

## Teacher Performance Evaluation System in a Private School: A Case Study

**Muhammet Emin TÜRKOĞLU<sup>1</sup>**

Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey

**Ahmet AYPAY<sup>2</sup>**

Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey

### Abstract

The purpose of this research was to reveal how the performance evaluations of teachers in a private school were made and the results of those evaluations. The research was designed as a case study, which is one of the qualitative research methods. The research was carried out in the 2013-2014 academic year. The participants of this research were 15 teachers, 3 administrators, 6 students and 4 parents. The data were obtained through semi-structured interviews. Findings revealed that the performance evaluation of the teachers were based on the surveys from students, school administrators and parents, general observations made by school administrators, course inspections and follow-up with digital cameras. In this context, teachers were awarded during the year and at the end of the year depending on their performance evaluation results. Participants also mentioned some positive and negative consequences of the performance evaluation in the school. The rewards given vary based on the performance of the teachers. The main rewards were as follows: salary increase, plaques and certificates with symbolic value, and contract renewal. On the other hand, teachers were punished due to their low performance. The consequences of the punishment were as follows: verbal or written warning penalties, low pay raise in salary, termination of some duties at the school and non-renewal of contract/dismissal.

**Keywords:** Performance evaluation, Accountability, Private school

**DOI:** 10.29329/epasr.2022.248.8

---

The data obtained from the 4th research question of the doctoral thesis titled *Teacher Accountability: Case Study in a Private School*, which was completed in 2015 under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Ahmet Aypay, was used in this article.

<sup>1</sup>Assist. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0003-3883-3414 **Correspondence:** mturkoglu@aku.edu.tr

<sup>2</sup>Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey, ORCID:0000-0003-0568-8409 Email: ahmetaypay@anadolu.edu.tr

## Introduction

Recent years have witnessed the effects of neoliberalism in education as in every field. This efficiency and market-based approach have brought with it different expectations at every level of education (Dahlstedt & Fejes, 2019; Espinoza, 2017; Press et al., 2018; Torrance, 2017). Accordingly, accountability in education and performance evaluation processes are becoming increasingly important in order to improve education and increase student success (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017; Flores & Derrington, 2017; Ehren & Perryman, 2018; Holloway et al., 2017; Hoy & Miskel, 2010; Kim, 2018; Ozga, 2013). Moreover, these processes occur in many educational institutions. Furthermore, evaluations in schools shows examples of efforts to establish strict performance and accountability standards to meet the high expectations of society in education (Fusarelli & Johnson, 2004).

On the other hand, efforts to set standards have paved the way for the private sector in many developing countries with the new public management approach (Cope et al., 1997; Çevikbaş, 2012; Hood, 1995). Since this approach is based on entrepreneurship and competition, it accelerated the development of private institutions (Kurt & Uğurlu, 2007). Therefore, supporting the private sector in increasing productivity has begun to be seen as an opportunity (Özer, 2005). Unsurprisingly, many sectors, including educational institutions, have started to evaluate the performance of employees in line with different corporate purposes (Cleveland et al., 1989).

For the first time in Turkey, transition to the performance evaluation system in the public sector was proposed with the Eighth Five-Year Development Plan. It is therefore clear that preparations for the transition to the performance evaluation system in schools have started and pilot studies have been initiated in some schools (Altun & Memişoğlu, 2008). The purpose of performance evaluation is shown as increasing the performance of the employees, ensuring efficiency and increasing the quality of the service provided (Yılmaz & Turan, 2019). As a matter of fact, increasing the quality of education is possible with effective planning of qualified human resources (Öztaş & Gürcüoğlu, 2018). In particular, performance evaluation in schools provides feedback on the educational decisions to be taken by the school administration and makes it easier to determine whether certain institutional standards have been reached (Çelebi et al., 2018; Erdağ & Karadağ, 2017).

It is obvious that the evaluation of teachers' performances in order to establish certain standards in schools contributes positively to teaching (Murray, 1997). Therefore, performance evaluation of teachers attracts the attention of education stakeholders all over the world (Flores & Derrington, 2017; Liu et al., 2016). In this context, private schools, which have to maintain entrepreneurship and competition, attach importance to improving the quality of their teachers (Ford et al., 2018). Since low teacher qualification is shown as the most important reason for low school

performance (Ingersoll & Collins, 2017), private schools want to perform the performance management of teachers in the best way. For this purpose, different methods are adopted to evaluate the quality of teachers in private schools and to ensure the development of teachers (Ford et al., 2018).

A sizeable literature on the performance evaluation of teachers in Turkey is mostly carried out by referring to the opinions of teachers and administrators in public schools (Altun & Memişoğlu, 2008; Bozan & Ekinci, 2017; Konan & Yılmaz, 2018; Topuz & Yılmaz, 2019). However, since the number of studies conducted in private schools is limited; it is recommended to focus on studies to be conducted in such schools (Sağbaş & Özkan, 2019). This study is important in terms of revealing the practices for performance evaluation of teachers in private schools where competition is quite high, and showing the performance evaluation processes. Explaining the details of teachers' performance evaluation will contribute to the field of educational administration. Therefore, this study examined how teachers' performance evaluations were made in a private school.

