). Therefore, in ELT contexts, according to Murdoch (2000) there is a "pressing need" for accounts of the fully-developed teacher evaluation system (p. 55).

Now, the important and tricky question is how an alternative model for EFL teacher evaluation can be developed. The question is a tricky one, mainly because there is no consensus among researchers and experts regarding the definitions of quality teaching. Furthermore, since teaching is a cultural activity, conception of teacher quality has shifted its concerns and values during the time (Mitchell, Robinson, Plake, and Knowles, 2001). According to Kennedy (2010), the language used to describe good teaching has been changed overtime. At the beginning of the twentieth century, influenced by industrial efficiency as a famous and fashionable concept, school administrators sought efficient

teachers. Then, they searched for teachers who were "virtuous" and not "neurotic". Later on, teacher competencies became fashionable and administrators searched for teachers who had specific competencies. Toward the end of the century the focus changed from teacher competencies to teacher professionalism and expertise, and today teachers are needed to meet the prespecified standards.

That being said, it does not mean that the complexities involved in developing an evaluation model for EFL teachers are limited to the definition of quality teaching, because there are many other factors that should be taken into consideration. Overall, to us, the first step for developing an evaluation model for EFL teachers is trying to determine the requirements for developing such a system. One of the requirements is to understand the current views regarding EFL

teachers, including but not limited to issues such as EFL teacher quality, teacher effectiveness, teacher learning, teacher cognition, teacher knowledge-base, teacher professional development and change, etc. Teacher evaluation needs to be informed of the new understandings and developments regarding all of these concepts.

For instance, in his paper entitled: "In search of the essence of a good teacher: towards a more holistic approach in teacher education", Korthagen (2004) believe that many different levels including the teaching *environment*, teacher *behavior*, *competencies*, *beliefs*, *identity* and *mission* influence teachers' functions and performance. Therefore, teacher evaluation should go beyond assessing what teachers do in the classroom (teacher behavior) and try to understand why they do that. Any feedback without this deep

understanding may be superficial and does not contribute to teacher professional development.

Another requirement is to know about different models of teacher evaluation, their strengths and shortcomings, and the way that they have been practiced in different contexts. Different models and methods including but not limited to *clinical supervision*, *differentiated supervision*, *value-added models*, *self-evaluation*, *peer review*, *teacher portfolio*, *student evaluation of teaching*, *survey of parents*, and *360-degree feedback* have been used to evaluate teacher performance. It is beyond the space of this article to explain the advantages and shortcomings of these methods, however, any attempt for developing a new model for teacher evaluation should be started with a critical analysis of these models and the way that they have been practiced in different contexts.

Still another requirement is to be aware of the views of different stakeholders, and the implications and requirements of the national documents for developing an alternative teacher evaluation model. Considering all of these requirements, of course, developing such a model is a very tricky undertaking, but taking into account the importance of teacher evaluation, it is imperative to be done.

References

[1] Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-Digilio, A. J., (2006). *Supervision for Learning*. Alexandria, VA. : Association for Curriculum Development.

[2] Beare, H., (1989). The Australian Policy Context. In Lokan, J., and McKenzie, Ph. (Ed.) Teacher *Appraisal Issues and Approaches.* Austrailian Council for Educational Research.

[3] Danielson, C., (2001). New Trends in Teacher Evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 12–15.

[4] Danielson, C. and McGreal, T., (2000). *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Alexandria, Virginia.

[5] Duke, D.L., & Stiggins, R.J., (1990). Beyond Minimum Competence: Evaluation for Professional Development. In Millman, J., and Darling-Hammond L., (ed.), *Handbook for the Evaluation of Elementary and Secondary Teachers*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[6] Freeman, D., and Johnson, K., E., (1998). Reconceptualizing the Knowledge-base of Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 337-417.

[7] Galluzzo, G., (2005). Performance Assessment and Renewing Teacher Education: The Possibilities of NBPTS Standards. *The Clearing House*, 78, 142-145.

[8] Kennedy, M. M., (2010). Approaches to Annual Performance Assessment. In Kennedy, M. M., (ed.) *Teacher Assessment and the Quest for Teacher Qquality a Handbook*. The American Association of Colleges for teacher Education.

[9] Korthagen, F.A.J., (2004). In Search of the Essence of a Good Teacher: Towards a More Holistic Approach in Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Educatio*n, 20, 77-79.

[10] Isoré, M., (2009). Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and a Literature Review. *OECD Education Working Paper* No. 23. Complete document available on OLIS in its original format.

[11] Lam, S., (2001). Educators' Opinion on Classroom Observation as a Practice of Staff Development and Appraisal. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 161-173.

[12] Marshall, K., (2009). *Rethinking Teacher Evaluation and Supervision how to Work Smart, Build Collaboration, and Close the Achievement Ggap*. Published by Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

[13] McGreal, T., (1983). *Successful Teacher Evaluation*. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[14] McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). Embracing Contraries: Implementing and Sustaining Teacher Evaluation. In Millman, J., and Darling-Hammond L. (Ed.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

[15] Michell, K.J., Robinson, D. Z., Plake, B.S., Knowles, K.T., (2001). *Testing Teacher Candidates the Role of Licensure Tests in Improving Teacher Quality.* National Academy Press. Washington.

