

OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education

Teacher Evaluation in Chile

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Paulo Santiago, Francisco Benavides,
Charlotte Danielson, Laura Goe and Deborah Nusche



This summary of main conclusions is drawn from *OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Teacher Evaluation in Chile*. The full report is available on the project's website: www.oecd.org/edu/evaluationpolicy.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where the governments of 34 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD.

This work is published on the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and the arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Organisation or of the governments of its member countries.

Executive summary

The market-oriented education reforms of the 1980s entailed the decentralisation of public school management responsibilities to municipalities and the introduction of a nationwide voucher programme. The latter has led a great number of private schools to enter the school system with a growing share of the student population (59.1% in 2011). Student learning outcomes in Chile are considerably below the OECD average. However, trend analyses of PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) results have shown some encouraging improvement in student learning outcomes. Research has also shown that student results differ considerably across the socio-economic background of students and the type of school attended. In this context, the government accords great importance to teacher policy and teacher evaluation within the general education improvement agenda. Chile has developed a national framework defining standards for the teaching profession, the Good Teaching Framework (GTF), as of 2003. It also established the teacher performance evaluation system (also referred to as *Docentemás*) within the municipal school sector in 2003. This system is complemented by a range of reward programmes which involve some type of evaluation: the Programme for the Variable Individual Performance Allowance (municipal sector only) (AVDI); the Programme for the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance (covering the entire subsidised school sector) (AEP); and the National System for Performance Evaluation (SNED), which provides group rewards for teaching bodies of given publicly subsidised schools. While Chile has made remarkable progress in implementing teacher evaluation and developing an evaluation culture among the teaching workforce, challenges remain in ensuring the coherence of the teacher evaluation framework, in adjusting instruments to better link them to the standards of practice and in strengthening improvement-oriented evaluation practices. The following priorities were identified for the development of teacher evaluation policies in Chile.

Placing greater emphasis on the developmental function of teacher evaluation with a larger role for local agents

While the intended original objective of *Docentemás* was to conceive teacher evaluation as a formative process, teacher evaluation, as implemented, is presently perceived mostly as an instrument to hold municipal teachers accountable. The feedback for improvement teachers receive from the *Docentemás* evaluation is limited, there is little professional dialogue around teaching practices that occurs as a result of teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation results are not systematically used to inform a professional development plan for all teachers and the concept of feedback is not yet fully ingrained among school agents. At the same time, formal teacher evaluation processes require little engagement from local agents. In particular, school leaders play a relatively small role in the evaluation process and seem to make little use of the results of *Docentemás* to coach their teachers and inform their school development plans. As a result, there needs to be a stronger emphasis on teacher evaluation for improvement purposes (i.e. developmental evaluation). Given that there are risks that the developmental function is hampered by high-stakes teacher evaluation (to take the form of a certification process as suggested below), it is proposed that a component predominantly dedicated to developmental

evaluation, fully internal to the school, be created. The main outcome would be feedback on teaching performance and the whole contribution of the teacher to school development which would lead to a plan for professional development. In order to guarantee the systematic and coherent application of developmental evaluation across Chilean schools, it would be important to undertake the external validation of the respective school processes for developmental teacher evaluation (a possible role for the Quality of Education Agency).

Fulfilling the accountability function of teacher evaluation through a system of teacher certification with a better integration of the private sector

Presently, in Chile, there are no career steps in teacher development (e.g. beginning; classroom teacher; experienced teacher), which would permit a better match between teacher competence and skills and the tasks to be performed at schools. This is likely to undermine the potentially powerful links between teacher evaluation, professional development and career development. A possible approach to fulfil the accountability function of teacher evaluation is to bring together the *Docentemás* system, the AVDI and the AEP into a single process of teacher evaluation for career progression through a certification process associated with a newly created teacher career structure (fitting 2012-13 governmental plans) – with progression within career paths and access to distinct career paths. This would formalise the principle of advancement on merit associated with career opportunities for effective teachers. The reward dimension would be captured through faster career advancement (leading to a higher salary). Each permanent teacher in the system would be required to periodically (say every four years) be the subject of a formal evaluation for certification (or re-certification). The purpose would be to certify teachers periodically as fit for the profession. Both the evaluations for certification (or career progression) and to access a new career path, which are more summative in nature, need to have a strong component external to the school and more formal processes. These processes could be governed by an accredited commission organised by the Quality of Education Agency. Also, a major gap in the teacher evaluation framework is that it is not publicly guaranteed that all teachers in the school system undergo a formal process of performance evaluation since teachers in the private school sector (over 50% of Chilean teachers) are not required to undergo a *Docentemás* evaluation and teacher evaluation procedures in private schools are not validated by public education authorities. Given that private subsidised schools receive public funds, there is a strong case for them to be integrated, to some degree, in the teacher evaluation framework.

Consolidating the Good Teaching Framework as the main pillar for teacher evaluation and adjusting the evaluation instruments

There is a clear definition in Chile of what constitutes good teaching, as described in the Good Teaching Framework (GTF). As implemented, however, the GTF could benefit from some adjustments. For instance, it displays poor alignment between some of the criteria and the descriptors intended to illustrate them. At the same time, the understanding of the GTF is not well disseminated throughout the system. Also, *Docentemás*, as designed, includes a rich combination of various sources of evidence of teaching practice as well as different evaluators. This adds to the validity of the system as a whole. However, the association between each of the standards and the instruments is not always clear. Moreover, self-evaluation is a poor instrument, there is room to

strengthen the peer interview, the third-party evaluation might not be effective and a number of adjustments can be made to the teacher performance portfolio. A priority should be to consolidate the Good Teaching Framework as the main pillar to guide teacher evaluation and development. Efforts should go into its further improvement through clear feedback mechanisms involving education practitioners. Teaching standards need to be continuously informed by research on teaching practice. Also, further work needs to be undertaken to ensure the Good Teaching Framework contains the relevant criteria and indicators and that these are adequately aligned with the evaluation instruments. Furthermore, it is fundamental to embed the teaching standards in teachers' everyday work in the classroom and to ensure they inform teacher preparation. Another priority should be for teacher evaluation to draw on instruments which capture more authentic teaching practices. In this way, portfolios could be designed to reflect what can be called a "natural harvest" of the teacher's work. Teacher evaluation should also be firmly rooted in classroom observation. In the peer interview, a better approach would be to give teachers access to the rubrics, and ask them to describe a specific instance in which they achieved the different elements. This approach would help teachers be more reflective, and would contribute to their professional development. Also, both the third-party reference report and the peer interview should involve a professional dialogue with the teacher. Finally, at this stage, it is premature to use student standardised assessment results as direct measures to evaluate the performance of individual teachers.

Strengthening competencies for teacher evaluation

At the central level, teacher evaluation relies on the competencies of several agencies that co-operate regularly so as to assure the quality of the process with, in general, stakeholder appreciation for the services provided. Additionally, the management of public schools by the municipalities offers the potential for closer monitoring of teacher evaluation practices with opportunities to recognise local realities and constraints. However, it appears that there are large variations in the extent to which municipalities have the capacity to fulfil their roles in teacher evaluation effectively. Also, a range of concerns remain about whether school leaders have the competencies necessary to lead the effective implementation of teacher evaluation at the school level, in spite of the recent policy focus on improving school leadership. Traditionally, in Chile, school leaders have played more of an administrative and managerial role than a pedagogical leadership role. A positive feature is the high involvement of practising teachers as markers of teacher portfolios and as peer evaluators. However, there are a number of areas where teachers lack evaluation competencies (e.g. capacity to undertake effective self-evaluation; limited understanding of the *Docentemás* system). Another concern is that there is little trust in the competencies of portfolio markers among evaluated teachers. A priority is therefore to ensure the high-quality preparation of portfolio markers, possibly through the establishment of a process to accredit them alongside the reinforcement of moderation processes where more than one marker agrees on a teacher's rating. Another priority is to strengthen the professional competencies of municipal education staff, through further training, strategic partnerships between municipalities and support from the central ministry. Similarly, policy attention should go into building pedagogical leadership capacity and giving school leaders a key role in teacher evaluation. Finally, ensuring that teachers are provided with support to understand the evaluation procedures and to benefit from evaluation results is also vitally important. Teachers can benefit from training modules that help them understand what is expected of them and how to make best use of the feedback provided.

Conclusions and recommendations

Education system context

A number of features characterise the Chilean education system

The market-oriented education reforms of the 1980s entailed the decentralisation of public school management responsibilities to municipalities and the introduction of a nationwide voucher programme. The former involved the transfer of the administration and infrastructure of all the country's public primary and secondary schools to municipalities. The latter is characterised by a per student public subsidy for schools which are part of the voucher system (municipal and the majority of private schools) and parents' free choice of schools. The introduction of the voucher programme has led a great number of private schools to enter the school system with a growing share of the student population (59.1% in 2011, with 51.8% of students enrolled in private schools which are part of the voucher programme). Attendance of different school types greatly depends on family income levels. Students from the most disadvantaged families attend municipal schools in largest numbers even if from 1990 they have increasingly attended subsidised private schools. A significant development in the area of educational evaluation has been the introduction in 1988 of the System to Measure the Quality of Education (*Sistema de Medición de Calidad de la Educación*, SIMCE), a full-cohort national standardised assessment of student performance across the country. There is no well-established, systematic approach to school evaluation in Chile. School-level aggregated data, mostly SIMCE assessments, provide general information on student performance at the school level against national averages.

Student learning outcomes are below the OECD average but show some progress

Student learning outcomes in Chile are considerably below the OECD average but there has been considerable progress in the last decade. In 2009, achievement levels of Chilean students in the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) were at the bottom end within the OECD area in the assessed areas of reading literacy, mathematics and science. However, Chile performed above any other Latin American country which took part in PISA (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay) in all assessed areas except mathematics (where its performance is similar to that of Mexico and Uruguay). Trend analyses of PISA results have also shown some encouraging improvement in student learning outcomes.

There are concerns about strong social inequities in the school system

Research shows that student results differ considerably across the socio-economic background of students and the type of school attended. In addition, there is evidence that total expenditure per student varies across the type of school attended as well as the socio-economic background of the student.

Teacher policy and teacher evaluation are among the most prominent education policy areas

The government accords great importance to teacher policy and teacher evaluation within the general education improvement agenda. Chile has developed a national framework defining standards for the teaching profession, the Good Teaching Framework (GTF) (*Marco para la Buena Enseñanza*), as of 2003. It also established the teacher performance evaluation system (also referred to as *Docentemás*) within the municipal school sector in 2003 following a tripartite agreement between the Ministry of Education, the Chilean Association of Municipalities and the Teachers' Association (*Colegio de Profesores*). This system is complemented by a range of reward programmes which involve some type of evaluation: the Programme for the Variable Individual Performance Allowance (municipal sector only) (AVDI); the Programme for the Accreditation of Pedagogical Excellence Allowance (covering the entire subsidised school sector) (AEP); and the National System for Performance Evaluation (SNED), which provides group rewards for teaching bodies of given publicly subsidised schools. In addition to these formal programmes, private schools (both subsidised and non-subsidised) autonomously organise their own performance teacher evaluation systems and any school is free to organise extra internal systems of teacher evaluation. A range of initiatives have been launched recently: a draft law proposing a new (multi-level) career structure for teachers associated with teacher evaluation for certification and conditions to be a teacher in the subsidised sector; the Programme for the promotion of quality in initial teacher education, which includes the development of Graduating Teacher Standards, a test to enter the profession (initial pedagogical excellence examination), and support for the improvement of teacher education programmes; and initiatives to improve the attractiveness of teaching, including the Teacher Vocation Scholarship and "Choose to Teach" (*Elige Educar*).

Strengths and challenges

There is a general consensus about the importance of teacher evaluation but it is perceived mostly as an instrument to hold teachers accountable

Teacher evaluation is recognised as an important policy lever to improve student learning. This is reflected in the substantial work on teaching standards, the very comprehensive approach to teacher evaluation in municipal schools and the multitude of reward programmes in the subsidised school sector. Over ten years of experience with formal teacher evaluation have produced a conviction among most teachers about the need for teachers to be evaluated, receive professional feedback, improve their practice and have their achievements recognised. However, while the intended original objective of *Docentemás* was to conceive teacher evaluation as a formative process, teacher evaluation, as implemented, is presently perceived mostly as an instrument to hold municipal teachers accountable. Attributing high stakes to the results of *Docentemás* has led the developmental function of teacher evaluation to become subsumed into the accountability aim of the system. The feedback for improvement teachers receive from the *Docentemás* evaluation is limited (and non-existent in AVDI, AEP and SNED), there is little professional dialogue around teaching practices that occurs as a result of teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation results are not systematically used to inform a professional development plan for all teachers and the concept of feedback is not yet fully ingrained

among school agents. The idea that the ultimate objective of teacher evaluation is to improve students' learning through strengthened teaching practices is not yet fully matured among Chilean education agents. Overall, the potential of professional development of teachers is underestimated. This translates into more limited local engagement in self-evaluation activities, incipient practices of evidence-informed inquiry, and teacher evaluation results not used to their potential. The emphasis on accountability risks leading to a compliance culture where teacher evaluation becomes an administrative burden with reduced potential to improve teaching practices.

There are a variety of mechanisms to evaluate and recognise teachers but gaps and some duplication remain in the teacher evaluation framework

Teacher evaluation develops in a context of considerable national policy attention to improving teacher quality. This is reflected in the multiple mechanisms currently in place that deal with teacher evaluation, covering a variety of purposes: selecting graduates into teaching (initial pedagogical excellence examination), assessing performance in view of improving practices and identifying underperformance (*Docentemás*), and rewarding good or excellent performance (AVDI, AEP, SNED). Also, two new teacher evaluation programmes for municipal schools are in the process of being defined as the new career structure for teachers is introduced (for new teachers and, on a voluntary basis, current teachers): teacher evaluation for certification to determine access to each career level; and teacher performance evaluation to be designed by municipal education authorities and implemented by individual schools in view of determining access to the teaching performance allowance (and identifying underperformance). However, the teacher evaluation framework remains incomplete and contains some duplication. A major gap is that it is not publicly guaranteed that all teachers in the school system undergo a formal process of performance evaluation since teachers in the private school sector (over 50% of Chilean teachers) are not required to undergo a *Docentemás* evaluation and teacher evaluation procedures in private schools are not validated by public education authorities. Also, there is no formal teacher evaluation which focuses on teacher development and feedback for the improvement of practices. Informal feedback for improvement might be undertaken at the school level but there is no external formal validation of such practices. Also, at least in municipal schools, there is no probationary period for teachers who enter the profession. There is also some duplication of efforts across components of the teacher evaluation framework. First, both the AEP and the AVDI provide monetary rewards to individual teachers and, to a great extent, use similar instruments. Second, there seems to be considerable overlap between the portfolio associated with the *Docentemás* system and the portfolio associated with the AEP process.

Teachers are generally open to external feedback but few opportunities are available and teacher evaluation generates little professional dialogue

The OECD Review Team formed the impression that teachers were generally interested in and open to receiving feedback on their performance when that feedback came from someone teachers trusted. In general, teachers liked the idea of having direct feedback on their classroom practice from someone within their school or someone who understood their teaching context. In some schools teachers are observed periodically by the leadership team, and receive feedback on those observations. However, Chilean

teachers have relatively few opportunities for professional feedback. The formal systems of teacher evaluation in Chile involve little or no professional dialogue around teaching practices and, as such, have more limited value for informing improvement. For instance, in *Docentemás*, the peer interview does not involve an interaction between the evaluator and the teacher being evaluated but rather the rating of recorded answers following a set of pre-established questions; the third-party reference report by school leaders entails a rating on a pre-defined set of teaching competencies with no prior dialogue with the evaluated teacher; and the teacher performance portfolio provides no room for the interaction of the teacher with another teaching professional. Also, the feedback given to the individual teacher seems not to be specific enough to be of value in informing their practice. Finally, the quality and extent of informal feedback in individual schools depend on the capacity and leadership style of the school directors. However, school directors are typically overwhelmed with tasks at the school and, in general they do not seem to have the time to engage properly in the coaching, monitoring, and evaluation of teachers. For example, classroom observations by school directors seem to be relatively occasional.

The Quality of Education Agency integrates teacher evaluation in a broader framework but with risks to reinforce focus on accountability

The creation of the Quality of Education Agency is an excellent development to complete and integrate the overall evaluation and assessment framework. In particular, it promises to fill in a gap with the organisation of the external evaluation of individual schools. It will also give teacher evaluation a broader evaluative framework. However, the OECD Review Team perceived that the conception of the Agency's activities as it starts its operations emphasises the accountability function of evaluation. This is reflected in its intentions to develop indicators of school performance (with particular emphasis on SIMCE results, which becomes a responsibility of the Agency), to position schools in four performance categories, to make information about school performance public, and to focus intervention in schools with low performance. Procedures for a comprehensive review of school processes by teams of trained reviewers with the objective of generating a school improvement plan seem to be receiving considerably less attention in the planning of the Agency's activities. It would be unfortunate if the improvement function of the Agency's evaluative activities is neglected as the perception of evaluation as an instrument for compliance and control among Chilean education agents would then be reinforced.

There is some room for local adaptation but the role of local agents remains limited

The teacher performance evaluation system in municipal schools is mostly centrally operated. Processes are standardised at the national level, including the reference standards, instruments to be used, marking criteria and follow-up processes. This strengthens the consistency of teacher evaluation procedures across municipal schools contributing to a more uniform implementation of the national education agenda. However, the system allows for some degree of adaptation to local needs and specificities. This is mostly accomplished by the co-ordination of teacher evaluation at the local level by the Municipal Evaluation Commission, which is empowered to ratify or modify the specific rating of individual teachers assigned centrally. This allows taking into account the context faced by individual teachers and reserves some judgement to agents who are

more familiar with local realities. At the same time, however, formal teacher evaluation processes require little engagement from local agents. In particular, school leaders play a relatively small role as they only contribute to the third-party reference report in the *Docentemás* system. The OECD Review Team also formed the impression that school leaders make little use of the results of *Docentemás* to coach their teachers and inform their school development plans. The introduction of *Docentemás* was not used as an opportunity to further engage school leaders in leading instruction in their schools.

Teacher evaluation is not embedded in a clearly defined teacher career

Presently, in Chile, there is no career path for teachers in the municipal sector. There is a unique career stage with a single salary scale. Pay differentiation is achieved through a range of salary allowances. Roles involving promotion are limited to head of technical-pedagogical units, senior management posts and school director, all of which involve an extra salary allowance. Hence, within a teaching role there are few opportunities for promotion, greater recognition and more responsibility. There are no career steps in teacher development (e.g. beginning; classroom teacher; experienced teacher), which would permit a better match between teacher competence and skills and the tasks to be performed at schools. This is likely to undermine the potentially powerful links between teacher evaluation, professional development and career development. Also, the system of salary allowances for teachers has become incomprehensible given the multitude of allowances (over 15) as well as the complexity of the eligibility requirements to obtain them. These concerns are currently being addressed by the 2012 draft law proposing a new career structure for teachers. The draft law proposes a career structure with four levels and a formal evaluation process to access each of the levels in addition to a school-based teacher evaluation process to receive the (simplified) teaching performance allowance.

There are clear standards of practice but of uneven quality and their understanding is not well disseminated throughout the system

There is a clear definition in Chile of what constitutes good teaching, as described in the Good Teaching Framework (GTF). Clarity on the definition of good teaching is the first, and in many ways, the most important, element of a robust system of teacher evaluation. Ideally, it is used as the benchmark for understanding practice, whether it is in the preparation of teachers, in organising programmes of professional development, or in the evaluation of teachers' skills. This shared understanding, if it is truly shared, enables a common language to develop around the definition of good teaching, and, with that, professional conversation. Moreover, there are clear statements as to what constitutes levels of performance on the standards. As implemented, however, the GTF could benefit from some adjustments. It displays poor alignment between some of the criteria and the descriptors supposedly intended to illustrate them. Some of the criteria in the GTF also appear to be much “bigger” than others, when each of the aspects of teaching on which teacher performance will be evaluated should be of roughly the same level of detail. Moreover, the meaning of some of the criteria is not always clear and some of the descriptors appear to be misplaced. At the same time, the OECD Review Team formed the view that the understanding of the GTF is not well disseminated throughout the system. For example, it is not taught in some initial teacher education programmes, nor is it used by teachers on a regular basis. It has not become, in other words, the “common language” to describe, understand, and improve practice. Also, although it is a concept

central to the equity and the effectiveness of an evaluation system, the OECD Review Team found that most teachers were unfamiliar with the levels of performance as reflected in the rubrics for the different criteria/descriptors in the GTF. Experience in other countries has found that the levels of performance are, all by themselves an important catalyst for teacher learning.

A mix of instruments is used to evaluate the performance of a teacher but there are no clear links between them and the standards of practice

The teacher performance evaluation system (*Docentemás*), as designed, includes a rich combination of various sources of evidence of teaching practice (self-evaluation, planning documents, video of a class, a peer interview and a third-party assessment) as well as different evaluators (teacher, peers, school leaders, and portfolio markers). This wide range of both data sources and evaluators permits a valuable variety of perspectives on a teacher's performance, providing, in effect, multiple measures, and thus adding to the validity of the system as a whole. In addition, valuable information on teaching context is captured in several ways. Such context information is essential for a fair consideration for teachers who are working in varied circumstances with challenges unique to the place or situation. Also, in Chile, teacher evaluation is not overly reliant on standardised student results, which is appropriate given that there are numerous caveats against the use of student standardised assessment scores to “mechanically” evaluate teachers. A challenge in the implementation of teacher evaluation is that it is not clear what are the sources of evidence for each of the standards. The overall “architecture” of the teacher performance evaluation system appears opaque. This opacity is unfortunate, since if teachers had a more accurate idea about which aspects of their teaching were to be evaluated through which evaluation instruments and if they had the rubrics that describe good practice in each of the criteria within each domain, then they could be sure to give it “their best shot” at demonstrating high levels of performance. Without that support, teachers are not sure what they should be demonstrating through each of the assessment activities.

Self-evaluation is a poor instrument, there is room to strengthen the peer interview and the third-party evaluation might not be effective

In order for self-evaluation to have value for teachers, and for the profession, it is essential that teachers be able to conduct their self-evaluation in private, with nothing hinging on the results. Otherwise, it is highly unlikely that teachers, even if they were accurate in their self-evaluation, would be honest. That is, if they honestly assess their own practice as poor, it is likely to be used against them. This is visible in the *Docentemás* system. For instance, for each of the years in the period 2007-2010, over 99% of teachers rated themselves as *Competent* or *Outstanding*. Research evidence suggests that self-evaluation provides little information to identify good teaching performance. Also, there are some limitations to the practice as peer interviews are implemented. First, it is extremely time-consuming. Second, there seems to be poor alignment between some questions and the criteria to which they are (supposedly) linked. Third, the rubrics used to define the four performance levels are additive, and answers are required to include an increasing number of the elements in order to be evaluated at increasingly high levels. Finally, the third-party reference report in *Docentemás* might not be effective as a result of the limited weight given to the views of the school director and the head of the technical-pedagogical unit. The form to be completed by the evaluators is

extensive, but it is valued at only 10% in the total rating for a teacher. This limited role for the school leadership in teacher evaluation is likely a direct reflection of school culture in Chile which casts school leaders in the role of administrators with little involvement in day-to-day instructional activities. Another concern about the third-party reference report is consistency across evaluators. Third-party evaluators receive no training for their function. Without training in what evidence to consider and how to rate that evidence, the validity of the results are called into question.

A number of adjustments can be made to the teacher performance portfolio

The teacher performance portfolio is the core instrument in the teacher performance evaluation system. It has the potential to generate reflective practices among teachers, it is comprehensive in the areas of teaching expertise addressed and it goes to the heart of teachers' work: classroom teaching. There are also indications that it has some power in predicting good teaching performance. However, there are some challenges to its implementation. It is not clear how the various contributors to a single criterion will be assembled to yield a single score for each criterion; that is, there are a number of different elements to the portfolio, but the directions do not indicate how the different "pieces" will be combined together to create a single "score". Moreover, the directions for completing the portfolio appear to be needlessly rigid. For example, the unit must be for eight pedagogical hours. If it is any more or less, the teacher's rating will be lower than it would be otherwise. Also, the system requires that teacher performance be judged in part based on a 40-minute (precisely) video of their teaching. In addition, the directions received by teachers to prepare the portfolio cause one to wonder whether their very detail makes them daunting for some teachers. The OECD Review Team perceived that teachers who were to submit portfolios dreaded the process; many of the interviewed teachers said that they were unsure of the procedures to be followed, and how their responses to questions would be judged. Finally, many teachers felt that completing the portfolio was far too time-consuming and they were not given release time in school to complete it.

The system relies on the competencies of several central agencies and academic institutions

At the central level, teacher evaluation relies on the competencies of several agencies that co-operate regularly so as to assure the quality of the process. While the Ministry of Education holds the political and management responsibility for teacher evaluation, the technical co-ordination of the process is exercised by CPEIP, which in turn is required to receive independent scientific advice from universities with expertise in the area. In particular, the close association with the *Docentemás* team, located at the Measurement Centre of the Catholic University of Chile, ensures that the system is based on scientific advice as well as national and international research evidence. During the Review visit, a range of stakeholders commented on the efficient central management of the teacher evaluation process. In general, key stakeholders perceived the *Docentemás* team as independent and possessing the strong technical capacity needed to run the teacher performance evaluation system effectively.

The municipal sector has the potential to foster systemic learning on teacher evaluation but the capacity of municipalities is uneven

The management of public schools by the municipalities offers the potential for closer monitoring of teacher evaluation practices than a centralised system would allow while also providing opportunities to recognise local realities and constraints. There appears to be growing awareness and interest among municipalities in these functions. The municipal school sector has the advantage of providing a range of opportunities for enhanced systemic learning on teacher evaluation. Municipalities can play a key role in supporting the creation of networks among schools, allowing both school leaders and teachers to meet with their peers from schools in the municipality. However, it appears that there are large variations in the extent to which municipalities have the capacity to fulfil their roles in teacher evaluation effectively, namely heading the Municipal Evaluation Commissions of the *Docentemás* system and ensuring the follow-up with teachers who perform poorly in the evaluation.

Recent emphasis on school leadership strengthens evaluation culture at the school level but there is still little tradition of pedagogical leadership

Over the last years, the Ministry of Education has made the improvement of school leadership an important policy priority. This is reflected in a whole range of recent initiatives – incentives to attract good candidates, more autonomy and accountability for school leaders, investment in school leadership development-, which have the potential to contribute to more effective teacher evaluation processes in schools. However, a range of concerns remain about whether school leaders have the competencies necessary to lead the effective implementation of teacher evaluation at the school level. Traditionally, in Chile, school leaders have played more of an administrative and managerial role than a pedagogical leadership role. While recent reforms have given school leaders greater powers and responsibilities, whether they actually take responsibility for the quality of education at the point of delivery depends largely on the motivation and leadership style of individual directors. It appeared to the OECD Review Team that the prevailing culture in Chile is not one in which school leaders are routinely involved in observation of teaching with an evaluative or professional development focus. The introduction of the national *Docentemás* teacher evaluation system could have been used as an opportunity to further engage school leaders in leading the core business of teaching and learning in schools. But, quite the contrary, the current teacher performance evaluation approach marginalises the role of the school leaders.

The high involvement of teachers as evaluators contributes to building ownership but competencies of teachers for evaluation need improvement

One of the strengths of the *Docentemás* teacher evaluation approach is the high involvement of practising teachers as evaluators in two main roles: as markers of teacher portfolios in one of the Assessment centres set up by *Docentemás* in various universities; and as peer evaluators who conduct peer interviews and participate in the Municipality Evaluation Commissions. For both roles, intensive preparation processes have been set up to build the capacity of those selected. The participation of teachers at various stages of the evaluation process contributes to building ownership and evaluation competency among

teachers and may also help them to understand and benefit from their own evaluation to a greater extent. However, there are a number of areas where there is room for improvement of teachers' evaluation competencies. There is much concern about the capacity of teachers to undertake effective self-evaluation. Clearly, there is a general perception in Chile that teachers invariably rate positively their own performance and that the self-evaluations do not reflect differentiated analysis about their own strengths and weaknesses. In part, this may reflect a lack of capacity of teachers to analyse their own strengths and weaknesses accurately. Also, many of the teachers interviewed by the OECD Review Team indicated that they did not fully understand the teacher performance evaluation process. Some mentioned that the language of the instruments was unclear while others pointed out that the standards and criteria in relation to which they were evaluated were not explicit. Moreover, there is little evidence that teachers actually look at the results to plan their further professional development. Another particularly important aspect is that there is little trust in the competencies of portfolio markers among evaluated teachers.

The teacher performance evaluation system is a missed opportunity for strengthening professional development

There appears to be little culture of professional development in Chile. Even though the importance of professional development is recognised at the policy level, the OECD Review Team formed the view that its provision appears fragmented and not systematically linked to teacher evaluation. There is insufficient use of formal teacher evaluation to identify teacher professional development needs which respond to school-wide needs. The teacher performance evaluation system does not provide for a systematic linkage between teacher evaluation results and professional development plans for individual teachers. The exceptions are those cases in which the teacher's performance is identified as *Basic* or *Unsatisfactory*. But even in these cases, the implementation of the mandatory Professional Development Plans is not satisfactory. There is also scope to better link teacher professional development to school development and improvement. In Chile, professional development is predominantly a choice by individual teachers and is not systematically associated with school development needs. When professional development is viewed as an individual and isolated matter, and pursued only as a result of a negative evaluation – and therefore for remedial purposes – an important aspect of professional culture is not available. In Chile, teachers do not necessarily expect to receive feedback on their performance and create a professional growth plan with guidance from an evaluator or school leader.

There are few examples of communities of practice in schools

During its visit, the OECD Review Team saw few examples of communities of practice in schools where teachers can share strategies, observe one another, collaborate on projects, all with the aim of learning from one another. There was little evidence of school-centred professional development that would emphasise the community of learners within the school. Partly because of the time demands of their jobs, but partly because of a culture of privacy and autonomy, teachers have very little opportunity to work collaboratively to plan or reflect on either their teaching or evidence of student learning. This is another example of the subversion of the goal of professional learning for teachers being subsumed into the aim of accountability; unless a school embodies a culture of professional sharing and growth, teachers tend to work in their own isolated “silos” with no meaningful interaction with one another.

Teacher evaluation is used as a basis for recognition and celebration of a teacher's work but the incentive system is complex and fragmented

In Chile, teacher evaluation fulfils the important function of recognising and celebrating the work of effective teachers. This is accomplished, in particular, through AEP and the AVDI, which mostly consist of monetary rewards for excellence in teaching. These are instrumental in retaining effective teachers in schools as well as in making teaching an attractive career choice. However, most countries do not directly link teacher evaluation results with teacher pay but, instead, associate teacher evaluation results to the speed of career advancement. This is because the research on the impact of bonus pay on teacher performance is mixed. AEP and AVDI are part of a larger set of salary allowances that, in addition to the basic salary, form the teacher incentive programme. It seems that the various salary allowances were created at different times for different reasons, but such a scattered approach dilutes the focus on identifying and rewarding Chile's best teachers. They result in a rather complex and fragmented system of incentives for teachers.

Ineffective teaching is addressed by the teacher performance evaluation system

The teacher performance evaluation system has been designed to deal with ineffective teachers. An *Unsatisfactory* or a *Basic* rating require teachers to participate in professional development activities specifically designed to address the weaknesses identified through the performance evaluation. It is entirely appropriate to systematically support teachers in their developmental needs. Otherwise, this causes difficulties not only for schools and the general teaching force, but also for the poorly performing teachers themselves. Hence, in Chile, the initial focus is on regular, ongoing teacher evaluation providing constructive feedback to teachers on their performance, and jointly identifying appropriate developmental strategies. In addition, *Docentemás* is designed to deal with the most critical cases of sustained underperformance in municipal schools. As of 2011, two consecutive *Unsatisfactory* ratings imply the removal of the concerned teacher from the post. It is a strength of the system that if improvements do not occur, processes exist to move ineffective teachers either out of the school system or into non-teaching roles.

There is no relationship between teacher evaluation and career advancement

Presently teacher evaluation is not embedded in a clearly defined teaching career structure. Teacher evaluation happens as a matter of course every four years, rather than being part of a system of continuous progression in a teaching career which recognises that teachers acquire new competencies and skills as they gain experience. As a result, the teacher performance evaluation system does not provide a means to reward teachers for the gained competencies and skills to take on higher responsibilities, i.e. the results of teacher evaluation have little bearing on teachers' careers, since results are not associated with career advancement and are not necessarily considered for promotion. This is problematic as the recognition of gained skills and competencies should come along with the ability to take on further responsibilities defined in a career structure.

Policy recommendations

Develop a medium term vision

Chile has made remarkable progress in implementing teacher evaluation and developing an evaluation culture among the teaching workforce. An impressive capacity was accumulated in developing instruments, preparing guidance materials, marking instruments, designing information systems, and reporting results. Although the development of teacher evaluation requires adjustments, it is important not to lose the ground that has been gained. In the medium term, the approach to teacher evaluation which holds greatest promise of sustained high impact on student learning is one where teachers engage in authentic reflective practice, study their own practices, and share their experience with their peers as a routine part of professional life. The developmental (or improvement) function of teacher evaluation whereby the results of evaluations are used to inform the professional development of teachers and foster the professional dialogue among school actors around teaching practices is yet to receive proper attention.

Consolidate the Good Teaching Framework as the main pillar for teacher evaluation and development

The Good Teaching Framework should be consolidated as the main pillar to guide teacher evaluation and development. Efforts should go into its further improvement through clear feedback mechanisms involving teachers, education experts, municipal education authorities and units in charge of teacher evaluation. Teaching standards need to be continuously informed by research and express the sophistication and complexity of what effective teachers are expected to know and be able to do. Periodical revisions to the standards should be undertaken to ensure they remain relevant and aligned with other elements of the system. Also, further work needs to be undertaken to ensure the Good Teaching Framework contains the relevant criteria and indicators and that these are adequately aligned with the evaluation instruments. Furthermore, it is fundamental to embed the teaching standards in teachers' everyday work in the classroom. Extensive socialisation of standards at several stages of teachers' careers such as initial teacher education and the early years in the profession is needed and should preferably involve training for in-service teachers on the use of standards and their implications for classroom practice.

Embed evaluation for teacher development and improvement in regular school practice

There needs to be a stronger emphasis on teacher evaluation for improvement purposes (i.e. developmental evaluation). Given that there are risks that the developmental function is hampered by high-stakes teacher evaluation (to take the form of a certification process as suggested below), it is proposed that a component predominantly dedicated to developmental evaluation, fully internal to the school, be created. This developmental evaluation would have as its main purpose the continuous improvement of teaching practices in the school. It would be an internal process carried out by line managers, senior peers, and the school leadership. The reference standards would be the Good Teaching Framework but with evaluation rubrics developed at the school level to better account for the school objectives and context. The main outcome

would be feedback on teaching performance and the whole contribution of the teacher to school development which would lead to a plan for professional development. It can be low-key and low-cost, and include self-evaluation (possibly through the preparation of a portfolio), classroom observation, and structured conversations and regular feedback by the leadership and experienced peers. School-based teacher developmental evaluation could be conceived as part of a framework defined at the municipal level. Municipal education authorities could develop such framework in consultation with school directors and experienced teachers. The framework could define general principles for the operation of procedures while allowing flexibility of approach at the school level within the agreed parameters to better meet local needs. In order to guarantee the systematic and coherent application of developmental evaluation across Chilean schools, it would be important to undertake the external validation of the respective school processes for developmental teacher evaluation. An option is that the Quality of Education Agency, in its monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning in individual schools, includes the audit of the processes in place to organise developmental teacher evaluation, holding the school director accountable as necessary.

Create a teacher career structure with distinct pathways and salary steps

Schools and teachers could benefit from a career structure for teachers that comprised (say) three career pathways: competent teacher; established teacher, and accomplished/expert teacher. The different career pathways should be associated with distinct roles and responsibilities in schools in relation to given levels of teaching expertise. For instance, an established teacher could assume responsibility for the mentoring of beginning teachers and an expert teacher could take responsibility for the co-ordination of professional development in the school. Access to each of the career pathways should be voluntary and be associated with formal processes of evaluation through a system of teacher certification, as proposed below. Also, each of the career pathways should be organised according to steps indicating a clear salary progression. A teacher who would like to remain in the classroom and not assume new responsibilities should be given the opportunity to progress within the “competent teacher” or the “established teacher” career paths. Such progression within career paths should also be regulated through a process of teacher certification. This recommendation supports the current government plans to introduce a new career structure for teachers in the municipal school sector. An important objective should be to align expectations of skills and competencies at different stages of the career (as reflected in teaching standards) and the responsibilities of teachers in schools (as reflected in career structures). This would strengthen the incentive for teachers to improve their competencies, and reinforce the matching between teachers’ levels of competence and the roles which need to be performed in schools to improve student learning.

Set up a system of teacher certification to determine career progression, which includes entrance requirements and a probationary period

The summative (or accountability) function of teacher evaluation that is currently being achieved through the *Docentemás* system, the AVDI and the AEP could be brought together into a single process of teacher evaluation for career progression through a certification process associated with the teacher career structure suggested above – with

progression within career paths and access to distinct career paths. This would formalise the principle of advancement on merit associated with career opportunities for effective teachers. The reward dimension would be captured through faster career advancement (leading to a higher salary) rather than a salary bonus (as is currently the case with the AVDI and the AEP). Each permanent teacher in the system would be required to periodically (say every four years) be the subject of a formal evaluation for certification (or re-certification). The purpose would be to certify teachers periodically as fit for the profession. The evaluation would also influence the speed at which the teacher progresses within a career pathway (e.g. if outstanding, the teacher would progress two salary steps at once; if competent, the teacher would progress one salary step (the “regular” step); and if unsatisfactory, the teacher would remain in the same salary step). Once teachers meet certain requirements (related to experience and performance), they could also voluntarily request a formal evaluation to access a new career path (as “established” or “accomplished/expert” teacher). Both the evaluations for certification (or career progression) and to access a new career path, which are more summative in nature, need to have a strong component external to the school and more formal processes. These processes could be governed by an accredited commission organised by the Quality of Education Agency. Such commissions could be formed by distinguished teachers and recognised school leaders as well as representatives of municipal education authorities. The evaluators would need to receive proper training and be accredited by the Quality of Education Agency. The evaluation of a given teacher should also be informed by the input by the respective school director. As the opening step in the certification process, and as long as there are concerns about the quality of initial teacher education programmes, an entry examination to identify candidates fit to enter the teaching profession should be organised. The current initiative of introducing the initial pedagogical excellence examination is positive and can help ensure some quality control of initial teacher education programmes (in the absence of a robust quality accreditation system in higher education). Also, a formal probationary process for new teachers should be introduced, alongside induction processes for beginning teachers.

Integrate, to some degree, the private school sector in the teacher evaluation framework

In spite of the existence of teacher evaluation practices in private schools, there is limited guarantee that those practices are aligned with the national student learning objectives. This is debatable in light of the fact that most of these teachers work in private schools which receive public funds, most of which at levels similar to those received by municipal schools. The receipt of public funds provides a strong case for private subsidised schools to be integrated, to some degree, in the teacher evaluation framework. There are a range of possible approaches to integrate the private school sector in the overall teacher evaluation framework. One possibility is to require private schools to comply with the approaches followed within the teacher evaluation framework. This would mean requiring teachers in private schools to undertake the same evaluations as municipal teachers. Another possibility is for the private sector to be part of protocol agreements which specify general principles for the operation of teacher evaluation while allowing flexibility of approach within the agreed parameters. The Quality of Education Agency could then audit whether private schools are complying with the agreement. This should include the validation of internal processes for teacher evaluation in private schools.

Give the Quality of Education Agency a prominent role in supporting teacher evaluation

A priority for the Quality of Education Agency should be to emphasise the developmental function of evaluation and assessment and reflect on the best ways for evaluation and assessment activities to improve student learning. This would avoid the risk that evaluation and assessment are perceived mostly as instruments to hold school agents accountable, to “control” and assess compliance with regulations. This requires communicating the idea that the ultimate objective of evaluation and assessment is to improve students’ learning and teachers’ teaching. It also entails establishing strategies to strengthen the linkages to classroom practice, where the improvement of student learning takes place. The more specific role of the Agency in teacher evaluation could be considerable. First, the Agency is in a good position to undertake the external audit of school-based teacher evaluation procedures. Second, another key role should be the accreditation of external evaluators involved in teacher evaluation for certification. Third, the Agency should have an important role in supporting agents in the implementation of teacher evaluation procedures. This includes supporting municipal authorities in the development of their capacity for educational evaluation (e.g. for designing frameworks for teacher evaluation), giving feedback to schools on how they can improve their internal approaches to teacher evaluation (in the context of school evaluation), and developing functions such as school leadership and the monitoring of teaching and learning which directly influence teacher evaluation. Fourth, the Agency should have an eminent role in modelling, identifying and disseminating good practice in teacher evaluation and in using relevant research to improve evaluation practices. This requires the Agency to acquire a strong technical capacity. Finally, another major function of the Quality of Education Agency is to articulate the different components of the evaluation and assessment framework, including between teacher evaluation and school evaluation.

Update the Good Teaching Framework and improve its understanding by the relevant parties

It would be important for the Ministry of Education to examine recent research on teaching practice and determine whether the GTF should be slightly revised. One important aspect of this matter concerns the evidence, from classrooms, of student active engagement in learning. The GTF could better take into account the active role that students play in the classroom. Another area which could be better reflected in the GTF is the use of formative assessment in the instructional process. Whether revised in light of recent research or not, the GTF should serve as the nation’s agreed-upon definition of teaching, informing all the efforts to describe and strengthen practice. Therefore, the GTF must inform programmes of teacher preparation, to ensure that when teachers enter the profession they already understand what is important for them to know and be able to do. Furthermore, if the GTF is to be embedded into professional conversations across the country, it needs to become the language of instruction throughout the nation’s schools.

Link teaching standards with evaluation instruments

A simple “crosswalk” between the evaluation instruments and the GTF, provided in table form, would help teachers understand both the evaluation criteria and the requirements for the instruments. Furthermore, it would, at least implicitly, help teachers understand how their submissions will be evaluated, and what, therefore, comprises a

submission of high quality. Such a crosswalk almost certainly exists, since it must have formed the foundation of the original design of the evaluation system. Hence it is recommended that the alignment between the evaluation instruments and the criteria of the GTF be made known to teachers.

Firmly root all evaluation in classroom observation and rethink the mix of instruments for both career progression and developmental evaluation

A key decision is the mix of instruments to use in teacher evaluation. The experience with the diverse instruments used in *Docentemás* is a good basis for further development. Vast expertise has been developed in the design and use of the instruments across the municipal school system in the implementation of *Docentemás*, which is not to be lost. A priority should be to give vast prominence to those instruments better capturing the quality of teachers' practices in the classroom and which are richer to inform the improvement of teaching practices. As a result, teacher evaluation should be firmly rooted in classroom observation. Most key aspects of teaching are displayed while teachers interact with their students in the classroom. Other instruments that can be used to capture teachers' actual classroom practices include: self-evaluation, teacher portfolios, evidence of student learning and interviews. Teacher evaluation should involve an opportunity for teachers to express their own views about their performance, and reflect on the personal, organisational and institutional factors that had an impact on their teaching, through a self-evaluation instrument. A portfolio could be used in both summative and formative contexts. For summative purposes, a portfolio should require teachers to mention specific ways in which they consider that their professional practices are promoting student learning, and could include elements such as: lesson plans and teaching materials, samples of student work and commentaries on student assessment examples, teacher's self-reported questionnaires and reflection sheets. For formative purposes, teachers could develop a simplified but well-structured portfolio with specific evidence about key aspects of their teaching. The main objective is that the portfolio plays a role in supporting a reflective approach to teaching practice. Also, the OECD Review Team considers that at this stage it is premature to use student standardised assessment results as direct measures to evaluate the performance of individual teachers. Student results are fundamental, but given the current limitations of value-added models, they are more relevant for whole-school evaluation than for individual teacher performance evaluation. In addition, Chile does not yet have in place the necessary pre-requisites to engage in the measurement of individual teachers' contributions to student learning growth.

Design the portfolio requirements in such a way that the contents represent more of a "natural harvest" of teachers' everyday practice

A priority should be for teacher evaluation to draw on instruments which capture more authentic teaching practices. In this way, portfolios could be designed to reflect what can be called a "natural harvest" of the teacher's work. Hence, the planning documents describe a unit or lesson that the teacher is actually teaching; the video, and accompanying commentary, are of a lesson the teacher is doing with his or her class. This feature of "natural harvest" results in the entire requirement feeling far less burdensome to teachers than would be the case if it were perceived as an add-on to their normal responsibilities. While portfolios for developmental purposes should only involve a

qualitative assessment, portfolios for career progression require clarity about how each GTF criterion will be scored on the basis of the different elements of the portfolio. Regarding the latter, teachers should also receive comprehensive instructions, possibly with some support at the school level to complete their portfolios. Teachers also need to be given the necessary release time to complete their portfolios.

Make the peer interview more meaningful and use the third-party reference report to link developmental to career progression evaluation

In the peer interview, a better approach would be to give teachers access to the rubrics, and ask them to describe a specific instance in which they achieved the different elements. This approach would help teachers be more reflective, and would contribute to their professional development. Also, the peer interview does not involve any professional dialogue between the teacher and his or her peer, which eliminates the possibility of feedback for the improvement of practice. A more interactive and open discussion around professional practice would greatly improve the meaningfulness of the peer interview. It is also suggested that the peer interview is combined with classroom observation – in both the cases of career-progression teacher evaluation and developmental evaluation. The objective is to establish a professional dialogue between peers which includes the information generated by the direct observation of practice. In the context of career-progression evaluation it might be combined with a discussion of general practice while in the context of developmental evaluation it should generate an open and frank discussion about the strengths and weaknesses identified by the evaluator. In career-progression teacher evaluation it is important to ensure that the views and perspectives of an evaluator familiar with the teacher's school context are also given consideration. This is ideally carried out in a third-party reference report by the leadership of the teacher's school. This would provide a link between developmental evaluation and career-progression evaluation as school leaders (directors and heads of technical-pedagogical units) would use information from the internal developmental evaluations as an input to prepare their third-party reference reports.

Ensure consistently high-quality preparation for portfolio markers

Given the lack of trust of some teachers in the marking of their portfolios, a review of the processes for selecting and preparing the markers should be considered. One option to ensure that all markers across Chile are qualified according to the same standards (and perceived as such) would be to establish an accreditation/certification process in which markers would have to pass an assessment to prove their marking competencies. Another important element in ensuring the quality of marking would be to systematically use moderation processes where more than one marker agrees on a teacher's rating – for instance, two markers could rate each of the assessed portfolios.

Strengthen the professional competencies of municipal education staff

Strong municipal leadership is essential to establish teacher evaluation as a priority at the local level and to support schools in using evaluation results for improvement. To foster such leadership, it is important to strengthen the professional competencies of staff working within the municipal education departments and corporations across Chile. To

this end, the Ministry of Education should take a stronger role in promoting strategic partnerships between municipalities and key sources of support. This could include the universities and professional institutes and other potential providers in each region. Rather than expecting each municipality to develop pedagogical support and evaluation strategies on their own, Chile could also consider building larger scale “shared service” approaches offering regional support in evaluation to a larger group of municipalities and schools. This might include coaching and consultancy for groups of municipalities and schools within a region. Finally, given the heterogeneity of competencies and approaches across municipalities, there is much potential for municipalities to work together and learn from each other. The Ministry of Education could help support increased collaboration and networking among the municipal staff responsible for evaluation and pedagogical support in schools. This could be done, for example, through the organisation of meetings or workshops for municipal quality assurance staff.

Build pedagogical leadership capacity and give school leaders a key role in teacher evaluation

Developing a culture of evaluation and improvement of teaching practices is an important aspect of pedagogical leadership. Given their familiarity with the context in which teachers work, their awareness of the school needs and their ability to provide rapid feedback to the teacher, the school director and/or other teachers in the school are well placed to play a more prominent role in teacher evaluation. They are in a good position to complement the national teacher performance evaluation system with more localised approaches based on regular observation of teaching practices and provision of formative feedback in a non-threatening way. For school directors to be able to play such a role, it is important to build their competencies and credibility to develop effective evaluation and coaching arrangements for their staff. School directors need to be equipped to focus thoroughly on the quality of teaching and learning and help set up the trusting work environment necessary to embed a focus on continuous evaluation and improvement in the everyday work of teachers.

Ensure teachers are better prepared to benefit from their evaluation

Ensuring that teachers are provided with support to understand the evaluation procedures and to benefit from evaluation results is also vitally important. Teachers can benefit from training modules that help them understand what is expected of them and how to make best use of the feedback provided. Such learning should be offered both in initial teacher education and continuous professional development. Also, there needs to be better connections between initial teacher education and teacher evaluation, including with the alignment between the *Docentemás* system and the content of initial teacher education and the establishment of better feedback loops between the *Docentemás* system and initial teacher education.

Improve linkages of teacher evaluation to professional development and secure linkages to school development

Professional development is only fully effective when it is aligned with recognised needs, for both individual teachers and for schools as a whole. Professional development in Chile appears at the moment to be a matter for individual teachers to pursue and it is to

a great extent de-coupled from the results of the teacher performance evaluation system. This situation can and should be improved. Linking professional growth opportunities to evaluation results is critical if evaluation is going to play a role in improving teaching and learning. Chile does not have a system in place to ensure that the feedback provided to teachers is systematically used to guide improvement plans. At the same time, the linkages between teacher evaluation, professional development and school improvement need to be reinforced. Professional development informed by teacher evaluation needs to be associated with school development if the improvement of teaching practices is to meet school needs. Schools can learn from the strengths of effective teachers and implement professional development programmes that respond to their weaknesses.

Use non-monetary and group rewards as complementary tools to recognise teachers

Establishing linkages between teacher evaluation and career advancement, as suggested above, provides an indirect link between teacher performance levels and pay. By contrast, initiatives such as the AVDI and the AEP programmes, establish a direct link between performance levels and pay through monetary rewards. In countries such as Chile, where the basic salary of teachers is modest, bonuses of this type are always welcome. However, the “bonus” pay element should be approached with considerable caution. The evidence of the overall impact of such extra payments is mixed and can be contentious and potentially divisive. Rewarding teachers with time allowances, sabbatical periods, opportunities for school-based research, support for post-graduate study, or opportunities for professional development could be more appealing for many teachers. This is particularly the case if the resources currently devoted to the AEP and the AVDI are transferred to the overall performance-based professional career ladder proposed above. Besides, the “excellence” dimension of these programmes would be captured by career advancement within and access to the different career pathways. Also, in some circumstances it may be more effective to focus on group recognition and rewards at the school or grade level rather than individual teacher rewards. This gives support to retaining SNED as a mechanism to reward groups of teachers.