### **Private Schools in Turkey**

Education and training institutions that plan their own budgets and expenditures are called private schools (Uygun, 2003, p. 108). There are four different types of private schools operating in Turkey according to the Law on Private Education Institutions. These types of private schools are: (i) Schools opened by Turkish nationals (ii) Schools opened by foreigners (iii) Minority schools (iv) International private education institutions (Kulaksızoğlu et al., 1999). These private schools are established by locals or foreigners; and they provide education within the framework of legal regulations (Uygun, 2003). Private education institutions can be opened with the permission from the Ministry of National Education. The qualifications and conditions of the personnel who will work in these institutions must be the same as those working in the official schools of the Ministry of National Education. Private schools, with exceptions, apply the relevant curriculum of the Ministry of National Education (Kulaksızoğlu et al., 1999). The government encourages private schools at all levels of education. These schools are expected to meet the quality education expectations of the society by providing competition in education (Uygun, 2003, p. 107). According to the statistics of the Ministry of National Education for the 2019-2020 academic year, a total of 1,468,198 students receive education in 13870 private education institutions in Turkey; and 174,750 teachers work in these schools (MEB, 2020). Therefore, the burden of public education in education can be reduced by opening private schools. However, it is not surprising that private schools can set an example in increasing the quality of education with their innovative practices (Özdemir & Tüysüz, 2017). Since private schools choose their teachers, they may also prefer to employ teachers with master's and doctorate degrees. Moreover, when compared to public schools, private school students have a higher university admission rate (Erdoğan, 2002). However, such findings can be misleading where school effectiveness is not measured. The rapid change process in all areas of the world paves the way for

private schools due to their entrepreneurial structure. In this respect, there is a growing argument that private schools can be a solution to the schooling problem in Turkey (Parlar, 2006, pp. 18-19). It is clear that private schools need qualified teachers in order to be competitive. In private schools, different methods are adopted to evaluate the quality of teachers and to ensure the development of teachers (Ford et al., 2018). However, due to competition in private sector, measures should be taken regarding the occupational safety, working conditions, wages and social and psychological health of teachers in private schools (Çimen & Karadağ, 2020; Sever & Aypay, 2014).

### **Performance Evaluation of Teachers**

The radical changes experienced in the fields of economy, politics and culture in the world have led to an increase in social expectations in education (Nartgün & Kaya, 2016). These rapid changes have also led to the emergence of processes for ensuring accountability in education, school reforms and effectiveness in school (Şişman, 2011). This situation has caused formation of different performance evaluation systems. Therefore, demanding accountability in the private sector is closely related to meeting the expectations of stakeholders (Gaventa & McGee, 2013, p.2).

Since the 1980s, parents started to prefer private schools with the expectation of a better education (Açıklalın, 1989). The characteristics and qualifications of teachers in private schools are also cited as a reason for this demand (Hesapçioğlu & Nohutçu, 1999). As a striking example of this is that parents want their students to gain a good university in line with their high career expectations (Erdoğan, 2002). Private schools, which have to meet these demands, want their teachers to be highly motivated and expect them to provide qualified and high-quality education (Kocabaş & Karaköse, 2005). Accordingly, administrators working in private schools exhibit a higher level of leadership (Aslan & Ağiroğlu Bakır, 2014; Birekul, 2018) and take on more responsibilities (Karaköse & Kocabaş, 2006; Topçu, 2010).

The fact that the influence of the teacher on student learning is frequently emphasized in many international publications has increased the interest in teacher quality and evaluation (Paufler et al., 2020; Tuytens & Devos, 2017). Schools perform performance evaluation by making teachers accountable (Reinhorn et al., 2017). Evaluation of teacher performance is carried out to measure teacher quality and to support teachers' professional development (Ford et al., 2018; Lillejord et al., 2018; Looney, 2011; Su et al., 2017). For this reason, different tools and methods are used to evaluate teachers' performance and to measure how teachers contribute to student learning and success over time (Amrein-Beardsley & Holloway, 2019). Models and methods such as 360-degree feedback system (Kantos, 2013), school principals' observations (Grissom & Bartanen, 2019) and students' evaluations of teachers are frequently applied (Finefter-Rosenbluh, 2020; Moran, 2017). Indeed, it is argued that student learning can be facilitated when the necessary importance is given to

teacher performance evaluation by creating an environment of trust in the school (Donaldson & Firestone, 2021).

However, it is possible to see some implementations that are criticized in the evaluation of teacher performance in schools (Derrington & Campbell, 2018). It is known that school leaders spend a significant amount of time on teacher evaluation. While some of the school principals think that allocating this time for performance evaluation, observing and providing feedback to teachers is an important skill, most of them think that evaluating teachers' performance is a waste of time and hinders their work (Lavigne & Chamberlain, 2017). This supports the perception that the discretionary evaluation processes used by school principals in the evaluation process are made perfunctorily (Donaldson & Woulfin, 2018). In addition, in systems where teachers are evaluated according to the academic performance of their students, teachers' motivation decreases (Cuevas et al., 2018; Erichsen & Reynolds, 2020). For this reason, it is necessary to make alternative applications to uniform assessment methods based only on student results (Paufler et al., 2020). On the other hand, discussions have increased over the inadequacy of different teacher performance evaluation systems. Discussions continue that these assessments cannot distinguish qualified teachers (Steinberg & Kraft, 2017).

There are some other opposing views on this matter. These evaluations are criticized because they create resistance in schools and reflect very poorly the multifaceted work of teachers (Storey, 2002). Considering the reasons that lead to criticism of performance evaluation, they are based on quantitative measures rather than qualitative measures. Quantitative evaluations have a negative effect and affect motivation negatively (Kallio & Kallio, 2014). Teacher evaluation processes fall short of evaluating professional competencies and harm the professional identity of teachers (Bradford & Braaten, 2018). However, although the reasons such as job loss, termination of duty or salary cuts that may arise as a result of teachers' performance evaluation are criticized, contrary to what is thought, it is also shown as the primary motivation source in the professional development of teachers (Ford et al., 2017).

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

This research was designed as a case study, which is a qualitative research method. In order to examine how the performance evaluations of teachers in a private education institution are carried out, interviews were conducted with teachers, administrators, students and parents in the 2013-2014 academic year.

### **Study Group**

The participants of this research were 15 teachers, 3 administrators, 6 students and 4 parents. The purposeful selection of the participants includes the decision-making processes related to the sample in order to obtain more detailed information in the interviews (Cresswell, 2007; Neuman, 2010). Therefore, the researcher determined the participants according to certain criteria in the private high school where the research was conducted. People who met these criteria were asked whether they volunteered. Participants who voluntarily participated in the study were included. After the participants were given detailed information about the interview process, interviews were conducted.

### **Data Collection Tool**

Since a holistic analysis is made in case studies, several different data collection tools can be used. Therefore, interviews, observations and document analyzes are frequently used in case studies (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). Since this article was carried out within the framework of a single question of the doctoral study, especially the data obtained as a result of the interview was taken as a basis. A semi-structured interview was used within the scope of the research. Due to the complex nature of schools, case studies are preferred in many studies in the field of education (Merriam, 1998). In addition, case studies allow the researched subject to be examined in more detail (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). The interviews were held at the places and times that the participants deemed appropriate, after appointments were taken from the participants.

### **Data Analysis**

According to Yin (2009), researchers analyze data in line with the analysis strategies they have determined. Some of the techniques performed in the analysis process are as follows. (i) Arranging and sorting the data appropriately (ii) Sorting the data into appropriate categories (iii) Sorting the events within the scope of the research in a certain order. Within the scope of this research, firstly, the records obtained from the interviews with different participants were transcribed. Then, the answers given to each question were read and the important concepts were determined as codes. Then, codes were created by repeatedly reading the data in each main section. Categories were created from the generated codes and themes were revealed based on these categories. Finally, comments were made based on themes.

### **Reliability and Validity of the Data**

In this study, interviews were conducted with different stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents and students) in line with the processes stated by Yin (2009) regarding validity and reliability. Data obtained from different stakeholder participants were explained as supporting evidence for each other and descriptions were made. In addition, the opinion of a field expert on the comments of the interviews was sought.

## **Findings**

In this section, there are findings about the performance evaluation processes of teachers. Since the researcher was constantly observing within the institution, he also stated some relevant situations in the findings.

### **Findings on the Performance Evaluation Process**

When the participants were asked how the performance evaluation was made, it was seen that the participants first mentioned the surveys. When the interviews were examined, it was revealed that the teachers were evaluated at least once a semester through surveys. Thus, the stakeholders who answer the surveys score the questions asked about the teachers. With the average score of each teacher, the ranking of the teacher in the whole school is determined. This ranking is published on the school's official website. Different participants mentioned the following in their statements about the implementation of the surveys:

Teacher 12: "Performance evaluation is done by survey method separately in the 1st and 2nd semesters of the school."

Teacher 10: "There are surveys filled by parents and students. There are surveys that administrators fill out about teachers."

The explanations of Teacher 12 and Teacher 10 reveal when the surveys were conducted, and which stakeholders evaluated the teachers. On the other hand, in the statements of Teacher 9, it was pointed out that the surveys were administered over the internet. The statements of Student 1 and Parent 1 confirm the teachers' statements. Parents state that they were asked to make an evaluation on teachers. It is seen that the surveys to evaluate the performance of teachers are filled separately by parents, students and school administrators:

Teacher 9: "Surveys are being conducted. All the students answer the questions about us. They do this on internet-based programs. Scoring is done online."

Student 1: "For example, there are some forms on the internet; about teachers.... we can answer in the form. "

Parent 1: "At the end of the semester, they give us surveys. We evaluate teachers' performance. They can also call us on the phone to remind the surveys. So we do it. These provide an opportunity to evaluate the performance of teachers."

As a matter of fact, Administrator 1 also points out that teachers are scored quantitatively, drawing particular attention to scoring:

Administrator 1: “First, a survey is prepared for the students. Those surveys are opened to students. They evaluate between 0 and 100.”

Participants stated that their superiors in the hierarchy made general observations and evaluated teachers based on some criteria. It is understood that these general observations cover evaluations in different fields related to many criteria related to education. From the statements of the participants, it was seen that many factors that are both disruptive and positive were evaluated. Also, general evaluations play an important role in the formation of a general opinion on the renewal of teachers’ contracts, which is held at the end of the year. Different participants expressed this situation as follows:

Teacher 7: “So first of all, the coordinators evaluate the teachers. Those current performance criteria are evaluated there. The teacher's contributions to the group, teamwork are evaluated. Collaboration, the materials he/she applies in the classroom, that is, all events related to his/her own branch in a very broad sense are noted by the group coordinators.”

Teacher 9: “They try to take note of everything that happens. Of course, this is related to the point of view of the administrators. They then evaluate them on a person-to-person basis, evaluate what they have written rather than what they remember, according to the criteria set by our school. They make their decisions about whether they will work with the teacher the next year.”

Teacher 3: “The person who observes and follows us is either our coordinator, our assistant principals or the principal. Based on all quantitative data such as the duration of the smart board recordings, our classroom management, they reach a successful or unsuccessful conclusion about the teacher at the end of the year.”

Administrator 2: “We observe everything. The monthly reports to be submitted should be prepared on time. We observe how they communicate with our students’parents.”

Participants stated that another important pillar of the performance evaluation process is the supervision of teachers' lessons. It was stated that the course follow-ups were made especially by the department coordinator. From the statements of the participants, it is obvious that teachers’ file control was also carried out in addition to following the course. Therefore, a lot of importance is given to the students' development, such as the nature of the homework.

Teacher 10: “This is mostly done in the form of watching a lesson in certain periods, watching a lesson of each teacher.”

Teacher 4: “They come and watch our lessons from time to time..”



Teacher 1: “The coordinator monitors each of his/her teachers in this school; one or more times during the semester.”

Teacher 11: “The coordinator himself/herself can come to our lesson and be a guest.”

In the statements of the participants, it is understood that another method used from the performance evaluation of the teachers is tracking/monitoring with cameras. The recordings are made with the cameras with audio and video, and 24/7 digital monitoring is done. It has been revealed that especially when some positive or negative events about a teacher are received, camera recordings are watched in order to confirm this situation. Accordingly, it was also reflected in the statements that teachers were given feedback from time to time:

Teacher 4: “We have cameras in our classrooms. With the help of cameras, they watch you at any time.”

Teacher 11: “The lessons are followed by the cameras in the classroom that record audio and also record images. Feedback on these is given to us.”

Teacher 9: “Administrators make instant observations through the doors in the classroom, and they can observe all of our lessons moment by moment because there are cameras in our classrooms.”

Teacher 10: “But as I just said, if they want clarify or understand some certain things, the lessons of that teacher about a teacher can be watched a little more than others.”

Teacher 5: “While the monitoring in the classroom was taken with the camera before, now there is audio-video monitoring. Sometimes this is not enough. The coordinator can come to the lesson and watch you. They want to know how the classroom management is.”

Participants are also aware of the fact that teachers are being watched, and they think that living with this feeling is contrary to educational psychology.

Teacher 13: “For the last 2 years, our monitoring has been done in our buildings, especially with the camera system. We have both in our classrooms and in the corridors, in our rooms, everywhere. Because there are cameras everywhere.... We feel that the school is like someone is spying on us.”

It is clear from the statements that the evaluation of the performance of the participants at school has some positive results. Accordingly, it has been stated that teachers who get high scores or show high achievement in certain fields as a result of the evaluations made during the academic year are awarded; and these awards are given to the relevant teacher on some special days. The awards are

sometimes symbolic. Also, contract renewal at the end of the year is perceived as an important form of reward by the participants:

Teacher 10: “They give points to the teachers. Teachers who have high scores are awarded. We are private school. Contracts are made every year. If some evaluations about you are insufficient, this may be reflected in your raise rate.”

Teacher 9: “They give plaques and monetary awards on teacher's day to a few people”

Teacher 8: “On a teacher's day, plaques are given. Moreover, a reward is given if a teacher's project has received a degree in national competitions. If he/she has a degree in Turkey. ”

An administrator stated that awarding teachers based on performance evaluations increases motivation at school, and that this reward, even if it is symbolic, is meaningful as follows:

Administrator 2: “We are talking about the motivations of the teachers. Sometimes we take some of the meetings as an opportunity and present a document to our teachers in order to award the good activities they have done so far. Maybe, it is a certificate of achievement, but still it is important.”

Participants also mentioned some negative consequences of performance evaluation. They stated that teachers were frequently exposed to warnings during the evaluation process. According to this, coordinators of the departments intervene in the wrong behaviors of the teachers in the school. However, the process gains a new dimension with verbal and written warnings with the involvement of the principal and assistant principals in situations that persist despite reminders and are not corrected. These warnings are processed in TTS (Teacher tracking system). The warnings recorded in the TTS are considered together with other performance evaluation elements and affect the decision to be made about the teacher at the end of the academic year. As a result, it may cause teachers to receive a lower raise in the new contract, to be dismissed from some senior positions at the school. Also teachers can be fired by terminating their contract. It is seen that such situations are perceived as ordinary events in the routine of a private school.

Teacher 1: “For example, the teacher may have some inadequacies. He may have inadequacies in classroom management. First, guidance is given about what should be the right behavior. Then, they may warn you.”

Teacher 2: “During the academic year, from your coordinator, you get feedback. If there is something wrong, they warn you.”

Teacher 11: “For example, if there is a problem with your presentation on the smart board you are warned directly.”

Teacher 4: “They warn you. They remind your responsibilities if you fail to do them.”

Teacher 7: “So, if there is a problem, let's say the teacher hardly manages the classroom, administrators talk to the teacher and warn. ”

School administrators confirm the statements of many participants. It is stated that they warned teachers and these warnings are very common. When the statements are examined, it is understood that teachers with less professional seniority are exposed to more warnings. In addition, the contracts of inexperienced teachers are more terminated at the end of the year. On the other hand, these intense warnings may be related to many issues; from simple actions like coming to school a little bit late, to serious negligence of duty. This situation was reflected in the statements of the participants as follows:

Administrator 1: “If the mistakes continue, they will receive a warning. First He/she receives a verbal warning. If he/she continues to make mistakes despite the verbal warning, this time we give the envelope. Yellow envelope, which means you get a written warning.”

Teacher 9: “So they warn us. If they warn you several times, different measures can be taken.”

Teacher 6: “They warn us. Sometimes, we receive verbal or written warnings. They can give you a written warning when you come to school late. If you do not follow the rules as a result of the evaluation, you will be fired at the end of the year. These are ordinary things in private schools”

## **Discussion**

This study revealed how the performance evaluation of teachers in a private school was carried out. It was seen that the performance evaluation of teachers was made by (i) surveys applied to students, school administrators and parents (ii) observations made by school administrators in general (iii) course inspections and (iv) follow-up with digital cameras. In this section of the study, limitations, interpretations of the findings and conclusion are presented.

### **Limitations**

As it can be seen in some qualitative studies, a limitation of this research was the small sample size. This study was conducted only in one private school so the findings cannot be generalised across all schools in Turkey. Moreover, it is very hard to gain access to data since teacher performance evaluations are not carried out systematically in the context of accountability in Turkey. Therefore, other schools in Turkey awaits confirmation through new research.

One another limitation of this research is associated with time. Specifically, the research was carried out in the 2013-2014 academic year and the purpose of the research was to reveal how the performance evaluations of teachers in a private school were made. However, a legal framework for the performance evaluation of teachers has not been established in Turkey, yet. On the other hand, since the number of studies on the performance evaluation practices of teachers in schools is very low, the data still have a potential to shed light on the present situation.

### **Interpretation of the Findings**

In the study, it was seen that the surveys have an important place in the evaluation of teachers' performance. When the opinions of the participants were examined, it was determined that the surveys were applied once in a period to evaluate the performance of the teachers in the private school where the research was conducted. When the literature was examined, it was seen that with the 2000s in the United States primary, secondary and high school students started evaluating their teachers (Ferguson, 2012). Similarly, in the same years, online surveys were made in universities where students could evaluate the education given to them (Dommeyer et al., 2002). However, it is stated in some studies that only the survey results are not sufficient to evaluate the performance of teachers (Bacher-Hicks et al., 2019; Looney, 2011). For this reason, it would be appropriate to evaluate teachers in a more holistic way. Within the scope of the research, attention was drawn to the general observations made in the performance evaluation of teachers. The participants stated that their superiors made general observations throughout the school, and that teachers were evaluated based on some criteria. Studies draw attention to the importance of school principals' observations in the evaluation of teachers (Reid, 2019). School principals use general observations to distinguish high or low performing teachers (Jacob & Lefgren, 2008; Orphanos, 2014). Therefore, school principals try to determine the performance level of teachers by observing the quality of teachers' relationships, especially with students and parents, and the processes of dealing with disciplinary problems (Yariv, 2009). Based on these views, it can be said that it is important to make effective observations.