[16] Murdoch, G. (2000). Introducing a Teacher-supportive Evaluation System. *ELT Journal*, 54, 54-64.

[17] Peterson, K. D., (2000). *Teacher Evaluation: A Comprehensive Guide to New Directions and Practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

[18] Prybylo, D., (1998). Beyond a Positivistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 558-583.

[19] Rosenholtz, S. J., (1991). *Teacher's Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

[20] Rushton, S., Morgan, J. and Richard, M. (2007). Teacher's Myers-Briggs Personality Profiles: Identifying Effective Teacher Personality Traits. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 432-441.

[21] Scriven, M., (1989). The State of the

Art in Teacher Evaluation. In Lokan, J., and McKenzie, Ph. (ed.) *Teacher Appraisal Issues and Approaches*. Austrailian Council for Educational Research.

[22] Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R., (1993). *Supervision: A Redefinition*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

[23] Shinkfield, A. J., and Stufflebeam, D., (1995). *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Boston/Dordrecht/London.

[24] Shohel, M. & Banks, F., (2010). Teachers' Professional Development through the English in Action Secondary Teaching and Learning program in Bangladesh: Experience from the UCEP Schools. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 5483-5494.

[25] Stiggins, R. J., & Duke, D. L. (1988). *The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth: Research on Teacher Eevaluation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

[26] Stronge J. H., and Tucker P. D., (2000). *Teacher evaluation and student achievement*. National Education Association of the United States.

[27] Taut, S., Santelices, V., Araya, C., and Manzi, J., (2010). Theory Underlying National Teacher Evaluation Program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33, 477-486.

[28] Toch, T., & Rothman, R., (2008). Rush to Judgment: Teacher Evaluation in Public Education. *Education Sector Reports*, 1-27.

[29] Walen, E., & DeRose, M., (1993). The Power of Peer Appraisals. *Educational Leadership*, 51, 45-48.

[30] Wise A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., and Bernstein, H, T., (1984). Teacher Evaluation a Study of Effective Practices. Prepared for the National Institute of Education. Published by the Rand Corporation.

[33] Wolf, K., (1996). Developing Effective Tteaching Portfolio. *Educational Leadership*, 53, 34-37.

ارزشیابی عملکرد معلمان زبان انگلیسی در دبیرستان‌های ایران: ارزیابی موثر بودن وضعیت موجود و زمینه‌سازی برای طراحی مدلی جایگزین

حسین نویدی نیا[1]، غلامرضا کیانی[2]، رامین اکبری[3]، رضا غفار ثمر[4]،

ارزشیابی عملکرد یکی از مهمترین ارکان هر سازمانی بوده و سازمانهای آموزشی نیز از این امر مستثنی نیستند. از میان اجزای مختلف نظام آموزشی به گفته بسیاری از محققان مهمترین عامل در تعیین موفقیت و یا عدم موفقیت دانش آموزان معلم کلاس می باشد. فلذا معلمان باید در مرکز تلاش هایی باشند که برای توسعه و اصلاح سیستم های آموزشی در سراسر دنیا صورت می گیرند. با توجه به نقش محوری معلمان، سیستم های آموزشی لازم است که اطمینان حاصل کنند که معلمان نهایت تلاششان را برای افزایش یادگیری دانش آموزان صورت می دهند و همچنین تلاش کنند تا با شناخت بهتر نقاط ضعف و قوت عملکرد معلمان زمینه را برای توسعه حرفه ای آنها فراهم کنند. تحقیق حاضر در صدد است تا نظر معلمان زبان انگلیسی در مورد موثر بودن سیستم ارزشیابی موجود را با توجه به اهداف و انتظارات متصور از سیستم ارزشیابی معلمان مورد بررسی قرار دهد. بدین منظور پرسشنامه‌ای بر اساس مبانی نظری موجود در مورد اهداف ارزشیابی معلمان، نظر خبرگان، و اهداف تعیین شده برای آموزش زبانهای خارجی در برنامه درسی ملی تهیه گردید.   از ٤۲۳ معلم زبان انگلیسی خواسته شد تا به این پرسشنامه جواب بدهند. نتایج نشان داد که معلمان معتقدند سیستم ارزشیابی موجود کمکی به توسعه حرفه ای آنها نکرده و همچنین نمی تواند اطلاعاتی را در مورد تضمین کیفیت تدریس معلمان بدست آورد. نتایج تحقیق و ملزومات طراحی مدلی جایگزین برای ارزشیابی عملکرد معلمان زبان انگلیسی مورد بحث قرار گرفته‌اند.

واژگان کلیدی: ارزشیابی آموزشی، ارزشیابی عملکرد معلمان، معلمان زبان انگلیسی، ارزشیابی **معلمان** زبان انگلیسی، مدلهای ارزشیابی معلمان.

۱. دانشجوی دکتری، آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس.

۲. دانشیار، گروه آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس.

۳. دانشیار، گروه آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس.

٤. دانشیار، گروه آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس.