

5.0. Introduction

The 86 amendments included elementary education in Right to Live by inserting it in article 21. It brought out The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 which came on force from 1st April 2010 in Gujarat. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA, 2001) now Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan has been implemented with three major goals i.e., 100% enrolment, ensuring retention and enhancing quality. In the present time, the improvement of quality is one of the major focuses of primary education. It has been observed that Infrastructural facilities, administration, academic & non-academic achievements, teaching –learning process etc. are all indicators of quality of a school. It is without doubt that the quality of the teaching- learning process is the soul of the education system. Effective and efficient teachers play a vital role in quality education because the standard of education to a large extent is determined by teachers. To achieve quality in education, to develop competencies of teachers and for achieving the goals of education, there should be a system to evaluate the teachers' work. The effectiveness of a teacher's work can be measured and they can be guided to develop their potential. It is therefore necessary to carry out the evaluation of teachers in order to sustain the quality in education.

5.1. Policy Perspectives

According to Secondary Education Commission (1952-1953), in order to evaluate the academic side of activities of a school there should be a panel of experts with the Inspector as Chairman to inspect the schools. Special Inspectors or panels of Inspectors should be appointed to inspect the teaching of special subjects like Domestic Science, Art, Music, etc. The National policy on Education (1986) laid stress on performance and accountability at all levels. It strongly advocated the need for a more reliable and opens system of teacher appraisal to link teacher's performance with accountability.

NCF (2000) recommended to design an institutional appraisal system for institutions to ensure effective curriculum transaction and overall improvement in educational scenario by implementing gradation system. Gradation system must ensure some kind of uniformity in standards. Therefore, all school headmasters and principals have the role of manager, facilitator. They have to be suitably trained too. National Curriculum

Framework (2005) also stated that the monitoring system put in place must be carefully analysed in relation to its objectives and the norms and practices that are to be institutionalized to achieve objectives. It must provide for sustained interaction within individual schools in terms of teaching- learning processes within the classroom context. According to NEP (2020), “All aspects of teacher career management, including tenure, professional development efforts, salary increases, promotions, and other recognitions will be determined based on NPST. Promotions and salary increases will not occur based on the length of tenure or seniority, but only on the basis of such appraisal (NEP, 2020).”

5.2. The Need for Teacher Evaluation

There is a quest for quality in all sorts of elementary schools. Under the flagship of Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan, attempts are going on to improve the standard of elementary education. Yet, it was found in ASER (2019) report that 10.6% of grade 2 students, 53.7% of grade 5 students, 73.2 of grade 8 students can only read the textbook of std 2 level. “Among children in Std III, 5.8% cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 26.1% can recognize numbers up to 9 but cannot recognize numbers up to 99 or higher, 42.5% can recognize numbers up to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 23.3% can do subtraction but cannot do division, and 2.3% can do division” ASER (2019).

“A school which has an adequate number of teachers who are neither empowered nor professionally qualified are not committed to be basic ideas of the profession with low morale and self-esteem are likely to do more damage than good to students” (Nawami, 2008). According to PROBE (1999) “the DIETs (District Institute of Education & Training) also fail to give hands- on training. They were meant to work with local schools and develop them as models where good teaching could be demonstrated.” “There is no demonstration of good model teaching” PROBE (1999). In-service training programme according to the survey found “little evidence of impact of the training on classroom process. In the remote area the problem of absenteeism, late coming and less attendance were high. This happens partially because of their engagement in non-teaching activities.” The PROBE survey came upon many instances wherever a component of negligence conjointly occurred. These embody several cases of irresponsible teachers keeping a school closed or non-functional for months at a time and teachers being drunk. The teachers’ major focus was to pass the students in exam through rote memorizing. The teacher’s major concentration is simply chasing

government target, that is reflected on paper work; but is not completely a reality. Govinda & Bandyopadhyay (2008) found poor quality of teaching learning processes in many schools that consequence in low levels of basic skill achievement, i.e., reading, writing and arithmetic which is often after attending five or even at eight years of schooling. All these need evaluations of performance of the teacher to correct it and guide them properly. Therefore, teacher evaluation is an important part in schools.

Effective teacher evaluation pay attention on actual teacher and their performance and accomplishment. According to Peterson & Peterson (2006), “It recognizes student achievement, acknowledges good practice, support teacher goal, shape performance, motivates to improve on weakness and removes the rare bad teacher from the profession.” Excellence of teacher performance deserves documentation as it provides basis for research, development and reform in school instead of having agenda for charge driven by non-teacher dialogues. Successful system uses multiple classroom observations, expert evaluators, multiple sources of data are timely and provide meaningful feedback to the teacher (Darling-Hamond, Amerein-Beardsley & Haertel et.al., (2012).

So, for improvement of the teaching standards, a more supportive work environment and enhanced accountability of the teachers are required. Because “the public has come to believe that the key to educational improvement lies in upgrading the quality of teachers rather than in changing school structure or curriculum” Darling-Hamond, Wise & Pease (1983). **Zarro (2005)** study strongly supported the concept that quality professional development and a healthy school culture are catalysts for improving classroom instruction and student learning. Therefore, major concentration should be on the continuous development of the teachers. According to Denielson & McGreal (2000) “teachers tend to know where their areas of strength and relative weakness lie and are keen to bring all areas of their practice to higher levels. The evaluation of the performance of teachers would go a long way to achieve the goal.” According to National policy on Education (NPE,1986) “professional improvement and career enhancement depending on performance evaluation of teachers should be addressed on a continuous basis. Through the help of feedback, teachers know the best practice and drawback, hindrances as well as the way of improvement can be identified. Performance evaluation makes the teacher conscious about their work, outcome, and mistakes and get guidance how to reach at the destination. This makes them accountable. It also provides an opportunity to appraise the performance of teacher. In

short, through continuous engagement of teacher in updating knowledge, skill acquisition and refinement to practice, students' learning need can be met effectively. So, teacher evaluation is needed for self-discovery for improvement of quality of education and development of healthy culture of learning.

5.3. Evaluation: Meaning and Concept

Oxford Dictionary & Thesaurus (2001) gives meaning of evaluate as appraise, assess, estimate, judge, value, colloquial weigh up, calculate value of, compute work out.

Darling-Hammond & et.al (1983) define evaluation as "collecting and using information to judge."

Evaluation is a methodical way of assembling, ordering and making judgments about information. It proves that something is working or needed to improve. It involves careful judgement about the work and its significance.

5.4. Teacher Evaluation: Meaning and Concept

According to Smith, (2006) "Teacher Evaluation is the systematic exploration and judgement of working processes, experiences and outcomes. It pays special attention to aims, values, perceptions, needs and resources."

According to Kocak (2006) "Performance evaluation is a process of measurement and appraisal of employee's individual achievement and behaviour that is performed in certain interval."

Bambewale & et.al. (2018) has stated that "Teacher evaluation is a continuous process to understand teachers; knowledge, skills and attitudes in order to take actionable steps for teaching and learning improvement."

Evaluation entails gathering, ordering and making judgments about information in a methodical way. It involves careful judgement about the work, and its significance. "The evaluation system involves direct inspection of teachers' work- monitoring lesson plans, classroom performance, and performance results; the school administrator is seen as the teachers' supervisor" (Darling-Hamond, Wise & Pease, 1983). Evaluation is an integral part of staff development because with the help of teacher evaluation, teachers' performance level, problems, good practices can be identified and treated accordingly. The concept of teacher evaluation gives way for the important purposes of teacher evaluation which have been described below.