The study also showed that classroom inspections are also used in the performance evaluation of teachers. In the statements of the participants, it was explained that together with the course inspections, the teacher file control was also carried out. In the literature, in-class inspections have an important place in the performance evaluation of teachers along with different methods (Ayeni, 2012; Bacher-Hicks et al., 2019). In-class inspections are seen as a feedback opportunity for the emergence of the instant situation regarding teaching and for the professional development of teachers (Range et al., 2011). New school principals attach more importance to course inspection and feedback (Hvidston et al., 2016). It is for sure that schools in which classroom instruction is supervised are much more effective than non-supervised schools (Iroegbu & Etudor-Eyo, 2016). From this point of view, it is

seen that the performance evaluation of teachers can be better understood with the inspection in the classroom.

In line with the statements of the participants in the study, it is understood that the cameras and audio and video surveillance in all places of the school is another method used in the performance evaluation of the teachers. Recordings made through cameras at the school are archived. Thus, records can be traced retrospectively when necessary. This situation can be handled on the basis of Michel Foucault's criticisms of modern societies, which aim to keep people under control by constantly monitoring and controlling (Mathiesen, 1997). Monitoring schools and classrooms with cameras ensures that teachers are always above certain standards and that the classrooms are always ready for inspection. In addition, the monitoring is used as a tool to provide predictable goals for the future of teaching (Page, 2017). A similar situation indicates the existence of such practices in different countries in the literature. It has been monitored by cameras in schools and classrooms in England since 1998, and is used to intervene in different security problems and evaluate teacher performance (Taylor, 2011). A study conducted in Israel reveals that cameras in schools are used by school principals to monitor whether teachers attend classes on time, use their teaching time effectively or whether their duty is fulfilled and evaluate teachers (Perry-Hazan & Birnhack, 2019). In another study conducted in China, continuous live monitoring of lectures is seen as an alternative to classroom supervision (Dyke et al., 2008). At the same time, it is stated that continuous monitoring with cameras provides a more objective evaluation opportunity (Liang, 2015).

On the other hand, teachers are awarded during the year and at the end of the year according to the performance evaluation results. Participants mentioned some positive results of evaluating their performance at school. Accordingly, as a result of the performance evaluation, it is understood that the teachers who are ahead of the other teachers are awarded. The awards vary according to the performance of the teachers. According to the study results, the main awards are as follows: (i) salary increase (ii) plaques and certificates with symbolic value (iii) contract renewal.

Many studies in the literature point to the positive results that teachers get as a result of performance evaluation. Especially in the American education system, the determination of performance-based teacher salaries has been applied since the end of the 19th century (Springer & Gardner, 2010). The high performance of teachers is supported by cash or different rewards that teachers will like (Frase, 1989). Teachers' performance evaluation provides wage increases, promotion opportunities, and feedback opportunities for institutional decisions (Çelebi et al., 2018). Determining the increase in teachers' salaries depending on the goals set by the schools and the performance in student achievement is seen as an important step that can be taken for the improvement of education systems (Lavy, 2007; Loyalka et al., 2019; Mohrman et al., 1996). The reason for this is that the increase in teachers' salaries is expected to have positive effects on the

teaching quality of teachers (Figlio, 1997). Therefore, private schools are trying to take measures with the awareness that improvements in teachers' salaries will contribute to teacher performance (Podgursky & Springer, 2007). The results of the research also revealed some concrete results of this. For example, in many countries, there is an increase in student achievement, especially in science and mathematics branches, in schools where teacher performance is paid (Woessmann, 2011).

According to the results of the study, it was determined that the teachers were punished for their low performance. The consequences that emerge as punishments are as follows: (i) verbal or written warning penalties, (ii) low raise in salaries (iii) termination of some duties and (iv) contract renewal/dismissal.

In a study conducted in England and Finland, workload, low wages, increased behavioral disorders of students, and decreased respect for the teaching profession emerged as major challenges faced by teachers today, when performance expectations at school increase (Webb et al., 2004). According to the results of the research, it was seen that teachers were warned in some cases. This situation has been expressed in different studies. Teachers are warned by the school administration when they are late for their classes, leave the class early, neglect their duty or use slang expressions at school (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012). Teachers who are found inadequate as a result of the performance evaluation are exposed to some sanctions. This is perceived as punishment by teachers. Many studies reveal that low performers are dismissed as a result of teachers' performance evaluation (Taylor & Tyler, 2012). Today, private schools sometimes do not renew teachers' contracts without even giving a reason, and teachers who lose their jobs have to seek their rights in court (Gümrukçüoğlu, 2016). On the other hand, it is surprising that teachers accept these performance evaluation systems in their schools and do not bring any criticism (Aypay, 2015). A study conducted in India, Malaysia and Thailand focused on the negative consequences of evaluating teachers' performance in lessons. Accordingly, supervision is used as a punishment and a fault finding tool rather than providing professional development of teachers (Sharma et al., 2011). Despite the intense criticism that video surveillance in schools is a violation of private life, it is thought-provoking that schools have now become an ordinary fixture (Taylor, 2010).

### **Conclusion**

This research has shown that the performance evaluation of teachers is a very challenging process. Considering the inadequacies in performance evaluation and its negative consequences, it seems that it is more appropriate to use diversified methods instead of a single method for qualified evaluation (Guarino et al., 2015). On the other hand, considering the intensity of the administrative and bureaucratic work of school principals (Balıkçı & Aypay, 2018), performance evaluation of teachers is considered as a time-consuming and tiring process in most cases. However, considering that the quality of teaching is directly related to the teaching of teachers, it is an undeniable fact that

qualified teacher evaluation models are needed. Researchers are recommended to conduct qualitative and quantitative research with larger samples in both private and public schools.

### References

- Açıkalm, A. (1989). Özel ve devlet liselerinde veli beklentilerinin örgütsel ve yönetsel boyutları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4, 85-91.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(3), 1843-1852.
- Altun, S. A., & Memişoğlu, S. P. (2008). Performans değerlendirmesine ilişkin öğretmen, yönetici ve müfettiş görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53(53), 7-24.
- Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Holloway, J. (2019). Value-added models for teacher evaluation and accountability: Commonsense assumptions. *Educational Policy*, 33(3), 516-542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904817719519>
- Aslan, M., & Ağiroğlu Bakır, A. (2014). Resmi ve özel okul öğretmenlerinin paylaşılan liderliğe ilişkin görüşleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15 (1), 117-142. <https://doi.org/10.17679/iuefd.75431>
- Ayeni, A. J. (2012). Assessment of principals' supervisory roles for quality assurance in secondary schools in ondo state, Nigeria. *World Journal of Education*, 2(1), 62-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n1p62>
- Aypay, A. (2015). *Eğitim Politikası*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Bacher-Hicks, A., Chin, M. J., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2019). An experimental evaluation of three teacher quality measures: Value-added, classroom observations, and student surveys. *Economics of Education Review*, 73, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.101919>
- Balıkçı, A., & Aypay, A. (2018). An investigation of school principalship in the context of bureaucracy. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 13(11), 1535-1560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13395>
- Birekul, M. (2018). Özel öğretim kurumlarında okul müdürlerinin liderlik rolleri. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 5(24), 1652-1671.
- Bozan, S., & Ekinci, A. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin öğretmen performans değerlendirme yeterliliklerinin okul müdürleri ve öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(69), 142-161. <https://doi.org/10.17755.esosder.412344>
- Bradford, C. & Braaten, M. (2018). Teacher evaluation and the demoralization of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.017>
- Cleveland, J. N., Murphy, K. R., & Williams, R. E. (1989). Multiple uses of performance appraisal: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 130-135.

- Cochran-Smith, M., Baker, M., Burton, S., Chang, W. C., Cummings Carney, M., Fernández, M. B., Keefe, E. S., Miller, A. F., & Sánchez, J. G. (2017). The accountability era in US teacher education: Looking back, looking forward. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(5), 572-588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1385061>
- Cope, S., Leishman, F., & Starie, P. (1997). Globalization, new public management and the enabling state: Futures of police management. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 10*(6), 444-460. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513559710190816>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice.
- Cuevas, R., Ntoumanis, N., Fernandez-Bustos, J. G., & Bartholomew, K. (2018). Does teacher evaluation based on student performance predict motivation, well-being, and ill-being?. *Journal of School Psychology, 68*, 154-162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.03.005>
- Çimen, B., & Karadağ, E. (2020). Özel okullarda çalışan öğretmenlerin çalışma şartları ve gelecek kaygıları üzerine görüşleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 21*(2), 518-541. <https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.476428>
- Çelebi, N., Babaoğlu, E., Selçuk, G., & Peker, S. (2018). Performans değerlendirme formuna ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 37*(2), 211-233. <https://doi.org/10.7822/omuefd.425403>
- Çevikbaş, R. (2012). Yeni kamu yönetimi anlayışı ve Türkiye uygulamaları. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1* (2), 9-32.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Fejes, A. (2019). Shaping entrepreneurial citizens: A genealogy of entrepreneurship education in Sweden. *Critical Studies in Education, 60*(4), 462-476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1303525>
- Derrington, M. L., & Campbell, J. W. (2018). Teacher evaluation policy tools: Principals' selective use in instructional leadership. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 17*(4), 568-590. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2017.1326143>
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., & Hanna, R. W. (2002). College students' attitudes toward methods of collecting teaching evaluations: In-class versus on-line. *Journal of Education for Business, 78*(1), 11-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320209599691>
- Donaldson, M. L., & Firestone, W. (2021). Rethinking teacher evaluation using human, social, and material capital. *Journal of Educational Change, 1*-34. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-020-09405-z>
- Donaldson, M. L., & Woulfin, S. (2018). From tinkering to going “rogue”: How principals use agency when enacting new teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 40*(4), 531-556. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373718784205>
- Dyke, M., Harding, A., & Liddon, S. (2008). How can online observation support the assessment and feedback, on classroom performance, to trainee teachers at a distance and in real



- time?. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(1), 37-46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770701781432>
- Ehren, M., & Perryman, J. (2018). Accountability of school networks: Who is accountable to whom and for what? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(6), 942-959.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217717272>
- Erdağ, C., & Karadağ, E. (2017). Öğretmenler ve okul müdürleri perspektifinden okul hesap verebilirliği politikaları. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(13), 459-496.  
<https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.292614>
- Erdoğan, İ. (2002). *Yeni bir binyıla doğru Türk eğitim sistemi: Sorunlar ve çözümler*. Ankara: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Erichsen, K., & Reynolds, J. (2020). Public school accountability, workplace culture, and teacher morale. *Social Science Research*, 85, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.102347>
- Espinoza, O. (2017). Paulo Freire's ideas as an alternative to higher education neo-liberal reforms in Latin America. *Journal of Moral Education*, 46(4), 435-448.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2017.1363601>
- Ferguson, R. F. (2012). Can student surveys measure teaching quality?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(3), 24-28.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209400306>
- Figlio, D. N. (1997). Teacher salaries and teacher quality. *Economics Letters*, 55(2), 267-271.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765\(97\)00070-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765(97)00070-0)
- Finefter-Rosenbluh, I. (2020). 'Try walking in my shoes': teachers' interpretation of student perception surveys and the role of self-efficacy beliefs, perspective taking and inclusivity in teacher evaluation. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 50(6), 747-769.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2020.1770692>
- Flores, M. A., & Derrington, M. L. (2017). School principals' views of teacher evaluation policy: Lessons learned from two empirical studies. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(4), 416-431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1094144>
- Ford, T. G., Urick, A., & Wilson, A. S. P. (2018). Exploring the effect of supportive teacher evaluation experiences on U.S. teachers' job satisfaction. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(59), 1-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3559>
- Ford, T. G., Van Sickle, M. E., Clark, L. V., Fazio-Brunson, M., & Schween, D. C. (2017). Teacher self-efficacy, professional commitment, and high-stakes teacher evaluation policy in Louisiana. *Educational Policy*, 31(2), 202-248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815586855>
- Frase, L. E. (1989). Effects of teacher rewards on recognition and job enrichment. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 83(1), 52-57.
- Fusarelli, L. D. & Johnson, B. (2004). Educational governance and the new public management. *Public Administration and Management: An Interactive Journal*, 9(2), 118-127.
- Gaventa, J., & McGee, R. (2013). The impact of transparency and accountability initiatives. *Development Policy Review*, 31(1), 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12017>

- Grissom, J. A. & Bartanen, B. (2019). Strategic retention: Principal effectiveness and teacher turnover in multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(2), 514-555. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218797931>
- Guarino, C. M., Reckase, M. D., & Wooldridge, J. M. (2015). Can value-added measures of teacher performance be trusted? *Education Finance and Policy*, 10(1), 117-156. [https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP\\_a\\_00153](https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00153)
- Gümrükçüoğlu, Y. B. (2016). 5580 sayılı özel öğretim kurumları kanunu kapsamında yapılan zincirleme iş sözleşmesinin sona ermesinde kıdem tazminat. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 74, 223-249.
- Hesapçıoğlu, M., & Nohutçu, A. (1999). Velilerin özel okul tercihlerini etkileyen faktörler ve özel okulların reklam stratejileri. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(11), 183-202.
- Holloway, J., Sørensen, T. B., & Verger, A. (2017). Global perspectives on high-stakes teacher accountability policies: An introduction. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(85), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.3325>
- Hood, C. (1995). The “new public management” in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2-3), 93-109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682\(93\)E0001-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(93)E0001-W)
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, G. C. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi: Teori, araştırma ve uygulama*. (S. Turan, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Hvidston, D. J., McKim, C. A., & Mette, I. M. (2016). Principals' supervision and evaluation cycles: perspectives from principals. *Education Leadership Review*, 17(1), 100-113.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Collins, G. J. (2017). Accountability and control in American schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(1), 75-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2016.1205142>
- Iroegbu, E. E., & Etudor-Eyo, E. (2016). Principals' instructional supervision and teachers' effectiveness. *British Journal of Education*, 4(7), 99-109.
- Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2008). Can principals identify effective teachers? Evidence on subjective performance evaluation in education. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 26(1), 101-136.
- Kallio, K. M., & Kallio, T. J. (2014). Management-by-results and performance measurement in universities—implications for work motivation. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(4), 574-589. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709497>
- Kantos, Z. E. (2013). Performans değerlendirme süreci ve 360 derece geri bildirim sistemi. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama Dergisi*, 12(23), 59-76.
- Karaköse, T., & Kocabaş, İ. (2006). Özel ve devlet okullarında öğretmenlerin beklentilerinin iş doyumu ve motivasyon üzerine etkileri. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 2(1), 3-14.
- Kim, J. (2018). School accountability and standard-based education reform: The recall of social efficiency movement and scientific management. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 60, 80-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.11.003>

- Kocabaş, İ., & Karaköse, T. (2005). Okul müdürlerinin tutum ve davranışlarının öğretmenlerin motivasyonuna etkisi (özel ve devlet okulu örneği). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 79-93.
- Konan, N., & Yılmaz, S. (2018). Öğretmen performans değerlendirmeye ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri: Bir karma yöntem araştırması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 219, 137-160.
- Kulaksızoğlu, A., Çakar, M., & Dilmaç, B. (1999). Türkiye'de ve dünyada özel okulların yapısı ve işleyişi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(11), 219-232.
- Kurt, M., & Uğurlu, Ö. Y. (2007). Yeni kamu yönetimi ve yeni kamu yönetimi yaklaşımının gelişiminde Avrupa birliğinin rolü: İlerleme raporlarının içerik analizi. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 9 (2), 81-109.
- Lavigne, A. L., & Chamberlain, R. W. (2017). Teacher evaluation in Illinois: School leaders' perceptions and practices. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 29(2), 179-209. <https://doi.org/87-109>. 10.1007/s11092-016-9250-0
- Lavy, V. (2007). Using performance-based pay to improve the quality of teachers. *The Future of Children*, 17(1), 87-109.
- Liang, J. (2015). Live video classroom observation: an effective approach to reducing reactivity in collecting observational information for teacher professional development. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 41(3), 235-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1045314>
- Lillejord, S., Elstad, E. & Kavli, H. (2018). Teacher evaluation as a wicked policy problem. Assessment in education: *Principles, Policy and Practice*, 25(3), 291-309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1429388>
- Liu, S., Xu, X., & Stronge, J. H. (2016). Chinese middle school teachers' preferences regarding performance evaluation measures. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(2), 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-016-9237-x>
- Looney, J. (2011). Developing high-quality teachers: Teacher evaluation for improvement. *European Journal of Education*, 46(4), 440-455.
- Loyalka, P., Sylvia, S., Liu, C., Chu, J., & Shi, Y. (2019). Pay by design: Teacher performance pay design and the distribution of student achievement. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 37(3), 621-662. <https://doi.org/10.1086/702625>
- Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's panopticon revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2), 215-234.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB). (2020). Retrieved from (20. 04.2021) [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2020\\_09/04144812\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_orgun\\_egitim\\_2019\\_2020.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_09/04144812_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2019_2020.pdf).

- Mohrman Jr, A. M., Mohrman, S. A., & Odden, A. R. (1996). Aligning teacher compensation with systemic school reform: Skill-based pay and group-based performance rewards. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(1), 51-71.
- Moran, R. M. (2017). The impact of a high stakes teacher evaluation system: Educator perspectives on accountability. *Educational Studies*, 53(2), 178-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2017.1283319>
- Murray, H. G. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching?. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 2(1), 8-23.
- Nartgün, Ş., & Kaya, A. (2016). Özel okul velilerinin beklentileri doğrultusunda okul imajı oluşturma. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5 (2), 153-167.
- Neuman, L. W. (2010). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri: Nicel ve nitel yaklaşımlar* (Çev. S. Özge). İstanbul: Yayın Odası.
- Orphanos, S. (2014). What matters to principals when they evaluate teachers? Evidence from Cyprus. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(2), 243-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499262>
- Ozga, J. (2013). Accountability as a policy technology: accounting for education performance in Europe. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 79(2), 292-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852313477763>
- Özdemir, A., & Tüysüz, F. (2017). Özel okul yatırımları için Türkiye'deki 81 ilin çok kriterli karar verme yöntemleri ile stratejik analizi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 45, 93-114. <https://doi.org/10.15285/maruaeabd.29529>
- Özer, M. A. (2005). Günümüzün yükselen değeri: Yeni kamu yönetimi. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, 59, 3-46.
- Öztaş, N., & Gürcüoğlu, S. (2018). Türk kamu yönetiminde performans yönetimi: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı örneği. *Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(14), 537-549.
- Page, D. (2017). The surveillance of teachers and the simulation of teaching. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2016.1209566>
- Parlar, H. (2006). *Velilerin özel okul tercihlerini etkileyen faktörler ve özel okulların durumu: Kahramanmaraş örneği* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Paufler, N. A., King, K. M., & Zhu, P. (2020). Promoting professional growth in new teacher evaluation systems: Practitioners' lived experiences in changing policy contexts. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 65, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100873>
- Perry-Hazan, L., & Birnhack, M. (2019). Caught on camera: Teachers' surveillance in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 78, 193-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.11.021>
- Podgursky, M. J., & Springer, M. G. (2007). Teacher performance pay: A review. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(4), 909-949.
- Press, F., Woodrow, C., Logan, H., & Mitchell, L. (2018). Can we belong in a neo-liberal world? Neo-liberalism in early childhood education and care policy in Australia and New

- Zealand. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 19(4), 328-339.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949118781909>
- Range, B. G., Scherz, S., Holt, C. R., & Young, S. (2011). Supervision and evaluation: The Wyoming perspective. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 23(3), 243-265.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-011-9123-5>
- Reid, D. B. (2019). What information do principals consider when evaluating teachers? *School Leadership and Management*, 39(5), 457-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1576167>
- Reinhorn, S. K., Johnson, S. M., & Simon, N. S. (2017). Investing in development: Six high-performing, high-poverty schools implement the Massachusetts teacher evaluation policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(3), 383-406. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373717690605>
- Sağbaşı, N. Ö., & Özkan, C. (2019). 360 derece performans değerlendirme sistemine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası Liderlik Çalışmaları Dergisi: Kuram ve Uygulama*, 2(1), 1-18.
- Sever, M., & Aypay, A. (Ed.) (2014). *Öğretmenlik halleri: Türkiye’de öğretmen olmak üzerine nitel bir araştırma*. Ankara: PEGEM
- Sharma, S., Yusoff, M., Kannan, S., & Baba, S. B. (2011). Concerns of teachers and principals on instructional supervision in three Asian countries. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1(3), 214-217.
- Springer, M. G., & Gardner, C. D. (2010). Teacher pay for performance: Context, status, and direction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(8), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009100803>
- Steinberg, M. P., & Kraft, M. A. (2017). The sensitivity of teacher performance ratings to the design of teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 378-396.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17726752>
- Storey, A. (2002). Performance management in schools: could the balanced scorecard help?. *School Leadership & Management*, 22(3), 321-338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243022000020435>
- Su, Y., Feng, L., & Hsu, C. H. (2017). Accountability or authenticity? The alignment of professional development and teacher evaluation. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(6), 717-728.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1255189>
- Şişman, M. (2011). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı: Etkili okullar*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Taylor, E. (2010). I spy with my little eye: the use of CCTV in schools and the impact on privacy. *The Sociological Review*, 58(3), 381-405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2010.01930.x>
- Taylor, E. (2011). UK schools, CCTV and the Data Protection Act 1998. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.493226>
- Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-51. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.7.3628>
- Topçu, İ. (2010). Devlet ve özel ilköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin öğretimin denetimi görevlerini yerine getirme biçimleri. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34(2), 31-39.

- Topuz, M., & Yılmaz, K. (2019). Okul müdürleri ve öğretmenlerin performans değerlendirme süreci hakkındaki görüşleri: Nitel bir araştırma. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(2), 82-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22521/jesr.2019.92.3>
- Torrance, H. (2017). Blaming the victim: Assessment, examinations, and the responsabilisation of students and teachers in neo-liberal governance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(1), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1104854>
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2017). The role of feedback from the school leader during teacher evaluation for teacher and school improvement. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(1), 6-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1203770>
- Uygun, S. (2003). Türkiye'de dünden bugüne özel okullara bir bakış (gelişim ve etkileri). *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36(1), 107-120.
- Webb, R., Vulliamy, G., Hämäläinen, S., Sarja, A., Kimonen, E., & Nevalainen, R. (2004). Pressures, rewards and teacher retention: A comparative study of primary teaching in England and Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(2), 169-188.
- Woessmann, L. (2011). Cross-country evidence on teacher performance pay. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3), 404-418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.12.008>
- Yariv, E. (2009). The appraisal of teachers' performance and its impact on the mutuality of principal-teacher emotions. *School Leadership and Management*, 29(5), 445-461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430903152302>
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, V., & Turan, A. (2019). Kamuda performans yönetiminin önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 33(46), 313-342.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.