5.5. Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

Santiago & Benavides (2009) “Teacher evaluation has typically two major purposes. First, it seeks to improve the teacher own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development – *the improvement function*. Second, it is aimed at ensuring that teachers perform at their best to enhance student learning – *the accountability function*.”

According to Gage (1961) the purpose is to facilitate administrative decisions; to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in order to allow for self -improvement; to provide certain criteria for determining what good teaching is.

To clarify the concept of Teacher evaluation three terms i.e., detecting teacher incompetence, preventing incompetency and correcting deficiencies explained by Darling-Hamond, Wise & Pease (1983) become helpful. They stated that “detecting teacher incompetence involves the development and careful application of reliable, generalizable measures of teaching knowledge or behavior. Preventing incompetency implies the development of either a full-proof approach to teacher training or a teacher proof approach to instruction. Correcting deficiencies seem approachable objective however; this is the point at which research on teaching effectiveness leaves off and where summative and formative evaluations collide.” So, the major purposes of teacher evaluation are accountability, remedy, maintenance and development.

5.6. Types of Teacher Evaluation

The purpose of teacher evaluation can be met by two kinds of evaluation i.e. formative teacher evaluation and summative teacher evaluation.

Formative Teacher Evaluation

Formative evaluation is a system of feedback for teachers that are designed to help them improve on an ongoing basis. Egelson & MacColsky (1998) It is not extremely controlled and judgmental but teacher directed, individualized, and supportive for personal growth. The purposes of formative evaluation are to provide day to day feedback and to encourage the teachers for professional development as there is a close connection between behavior and feedback. It also aims to encourage quickly a good desirable behavior, discouraging undesirable behavior immediately so attention is paid to apply own competencies towards the correct direction.

Summative Teacher Evaluation

“Summative evaluation is a system of feedback for teacher that is designed to measure their teaching competencies” Egelson & MacClosky (1998). The summative evaluation of teacher is the assessment of performance based on clear set of performance standards at the end of the established period. It tends to judge job performance and job status.

Summative evaluation is usually done annually on a formalized basis and involves evaluatee and evaluator to measure individual performance for the progress of an organization. It helps to take administrative decisions about tenure and merit paying, personnel assignment, transfer, dismissal and ensuring recruitment procedure. This type of evaluation is useful to search shortfalls/ constraints and to evaluate present steps which are taken for quality of education and plan future actions. This way institute gets opportunity to identify both kind of the teachers i.e., effective teacher and teachers who need to have professional development remedial plan. “When coupled; formative and summative evaluation can be powerful tools for informing decision about teachers’ professional development opportunities as well as tenure.” Mathers, Oliva & Laina (2008).

In order to carry out either formative evaluation or summative evaluation in elementary schools’ different sources are required to be followed. The methods are given below.

5.7. Source of Teacher Evaluation

The major Sources of teacher evaluation are as follows

Teacher self-evaluation

The perspective of the teacher being evaluated is essential, because it allows teachers to express their own views about their performance, and reflect on the personal, organizational and institutional factors that had an impact on their teaching. Barrette, Morton & Tozecu (1995) states that “self- evaluation can be accomplished through such methods as self- reports, self- study materials. Self- rating forms, comparison of oneself to one’s peers and videotaping and analysing one’s teaching”. “The self-report practice may take in form of survey, instructional log and interview” Goe & Bell (2009).

Classroom Observation

This is a common practice executed by a superior Teaching practices and proof of student learning area unit possible to be the foremost relevant sources of data regarding skilled performance. As a result, classroom observation is typically as vital as a root in teacher evaluation. Classroom observation is used both summatively and formatively.

Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance

Students are the direct observer of teacher's behaviour and routine teaching process and therefore they are in a good position to evaluate their teacher's performance. Danielson, (2000) states student survey must be appropriate to the age of the students and should ask questions about the class, rather than about the teachers." This evaluation includes the most observable teaching habits of teachers in classroom situations to the personal attributes encompassing communication styles, attitudes, competencies, behaviour and other character tendency observable in a teacher.

Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation is commonly done through classroom observation, visiting another teacher's class for actual teaching assessment. The peer evaluation provides more constructive feedback for the improvement of teachers' performance. This encourages idea/ experience sharing and establish fear free environment due to peer as evaluator. "On the negative side, this method may have low reliability; may involve a conflict of interest resulting in biased reviews, especially if results are used for summative purposes; and criteria are sometimes open to various interpretation and may have fear of damaging relationship" Barrette, Morton, & Tozecu (1995).

Parents Survey

Parents are also a source of data for teacher evaluation. According to Danielson (2000) "Parents surveys should pose questions that parents can reasonably answer and should not be excessively detailed. They could comment on whether the teacher was accessible to them when they needed to contact that teacher or whether the teacher returned phone calls promptly." This can be helpful to understand community communication of teachers and which ultimately help teachers in child learning.

Teaching Artifact

According to Denielson (2000), "When teaching artifacts are included in a system for evaluation, they provide a window into classroom life not accessible through planning

documents alone. Teacher artifacts considers “lesson plans, teacher assignments, assessments, scoring rubrics, student work and other artifacts to determine the quality of instruction in a classroom” Little, Goe & Bell (2009).

Performance Standards of Teacher Evaluation

Performance standards are criteria followed by indicators which are expected when teacher perform their major duties based on clearly defined their role. Major standards of teacher evaluation cover area such as content mastery, teaching method & techniques, classroom, management, rapport with students, school staff and parents, assessment of students, personal traits and professional development. All these can reflect in teachers’ performance when the teacher internalizes professional ethics and take responsibility and show positive attitude towards professional development.

Performance Evaluation for Teachers and Administrators, (2010), (Arnold, Bain & et.al, 2011) mentioned the standards such as knowledge of curriculum, designing instruction planning, instructional delivery, implementation of technology, classroom management, assessment of/ for student learning, student academic progress, collaboration with colleagues/parents/others, professionalism & professional development, educational leadership. Danielson(2013) gave rubrics for assessment of teachers in four domains. On the basis of these, performances of teachers are evaluated. Teachers must be communicated these criteria/standards before evaluation procedure. Then only good result can be expected. These are the standards are that schools expect from the teachers.

5.8. Guidelines for Successful Teacher Evaluation

For the successful teacher evaluation, the role of teachers as well as evaluators are equally important who carry out the procedure. Donaldson, Morgan & Donaldson (2012) gave five steps to stronger teacher evaluation considering leadership.

Step 1: Teacher ‘s Involvement in Designing the Performance Evaluation System.

Leung & Sun (2009) also support that teachers’ participation in decision making of school, policies should be perceived as the essential pathway to professional development. So, teachers or their suggestions should be involved in designing the performance evaluation system.

Step 2: Protect opportunities to learn and grow.

The study of Musser, (2013) teacher evaluation empowers teachers to assess their own practice; self-diagnose areas for growth and generate goals through a continuous process of feedback, conversation and support. When a teacher and administrator identify a skill that needs developing, professional development environment must be flexible enough to support the teacher's pursuit of that skill. For that feedback and sharing knowledge should be done

Step 3: Hone Principals' Skill at Observing and Consulting with Teachers.

The teacher evaluator should have the potential to evaluate the teachers. For that the following qualities must be possessed. The principal should possess a sound knowledge of pedagogy and curriculum, teacher evaluation methods and procedures and have consulting skills to deliver feedback that teachers find both valid and constructive.

Step 4: Make Instructional Improvement a Priority.

When a leader clearly and persistently pursues assessment and growth for every staff member, teachers stay focused on their own growth, as well as their students' growth. Funding for teacher development should not be cut. And believe that "all teachers can learn". Policy Report of North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process (2009) reflects that formation and accurately reflects the teacher's performance.

Step 5: Build Time for Teacher Evaluation into Principals' Workload

Principal should give proper time and distribute workload with supervisors. Teachers whose performance has raised serious questions and novice teachers are evaluated primarily by administrators.

Accountability

In the school, principal must become quality control officer and create climate for accountability of his/her teacher. For that following two things must be clarified to teachers.

Role and Goal Clarity

This is the very first clarity one must have when appointed for the job. The teacher must have clarification of the role to perform and the goal to achieve. So, teacher is not confused ambiguous and have a clear vision what to do. Teachers are also informed the

objectives to achieve in the present year. So, he/she chases the objectives. Objectives of teacher evaluation must be stated clearly and shortly.

Standard/ criteria of teacher evaluation

For the performance evaluation of teacher, there must be a clear set of standard/ criteria/rubrics developed. The school authority should communicate these at the commencement of the year on which his or her performance is going to be evaluated.

Teacher Evaluation Culture

The school should have a positive culture of teacher evaluation. The study of McKay (1998) revealed that there is need of attention on school culture for the development of teacher evaluation practice and the study of Wissam (2005) revealed that “the principal has the potential to change the culture of school to reduce isolation, create communities of professional learner and elevate the status of the teachers”. For that there are some prerequisites such as teacher should be acquainted with the purpose of the teacher evaluation and fair evaluation.

Follow up work

Teacher evaluation should be a continuous process of evaluation and re-evaluation and development. After evaluation, there must be follow up work done by the teacher evaluator. There should be a session of guidance and training for further development of professional competencies to come right back on track.

Training of Teacher Evaluator

Policy Report of North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process (2009) also recommended evaluator to participate in training to understand and implement the teacher evaluation process. Training helps evaluator to develop requisite skills for identification and assistance, and divide the role of assistance and summative judgment.

Report of Teacher Evaluation

At the end of the academic session, report of individual teacher should be prepared in which the achieved set of standards as well as remaining standards to be achieved should be clearly mentioned. It is on the basis of evaluator’s primary observation estimation and also summary of other objective data collected from various resources.

At the end of report, clear recommendation for summative evaluation should be made.

Teacher Evaluation: Present Scenario

Various schools have their own methods of teacher evaluation. At the present various teacher evaluation activities are carried out in elementary education in Gujarat. The implementation of Gunotsav is an important programme which was introduced in 2009 in the jilla panchayat schools, Ashram Shala schools and Eklavy Model Residential Schools. The purpose of this program was to bring about qualitative improvement in academic and administrative activities. Now from 2019-2020 academic year, a new version called Gunotsav 2.0 has been introduced once in every semester. There are qualified School Inspectors (SI) who are appointed for Gunotsav 2.0.

Besides these, inspection is a common practice in central as well as state government and some private schools. It is conducted regularly every year.

For monitoring and supervision, there is SSA staff. At the CRC level, the CRC coordinator visits schools and fills the observation forms online. At the block level the BRC coordinators and BRPs evaluate the teachers to monitor quality of education. Besides these, there was also Teacher trainers and pedagogy coordinators who randomly visit the school to observe the implementation and effectiveness of training. The duty of SSA officials is to provide guidance to the teachers and monitor the implementation of government programs, training and practice in school on a regular basis.

Various private and government schools have their own method of teacher evaluation which could be of summative and formative type and include different methods of evaluation. Classroom observation by the principal is a commonly practiced for formative sevaluation in the elementary schools of Gujarat. Besides principals, the school where vice principals and supervisors are appointed, they also have responsibility to observe the class for quality enhancement.

5.9. Rationale of the study

The Universalization of elementary education has always stressed on three major goals i.e., access, retention and quality of education. The RTE Act 2009 has also emphasized on quality of education. The 6th goal of the Dakar framework includes commitment to improve “every aspect of the quality of education and ensuring their excellence so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy,

numeracy and essential life skill” Dakar Framework for action (2000). The quality of elementary education must be strengthened as it is the foundation for quality higher education.

Besides the infrastructure, administration, organizational climate; students’ achievement and quality of education majorly depends upon the teaching competencies of the teachers of the schools. The teachers must be acquainted with their competencies and institution should appraise their efficient work from time to time for further motivation. If something is lacking in their practice, they should be given guidance to proceed in the correct direction. Here emerges the role of an evaluation system.

Teacher evaluation is helpful for both novice and experienced teachers. First, evaluation of novice teacher provides an opportunity to know the progress of the teacher till date. The teachers’ attitude, skills, knowledge strength, weakness and development area can be identified and according to them, training can be provided to lead them towards the correct direction. Therefore, evaluation of teachers is of paramount importance to improve the quality of the teaching –learning process. Evaluation develops a sense of accountability in teachers as they are accountable to their students, parents, their schools and the community at large. The evaluation process helps them to become more accountable.

Therefore, it becomes important to develop and strengthen a systematic evaluation process so that a teacher’s strengths and weaknesses can be identified and remedial measures can be given. It seems that many times evaluation of teachers is not systematic, methodical, formative and regular. If the evaluation system is effective and formative evaluation is done skilfully from time to time, the problems can be found out and remedy can be suggested to teachers to guide them in the correct direction. An effectively organized teacher evaluation system provides motivation to the teachers to perform their duty well.

In the different types of schools, there are different evaluation methods. In Gujarat, Gunotsav Program, inspection and teacher evaluation by SSA officials are observed. The other private and central government schools have their own methods of evaluation. There are evaluation by principals, vice principal, SSA staff and inspection practices prevailing in the elementary schools of Gujarat. There is a need to study the process of evaluation that is going on in different types of schools.

Out of literature reviewed the researcher came across several studies which were conducted abroad. At the elementary level the researcher came across very few studies especially those related to teacher evaluation such as the Gunotsav and Inspection program in Gujarat. The study on the Gunotsav program focused on the academic aspect rather than the teacher evaluation aspect. The inspection related study focused on the development of an inspection model on the basis of a critical study of the present inspection model. Therefore, there is need to study the teacher evaluation system in elementary schools as a whole. Therefore, the present study is undertaken

Tapi is a tribal district which was formed in 2007. It has seven talukas. Tapi is one the representative districts of Gujarat state. The schools of Tapi district represent the schools having evaluation practices followed elsewhere in Gujarat. It would be important to know about the teacher evaluation system in the different types schools of Tapi district.

Research Questions

On the basis of rationale presented above, the following research questions were formulated;

1. How are the teacher evaluation practices conducted in different types of schools of Tapi district?
2. How do the different stakeholders perceive the existing teacher evaluation system?
3. What are the different problems faced by different educational functionaries and suggestions offered?

5.10. Title of the Study

A study of Teacher Evaluation System in the Elementary Schools of Tapi District of Gujarat

5.10.1. Objectives of the Study

The study has been carried out with following objectives:

1. To study the teacher evaluation practices followed in different types of schools of Tapi district in terms of
 - a. Self -evaluation
 - b. Peer -evaluation
 - c. Evaluation by superiors

- d. Student -evaluation
 - e. Classroom observation.
2. To study the perception of school functionaries towards the present system of teacher evaluation.
 3. To study the problems of teacher evaluation in different types of schools.
 4. To suggest measures for improvement of teacher evaluation system.

5.10.2. Explanation of the Terms

I. Teacher Evaluation: Teacher evaluation is the process of assessment of teachers' performance on the basis of well-defined criteria/standard of evaluation to judge for further development of teachers.

II. School Functionaries: School functionaries include principals and teachers.

III. Superior: Superior is referred to principal, CRC coordinator, Block, educational inspectors, Taluka primary education officers, District primary education officers, vice principal, supervisor
resource person

5.10.3. Operational Definition of the Term

- I. **Perception:** Perception in this study refers to the score obtained in the perception scale administered to the school functionaries.

5.10.4. Delimitation of the Study

The study is delimited to elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Shixan Samiti, Ashram shala, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Eklavy Model Residential schools, elementary section of private schools which may have KG to higher secondary or the elementary section only.

5.11. Review of Related Literature: Implications for the Present Study

Through the review of related literature, it was found that teacher evaluation is a common practice in the present time. The researcher came across many studies related to teacher evaluation system, most of them were conducted abroad.

For the review purpose, the studies are categorized into four parts. The studies on policy and practice conducted by Levandowsky (2000), Bonsignor et. al. (2012), Waite (2018), Headen (2014). Lolis (2014); on practice and impact by Santos-Camerino (2005), Wissmann (2005), Zarro (2005), Rapkin Miller (2006), Traynor-Nilsen (2006),

Gholam (2012), Mazzagati (2005), Morris (2013), Hoag (2015), and Morris (2013); on school culture by Hill (2017); on components of teacher evaluation by Walker (2014) on assessing model by Hadfield (2012); on shared responsibility by Munger (2012); on traditional to transformative teacher evaluation by Musser (2013); on satisfaction by Arp (2013).

Some studies were conducted on perceptions of school functionaries towards teacher evaluation. The researcher found studies on perceptions of teachers only towards teacher evaluation which included study on teachers' experience to implement reform by Nelson (2015), on relationship between evaluation policy and teacher practice by Frasier (2014), on factors contributing to teacher quality, professional growth, instructional improvement by Jauffer (2017); on self- efficacy and school culture by Carrol (2018) and on satisfaction by Arp (2013).

Besides the teachers, there are studies on the perceptions of principals towards teacher evaluation practice by Barton (2010), Clark (2014); principal's attitude towards teacher evaluation process by Himmelein (2009), on principals action by Ramirez (2005), on fostering teacher learning through relationship and dialogues by Erickson (2014), on formative evaluation by Myrick (2009), performance evaluation method by Scot & Chad (2005), on principals' perspectives on teacher evaluation by Hill (2013). There are also studies on perceptions of teachers and administrator together related to standard based teacher evaluation by Doherty (2009), Sough (2010), Pham (2013), Pauffler (2014); on efficacy-based teacher evaluation method by Killian (2010) on inspection model by Chavda (2015) and on Gunotsav Patel (2020). Attempts have been made to study perception of teachers, teacher leaders, school and district leader on misunderstanding and miscommunication and how stakeholders interpret teacher evaluation process by Pendleton (2014).

The researcher came across studies related to teacher evaluation methods such as self-evaluation, peer -evaluation and portfolio. On self-evaluation, studies were found on impact of self -appraisal conducted by Haynes (1998); on effectiveness of five selected strategies for using self -evaluation by Beaty (1981); on self- evaluation procedure for assessing classroom management on relative effectiveness of two different peer coaching program and self -evaluation program by Ahuja (2000); on teacher's self -evaluation and its effect on professional growth and teacher principal relationship and on self- evaluation for high performing teacher by Tellez (2010). On peer -evaluation researcher found studies conducted by Jancil (2004); on evaluation and implementation

of peer assistance and review with non-tenure teachers and by Hartloff (2014); on peer involvement in evaluation. On portfolios the researcher came across the studies conducted by Andrejko (2000) and Attinello (2004) on teacher portfolio for growth-oriented evaluation and teacher and administrators' perceptions of the value of portfolio-based teacher evaluation responsibility.

The researcher came across studies related to barriers of teacher evaluation done by McKay (1998), Gaudino (2008) on problems in organization culture and key issues in teacher evaluation process respectively.

It is observed that besides considering perception/perspective of school functionaries, the studies were conducted concerning school culture by Carrol (2018), Hill (2017) external accountability environment, self-efficacy by Carrol (2018), principals' experience by Munger (2012), principal's attitude by Himmelein (2009), principal's perspective by Hill (2013), Leadership style by Posada (2005), supervisory behaviour by Levandowsky (2000), teacher's satisfaction by Arp (2013), factors contributing to teacher evaluation Jaffurs (2017).

The researcher found from the review of related literature that researches in the field of teacher evaluation were done using qualitative, quantitative as well as mixed-method research designs. For the study of teacher evaluation various research designs were followed by the researchers such as survey- exploratory survey, quantitative survey, cross sectional survey, mixed method descriptive design, case study, conceptual and empirical design, quasi experimental, comparative analysis using qualitative design. There were studies following case study such as in-depth intrinsic case study by Lolis (2014), single case study by Goldstein(2003), McKay(1998), multiple case study by Ramirez(2005), multiple comparative case study by Frimannsdottir (2010) qualitative case study by Wissmann(2005), multimethod case study by Santos-Camerino (2005), Traynor-Nilsen (2006), mixed method case study by Doherty (2009) exploratory case study by Jancis (2004) case studies by Zarro (2005), Rapkine-Miller (2006), Arp (2013), Pham (2013). Chavda (2015) and Patel (2020). It was also found that survey was a common type of research followed by the researchers. The survey method was followed by Barton (2010), Killian (2010), Shough (2010), computer survey by Wormmeester (2005), online survey by Mazzagatti (2015) electronic survey by Himmelein (2009), Mixed method exploratory study by Clark (2014). Other methods such as experimental design pre and post-test design were followed by Andrejko

(2000), mixed- method descriptive design by Attinello (2004), qualitative research design by Ahuja (2000), exploratory, sequential mixed method design by Pendleton (2014), descriptive comparative study by Christensen (2013), and mixed method action research by Musser (2013).

The researcher restricted the review of literature related to teacher evaluation to school education only which included elementary to secondary school level. The sample were selected applying purposive sampling, random sampling and multi stage (stratified proportional sampling technique. Purposive sampling technique was applied to select the sample for qualitative studies. So, the sample of the studies included teachers, principals, administrators, mentors, district administrators such as district superintendents, assistant district superintendents, assistant superintendents of human resource. The sample selected included teachers by Lolis (2014), MacCalla (2014), Campbell (2014), Nelson (2015), Jaffurs (2017) Sonsanya (2010); elementary school teachers by MacKay (1998), Christensen (2013), Arp (2013); urban elementary school teachers by Traynor-Nilsen (2006) High-school teacher by Frasier (2017); Secondary school teachers by Zarro (2005), High school teachers by Jancis (2004); elementary and junior high school teacher by Ahuja (2000), secondary and higher secondary school teachers by Campbell (2014). Principals were selected by Ramirez (2005), Scot (2005), Himmelein (2009), Myrick (2009), Barton (2010), Munger (2012), Hill (2013). Clark (2014). Erickson (2014); whereas teacher and principals were selected in the same study by Beaty (1989), Gaudino (2008), Coulter (2013), Shough (2010). teachers and administrators by Goldstein (2003). Attinello (2004), Rapkin-Miller (2006), Doherty (2009) Wormeester (2005). Killian (2010); teachers, principal and administrator by Pham (2013); educational leaders by Bonsignor et. al. (2012); district teachers, district teacher- leaders together by Pendleton (2014), superintendent and principals by Walker (2004) principals and inspectors by Chavda (2015),and teachers, principals, BRC coordinator, Diet lectures as sample by Patel (2020)

For the collection of data, the researcher found the tools such as questionnaire, document, Likert scale, semi structured interview, open-ended in-depth interview, focus group interview, checklist, observation, field note, official website, student achievement data, documents, relevant artifact. For qualitative method of research, interview was a common tool applied by researchers such as Andrejko (2000), Rapkine-Miller (2006) Lolis (2014), Goldstein(2003), Santos-Camerino (2005), Wissmann (2005), Myrick (2009), Rosa (2011), Coulter (2013), Clark (2014), McKay (1998),

Doherty (2009), Frimannsdottir (2010), Musser (2013), Walker (2014); structured interview by Sonsanya-Tellez (2010); semi structured interview by Campbell (2014), Pendleton (2014), Wacha (2015); open ended interview by Traynor-Nilsen (2006); focus group interview by Ahuja (2000), Attinello (2004), Shough (2010), Richardson and Hoag (2015); semi structured and focus group interview by Erickson (2014), Pham (2013).

Besides these, other tools for data collection were applied such as document by Santos-Camerino (2005), Rapkine-Miller (2006), Traynor-Nilsen (2006), Zarro (2009), Frimannsdottir (2010) Morris (2013), Lolis (2014), McKay (1998), Attinello (2004); observation field note (Goldstein ,2003), Struyk (1990), Santos-Camerino (2005), Zarro (2005), Traynor-Nilsen (2006), Rapkin Miller (2006), Christensen (2010), Frimannsdottir (2010), Pham (2013); Artifacts by Rapkin-Miller (2006), Sonsanya - Tellez (2010); students' achievement data by Morris (2013) and checklist by Morris (2010). The common tool for survey is survey tool, questionnaire and likert scale. Survey tool applied by Goldstein (2003), Zarro (2005), Santos-Camerino (2005), Rapkine-Miller (2006), Shough (2010), Gravenor (2011), Arp (2013), Musser (2013), Campbell (2014), MacCalla (2014), Mazzagatti (2015), Jaffurs (2017); questionnaire by Myric (2009), Doherty (2009), Pham (2013), Richardson & Hoag (2015), Pendleton (2014); Likert scale by Beaty (1989), Levandowski (2000), Wormeester (2005), Killian (2010), Mazzagatti (2015), Wacha (2015) and opinionnaire (Patel ,2020).

The collected quantitative and qualitative data were analysed applying data analysis techniques such as frequencies, content analysis, descriptive analysis, documentary analysis, triangulation, comparative quantitative data, data comparison matrix, significance testing, frequency analysis of variance, chi-square, statical adjustment running multiple testing of significance, qualitative comparison, Pearson correlation and multiple regression and anova. Various data analysis techniques were applied such as Pearson correlation and multiple regression by Levandowski (2000); comparative data matrix Headen (2014); t-test Barton (2010), Chavda (2015), Christensen (2013); ANOVA by Pharm (2013), Arp (2013); Chi square by Arp (2013), [Patel \(2020\)](#) relevant significant testing, statical adjustment for running multiple test of significance McCalla (2014); frequencies and percentage Mazzagatti (2015), statistical and descriptive analysis Zarro (2005), discrepancy analysis (Gholam ,2012); triangulation (Ahuja ,2000), Santos-Camerino (2005), Rapkine-Miller (2006), Traynor-Nilsen (2006);; reviewing artifacts by Sonsanya-Tellez (2010): Documentary review/analysis Santos-

Camerino (2005), Rapkine-Miller (2006), Traynor-Nilsen (2006), Zarro (2009), Frimannsdotir (2010), Morris (2013), Lolis (2014), McKay (1998) and Attinello (2004).

Out of the literature reviewed, the researcher found that most of the studies were conducted in abroad. The researcher could find few studies related to Gunotsav and Inspection in India specially in Gujarat at the government elementary school level. The researcher did not come across studies in teacher evaluation under different management types of school considering various sources of teacher evaluation. So, the researcher decided to undertake this study. The present study is undertaken to find out different practices in teacher evaluation going on in the elementary schools of Tapi district of Gujarat run by different managements.

5.12. Methodology of the Study

5.12.1. Research Design

The researcher adopted descriptive survey method for the present study.

5.12.2. Population

All the teachers, principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya (JNV), Eklavya Model Residential schools (EMRS), all Cluster Resource Coordinators (CRC Coordinator) and Block Resource Persons (BRP) of Gujarat state constituted the population of the present study.

5.12.3. Sample

There were 802 government elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Shikshan Samiti, 56 Ashram shalas, 32 Private schools, 4 Eklavya Model Residential schools and 65 CRC coordinators and 35 Block Resource Person (BRP) in Tapi District of Gujarat in the year 2018-19.

The sample of the study was selected applying stratified random sampling technique. 10% schools of government elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Shikshan Samiti, Ashram shalas, Private schools. Eklavy Model Residential schools from the target population were selected. So, 80 government elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Shikshan Samiti, 6 Ashram shalas, 4 Private schools, 1 Eklavy Model residential schools and 1 Navodaya vidyalaya were selected. From these selected schools, a maximum of 5 teachers from each school of different management types were selected and all teachers were selected if schools had less than 5 teachers.

80 principals of Jilla panchayat schools, 6 principals of ashram shalas, 4 principals of private schools and 1 principal of Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya (JNV) and 1 principal of Eklavya Model Residential Schools (EMRS) constituted the final sample of the study. So, the sample included 214 teachers of Jilla panchayat schools, 24 teachers of ashram shalas, 19 teachers of private schools and 5 teachers of JNV and 5 teachers of EMRS for the present study. All 30 CRC coordinators were selected automatically on the basis of the selected sample of schools such as principal and teachers which fell under their cluster. If there were vacant posts of CRC Coordinators, in charge CRC Coordinators were selected. 4 Block Resource Persons (BRP) constituted the sample of the study.

5.12.4. Description of Tools

As per the requirement of the objectives of the study, the data for the present practices of teacher evaluation related to the needs and objectives of teacher evaluation, procedure of teacher evaluation, problems and suggestions for the improvement of teacher evaluation system were needed for the study. The aim of the study was also to understand the perceptions of the school functionaries towards teacher evaluation system. The way teachers and principals perceived the present system was an important data in order to understand their perceptions towards the system. So, in order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher developed the following tools and collected the data with their help.

- I. Questionnaire:** To achieve objective no. one, three and four of the study the researcher developed questionnaires for teachers, principals, CRC Coordinators and Block Resource Persons (BRP)
- II. Perception Scale:** To achieve objective no. two, the researcher developed perception scales for teachers and principals.

5.12.4.1. Questionnaires for Teachers, Principals, CRC. Coordinators and Block Resource Persons (BRP)

Based on the objectives of the study, the various tools of data collection were administered. The questionnaires for teachers, principals and CRC coordinators and BRPs were constructed separately. The aim of questionnaire for teachers was to get data in order to understand the evaluation practices going on in their institutions, whereas the aim of questionnaire for principals was to collect the data regarding the practices of evaluation by the principals as a superior and other evaluation practices as

seen by them. The CRC Coordinator and BRP were the participants for whom a common questionnaire was constructed. The objective of preparing a tool for CRC and BRP was to understand how effectively the resource persons of SSA were doing formative evaluation and to understand the procedure of evaluation accordingly.

5.12.4.2. Questionnaire for Teachers

The Questionnaire for teachers were constructed to collect data from the teachers about different practices in terms of self-evaluation, peer evaluation, evaluation by superior, student evaluation and classroom observation in the different management types of schools. The questionnaire for teachers was constructed considering different management types of schools. So, there were two questionnaires for the teachers. One common for the teachers of Jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala and EMRS where as other one was for private school and JNV teachers. The Questionnaire for the teachers of Jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala and EMRS comprised of all the common dimensions along with some special program such as Gunotsav and evaluation by SSA staff which did not exist in the private schools. However, the questionnaire for private schools and JNV also comprised of common dimension and a general practice of teacher evaluation including self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation of teachers, inspection which were expected in these schools. In this regard the questionnaire for teachers for the study of teacher evaluation included many common dimensions related to teacher evaluation such as need and objectives of teacher evaluation, various programs related to teacher evaluation, criteria and standards for teacher evaluation, frequency of evaluation, time schedule, methods of evaluation, techniques, dimensions of teacher evaluation, preparation for teacher evaluation done by the teachers, feedback, follow up work, teacher evaluation note/report. It also consisted of competency of evaluator, relationship of teachers with evaluators and grade given to the teachers. Along with these dimensions, influence of various effects on teacher evaluation, innovation in teacher evaluation, advantages and problems of teacher evaluation, satisfaction expressed on teacher evaluation and valuable suggestions for the improvement of existing teacher evaluation system were a part of the questionnaire. All these dimensions were the same in the both the questionnaires. However, in the case of a special program, some questions were asked pertaining to that. In the questionnaire there were both kinds of questions – close ended and open ended. Most of the questions were close ended questions which had different options and there was one option of

‘any other’ which gave freedom to the teachers to express their views. If any practice of teacher evaluation was not in existence in a particular school, the teacher could write NA i.e. not applicable and leave it.

The questionnaire also translated in Gujarati language for Gujarat medium teachers to overcome the barrier of language and could describe the different practices running in the schools.

5.12.4.3. Questionnaire for Principals

The Questionnaire for principals was constructed focusing majorly on evaluation by superiors and getting data of other evaluation practices too. The questionnaire for principals was constructed including different dimensions. In the questionnaire there were both kinds of questions – close ended and open ended. Most of the questions were close- ended questions which had different options and there was one option of ‘any other’ which gave freedom to the principals to express their views. If any practice of teacher evaluation was not in existence in a particular school, the principals could write N/A i.e. not applicable and leave it.

The questionnaire was also translated into Gujarati language for Gujarat medium principals. The questionnaire was common for all the types of schools. However, some differences were kept in mind while preparing the questionnaires for different types of school principals.

Questionnaire for CRC Coordinator and Block Resource Person:

The questionnaire for CRC Coordinator and BRP was constructed to collect the data regarding evaluation by resource persons (superior). There were 31 items in the questionnaire for Cluster Resource Centre Coordinator (CRC Coordinator) and Block Resource Person (BRP).

The different dimensions included in the questionnaire for CRC Coordinator and BRP were the need and objectives of teacher evaluation, criteria of teacher evaluation, school selection, process of teacher evaluation, frequency and time allotted for evaluation. Besides these dimensions, evaluating techniques, format for teacher evaluation, plan and schedule of evaluation, dimensions of teacher evaluation, cooperation of teachers, feedback, and note/report of teacher evaluation also form an important part of the questionnaire. Not only these, but also experience sharing meetings, rationale for decisions, satisfaction of evaluator with the present system and the suggestions for

improving the present practice of teacher evaluation were an essential part of the questionnaire.

In the questionnaire there were both kinds of questions – close ended and open ended. Most of the questions were close ended questions which had different options and there was one option of ‘any other’ which gave freedom to the CRC Coordinator and BRP to express their views. If any practice of teacher evaluation was not in existence in a particular school, the CRC Coordinator and BRP could write N/A i.e., not applicable and leave it. The Questionnaire was also translated into Gujarati language for CRC Coordinators and BRPs to overcome the barrier of language and could examine different practices running in the schools.

5.12.4.4. Perception Scale for Teachers

A five-point Likert type perception scale was developed for the teachers. The aim of the perception scale was to study perception of teachers of different management types of schools such as elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Samiti, ashram shalas, private schools, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya (JNV), and Eklavya Model Residential schools (EMRS). The perception scale was common for all the teachers of the different types of schools. For the teachers of Gujarati medium schools, the tool was translated in Gujarati language to overcome the barrier of language.

The perception scale for teachers comprised of 23 items.

. Every statement had 5 alternatives stated in the scale. It ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The five alternatives included strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. The scores were assigned as follows, strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2) strongly disagree (1). For each statement teachers were required to tick (✓) on one alternative only.

5.12.4.5. Perception Scale for Principals

A five-point Likert type of scale was developed to serve the purpose of studying perceptions of the principals regarding the teacher evaluation system. The aim of the perception scale was to study perceptions of the principals of different management types of schools. The schools included were elementary schools managed by Jilla Panchayat Samiti, ashram shalas, private schools, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya (JNV), and Eklavy Model Residential schools (EMRS). The perception scale was common for

all the principals of the different types of schools. For the principals of Gujarati medium schools, the tool was translated into Gujarati language. The scale comprised of 30 items. Every statement had 5 alternatives stated in the scale. It extended from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It included five alternatives as strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. The score was assigned for strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2) strongly disagree (1). Every statement has been provided with options against which the principals as participants needed to put a (✓) mark.

5.12.5. Validation of the Tools

The prepared tool was given to the four subject experts in field of Education for validation of content for its relevance and appropriateness to the study and its language. The tool was reviewed and accordingly, inclusion, omission and modification of the items in the tool has been done. The list of experts who validated the tools is attached in the appendix. The validated tool is also attached in the appendix. The first draft of the tool was shown to the expert requesting for their suggestions/modification if any. The suggestions were incorporated in the tools

5.12.6. Data Collection Procedure

The permission for data collection was taken from the principals of different types of schools in order to collect data from them and their teachers. Apart from this, the researcher also took permission of the BRC coordinator to collect data from the CRC coordinators and Block resource persons. The data was collected by the researcher personally with the help of questionnaire and perception scale during the academic sessions of 2017-18 (in April to May) and 2018-19 from the Elementary schools of Tapi district.

5.12.7. Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed on the basis of its nature. The data collected using questionnaires and perception scale were analysed quantitatively as well as qualitatively applying descriptive analysis techniques of frequency and percentage and intensity index. The objective wise data analysis techniques are as follow.

5.12.7.1. Objective 1, 3 and 4 related Data Analysis

To study the teacher evaluation practices in different management types of schools, questionnaires were used to collect data. The data collected using questionnaires were

analysed quantitatively as well as qualitatively. The data pertaining to close -ended questions was analysed applying descriptive statistical analysis through frequency and percentage. However, the data pertaining to open-ended questions was analysed applying content analysis method. Most of the content analysed data was quantified in terms of frequency and percentage to know the responses of the majority.

5.12.7.2. Objective 2 related Data Analysis

To study the perception of school functionaries towards the present system of teacher evaluation a perception scale was used for collecting the data. The data collected through the perception scale were analysed using descriptive analysis, applying frequency and percentage. Further, to know the intensity of data, intensity index was applied.

5.13. Major findings

5.13.1. Major findings of Objective No.1

Objective 1 To study the teacher evaluation followed in different types of schools of Tapi district in terms of

Self -evaluation

Peer -evaluation

Evaluation by superiors

Student -evaluation

Classroom observation

5.13.1.1. Need and Objectives of Teacher Evaluation

- Need for teachers' evaluation was found in the jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala, private schools, JNV and EMRS.
- Providing guidance, enhancing quality of education, observing the effectiveness of teaching practices were objectives of teacher evaluation in the jilla panchayat schools. providing guidance, enhancing quality of education and measuring effectiveness of teaching were majorly found as the objectives of teacher evaluation in the ashram shalas. Providing guidance, enhancing quality of education, educational planning and to know proficiency and professional readiness of teachers were major objectives of teacher evaluation in private schools. To enhance quality of education, to know proficiency and professional readiness of teachers, to measure effectiveness of teaching practices and to

motivate teachers were major objectives of teacher evaluation in JNV. To provide guidance to the teachers, to evaluate teachers through evaluation of students and to motivate teachers were objectives of teacher evaluation in the EMRS.

- The majority of school functionaries of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools, EMRS found the objectives of teacher evaluation were accurate, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound. However, majority of the teachers of JNV found objectives were not measurable and real. So, accuracy, and achievability were common criteria found in the objectives of teacher evaluation in all types of schools.

5.13.1.2. Teacher Evaluation System Decided by Government

- It was found that teacher evaluation system was decided by the government in the jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS except private schools.

5.13.1.3. Teachers' Involvement in Deciding Objectives

- Teachers of all types of schools were involved in deciding their own objectives. However, JNV teachers besides their own objectives, they were also involved in deciding objectives of teacher evaluation.

5.13.1.4. Support and resources provided to teachers to fulfill teacher evaluation objectives

- In all types of schools, teachers got support and resources to fulfill teacher evaluation objectives.

5.13.1.5. Standard /Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

- Majority of the principals of all types of schools, CRC coordinators and BRPs communicated criteria of teacher evaluation. Amongst them majority of principals, CRC coordinators and BRPs communicated them in oral mode.
- Achievement in basic learning skills, learning outcome- of students, content mastery, classroom management, effective implementation of curriculum, implementation of circulars, programs, superior's suggestions were basic criteria for teacher evaluation found in the jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. Syllabus coverage, learning outcomes, student achievements, giving project work to the students were major criteria followed in the private schools. Syllabus coverage, communicative skills, and teacher development were major

criteria for teacher evaluation followed in JNV. Learning outcomes/school comprehensive evaluation, implementation of knowledge and skills received in training/programs were major criteria followed in EMRS. The common criteria for teacher evaluation found in the all types of schools was to measure learning outcomes of students.

5.13.1.6. Availability of Readymade Format/Performa for Teacher Evaluation

- There were available readymade format/Performa for teacher evaluation in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala and private schools, JNV and EMRS.
- There was readymade available format of evaluation such as Gunotsav format, self-evaluation format, format for evaluation by principal, format for CRC Coordinator, format for BRC Coordinator and BRP evaluation format in the jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. Besides these, jilla panchayat schools had format for inspection too. There were available readymade formats for Evaluation by principals, supervisors, vice principals and format for Inspection in the private schools. Teacher evaluation format for evaluation by principals and inspection format were available in the JNV. Format for evaluation by CRC coordinators and Gunotsav format were available in EMRS.

5.13.1.7. Involvement of Teachers' Suggestions in Designing Teacher Evaluation Format / Teacher Evaluation Process

- The teachers' suggestions were not taken in the designing of teacher evaluation format or the teacher evaluation process.

5.13.1.8. Regular Teacher Evaluation conducted by Superiors

- In all types of schools, regular teacher evaluation by superiors was done. Superiors like principals, CRC coordinators, BRC coordinators, educational inspectors evaluated teachers in jilla panchayat schools. In ashram shalas, principals, CRC coordinator and BRP were superior who evaluated teachers regularly. The principals, vice principals, supervisors were superiors who evaluated teachers in private schools. In JNV, principal and vice principal were superiors who regularly evaluated teachers whereas in EMRS the principal and CRC Coordinators evaluated teachers regularly. The principal emerged a common superior in all types of schools taken for the study who evaluated teachers in the schools.

5.13.1.9. Sources of Teacher Evaluation

- Self-evaluation, evaluation by superiors such as evaluation by principals, CRC Coordinators, BRC coordinators, BRPs, evaluation by educational inspectors and inspection panel were in practice in the jilla panchayat schools. Evaluation by superiors including evaluation by principals and CRC coordinators were in practice in the ashram shalas. Self-evaluation, evaluation by principals, vice principal, supervisors and inspection were methods used in the private schools. Self-evaluation, evaluation by principal, vice-principal and inspection panel were in practice in JNV. Evaluation by superiors which included evaluation by principal and CRC Coordinators were common methods used in EMRS.
- Observation technique and student performance assessment were commonly used in all types of schools. Besides these, JNV also used the technique of reviewing performance in their school.

5.13.1.10. CRC Coordinators and BRPs on Visits of Schools for Teacher Evaluation

- Schools for visits by CRC Coordinators were selected on the basis of planning done by the state SSA office, Gujarat. Schools for visits by BRP were selected on the basis of probable diary (Sambhavit Diary). CRC Coordinators and BRPs visited more than 5 schools in a week and majority of them visited 6 schools. Frequency of visiting the same schools by CRC Coordinators were 5 to 12 times in a year whereas in case of BRPs it was 4 times in a year.

5.13.1.11. Frequency of Teacher Evaluation in a Year and Surprise Visits

- The frequency of evaluations by principals were more than thrice in a year in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS. In JNV schools, the frequency of evaluation conducted by the principal was once in a year. Frequency of evaluation by vice-principals was reported thrice in a year in private school and JNV. Evaluation by supervisors was twice in a year in the private schools. Evaluation by BRC Coordinators were found prominently once and twice in a year in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. Majority of the CRC Coordinator visited classroom of teachers more than three times in a year. Evaluation by BRPs was conducted once in a year. In jilla panchayat schools, the frequency of evaluation by educational inspectors, teacher trainer and pedagogy coordinator were once in a year.

In all types of schools, it was found that different types of evaluators visited schools at least once in a year for teacher evaluation. Surprise visits were taken by the principals of all types of elementary schools.

- CRC coordinators and BRPs evaluated individual teachers and frequency of BRP was once in a year and Frequency of CRC coordinators for evaluating individual teachers was prominently more than thrice time in a year. Majority of CRC coordinators allocated 20 minutes for class evaluation whereas BRPs allocated 1 period (30 minutes).

5.13.1.12. Timely Conduct of Teacher Evaluation

- It was found that in jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV, self-evaluation which was part of inspection was conducted timely most of the time. Evaluation by supervisors and vice principals was also conducted timely most of the time in the private schools however, JNV also had timely evaluations by vice -principals most of the time. In jilla panchayat schools and ashram shala, it was found Gunotsav was conducted timely most of the time. However, in EMRS, Gunotsav was sometimes conducted timely. There was timely conduct of teacher evaluation by CRC coordinators, teacher trainer and pedagogy coordinator.

5.13.1.13. Time Devoted on Individual Teachers by the Principal

- It was found that 20 minutes to one period i.e 35 minutes was the common time allocated by the principals for individual teachers during the evaluation process in the jilla panchayat primary schools. One period of time allocation was done for the individual teacher by principals of ashram shalas, private schools, and JNV. Therefore, it was found that one period was the common time allocated by the principals of all types of schools

5.13.1.14. Prior Declaration of Date of Teacher Evaluation

- It was found that date of teacher evaluation was not given prior to evaluation done by the principals, vice-principals, supervisors, CRC coordinators, BRC coordinators, BRPs, teacher trainers, pedagogy coordinators in all types of schools. However, the date of inspection and Gunotsav was given prior to evaluation in the Jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS.

5.13.1.15. Prior Information of Plan/Schedule of Teacher Evaluation

- It was found that principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, principals of private schools and EMRS did not give their plan/schedule for teacher evaluation in advance to the teachers. Only the JNV principal agreed that he gave the plan of teacher evaluation to the teachers in advance.
- Amongst the few principals who gave the plan of evaluation in advance, in ashram shalas and JNV it was given one day before in jilla panchayat three to seven days before. And CRC coordinators gave schedule two days before.

5.13.1.16. Preparation for Teacher Evaluation

- Amongst those teachers who were informed about the plan/schedule of teacher evaluation, all teachers of jilla panchayat schools and JNV gave priority to updating of records of their classes whereas, teachers of ashram shalas updated their daily planning book, practice pedagogy, prepared students updated their knowledge by reading and prepared TLM. Therefore, it was found that the preparation of record updating was the common major preparation done in the schools by the teachers.
- Majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools, private schools and one principal of JNV, CRC Coordinators and BRPs did some preparation before going to evaluate teachers whereas, majority of principals of ashram shalas private schools and one principal of EMRS did not do any preparation before going to evaluate their teachers. Therefore, it was found that majority of principals, CRC coordinators and BRPs did some preparation for teacher evaluation. Amongst those who did some preparation, they read some books for enrichment of knowledge. However, besides this, the principal of JNV prepared performa and other related records. In private schools, principals did preparation such as evaluating teachers' lesson plans and time tables, reviewing early performance of teachers (pre-performance observation and retention) and also took conducting subject related discussions with other principals.

5.13.1.17. Basis of Performance Evaluation of Teachers

On the basis of teaching learning process, curricular activities, personal attributes, teacher evaluation was conducted in the jilla panchayat schools whereas, teacher evaluation was done on the basis of teaching- learning process, curriculum activities and result / performance of the students in ashram shalas. In private schools,

teacher evaluation was done on the basis of planning, teaching learning process, community approach and Result / Performance of the students and curricular activities. In JNV, teacher evaluation was done on the basis of planning, teaching learning process, curricular activities, organization and involvement in intra, inter house activities or committees and assessment tools were planned or prepared tools were adopted. In EMRS, evaluation was done on the basis of teaching learning process, curricular activities, and result / performance of the students. According to CRC coordinators and BRPs the basis of teacher evaluation was methodology of teaching, cocurricular activities, result of students, teaching attitude and performance of students. CRC coordinators also considered the behaviour of teacher as the basis of teacher evaluation. Teaching learning process and curricular activities were common basis in all the types schools on which teachers were evaluated.

5.13.1.18. Dimensions of Teacher Evaluation

- It was found that daily planning by teachers, basic skills, use of TLM, written work of the students, teaching methods, content mastery, classroom management, syllabus completion, attendance of the students, student participation, learning outcomes, milestone completion, identification of card and identification of chhabadi (Stands in which flashcard are displayed) in Pragna approach were dimensions observed during teacher evaluation in the jilla panchayat school. Besides these, communication skill of teachers, effective use of black board, recapitulation, reinforcement and daily planning of teachers were taken consideration by resource persons.
- In ashram shalas dimensions such as lesson planning, use of technology, student participation, basic skills, teaching methodology, classroom management, use of TLM, effective use of blackboard, skill of recapitulation, skill of reinforcement, syllabus completion, attendance, written work of the students, participation of students, learning outcomes, cocurricular activities, on which teachers were evaluated. Classroom management, use of technology, student participation, methodology in teaching, communication skill, content mastery, maintenance of discipline, effective use of blackboard, use of TLM & technology, syllabus completion, participation of the students, written work of students, attendance of students, time management, communication skills

analytical ability and assessment, skill of reinforcement, skill of recapitulation, analytical ability & assessment, accomplishment of work, attitude of teachers for doing work, behaviour of teachers and sense of responsibility were major dimensions of teacher evaluation found in private schools.

- Dimensions such as content mastery, methodology of teaching, classroom management, effective use of blackboard, use of TLM, use of technology, syllabus completion, attendance, content mastery, skill of reinforcement, time management, maintenance of discipline, student participation, written work of students, communication skill, skill of recapitulation, skill of reinforcement, analytical ability and assessment, accomplishment of timely work, attitude of teachers for doing work, sense of responsibility, interpersonal relationship were considered while evaluating teachers in JNV.
- Methodology of teaching, classroom management, content mastery, effective use of blackboard, use of TLM & technology, teacher's communication, student participation, skill of recapitulation, skill of reinforcement, written work of students, attendance of students, syllabus completion, daily planning of teacher and learning outcomes were dimensions of teacher evaluation found in EMRS.

So, overall, the common dimension of teacher evaluation found in all the types of schools included teaching methodology, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, student participation, and attendance of the students.

5.13.1.19. Window Observation on Teacher Performance

- It was found in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools, JNV and EMRS, that window observation by principals was effective in improving teacher performance. Whereas, half of the principals of private school disagreed with this method of observation.

5.13.1.20. Adequate Co-operation

- In all types of schools, adequate cooperation to all evaluators was given from teachers. The major reasons for supporting principals were primarily good mutual relationships, secondary reason was compulsory teacher evaluation and the third reason was to prove to the teacher's own worthiness in jilla panchayat schools. In private schools, the major reasons for supporting principals were primarily compulsory teacher evaluation, the secondary reason were good mutual relationships, teachers to prove their self-worth and teachers' aspiration

to improve performance. Major reason for supporting principals were primarily good mutual relationship and teachers' aspiration to improve performance in private schools. However, compulsory teacher evaluation was the major reason in EMRS. However, it was found that teachers' aspiration to improve performance was main reason in JNV for extending cooperation to the principal.

- According to CRC coordinators the major reasons were good mutual relationships, compulsory evaluation for teachers and to improve teaching proficiency. Good mutual relationships and to improve teaching proficiency were the reasons for giving cooperation according to BRPs.

5.13.1.21. Feedback

- The teachers were given feedback by their evaluators after teacher evaluation in all types of the schools.
- The teachers were given feedback after every evaluation according to some teachers and it was also found that according to some teachers, they were given feedback most of the time but not every time jilla panchayat schools by the principals. In ashram shalas and private schools, the feedback after evaluation was given most of the time. However, in JNV, feedback was given every time whereas in EMRS it was given sometimes.
- According to principals, majority of them gave feedback timely. According to them CRC Coordinator and BRP prominently found giving teachers feedback. in private schools majorly supervisors and in JNV, vice principal was observed giving feedback to the teachers by the principals. And in EMRS, principal observed CRC coordinator giving feedback to the teachers.
- Feedback was given individually and both ways individually and in meeting in the jilla panchayat schools. Feedback was given individually in ashram shalas and private schools, whereas, in JNV and EMRS feedback was given following both was individually and meeting.
- It was found that feedback was given to the teachers in oral form in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools form, whereas feedback was given in both oral and written form in JNV and EMRS.
- Majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and private schools gave positive feedback, whereas Principals of JNV and EMRS gave both positive and negative feedback together after teacher evaluation.

- It was found that feedback given by the principals, CRC coordinators, BRPs, BRC coordinators and educational inspectors was effective. feedback given by principals and CRC Coordinators found effective in the ashram shalas. Majority of teacher of private schools found feedback of principals was more effective whereas feedback given by vice principals, supervisor was effective. Teachers of JNV found feedback of principal was effective. However, teachers of EMRS found the feedback given by the CRC Coordinators was more effective. So, it can be inferred that the feedback given by the principals, vice principals, supervisors, CRC Coordinators, BRPs, BRC. Coordinators and educational inspectors were found effective.

5.13.1.22. Difficulty in Accepting Suggestions

- The majority of teachers of all types of schools did not feel any difficulties to accept suggestions given by their evaluators.
- The majority of CRC Coordinators and BRPs found their guidance was followed by the teachers the most of the times.

5.13.1.23. Implementation of Advice in Practice according to Principal

- Advice/suggestion given by the evaluators were put in practice by the teachers. They implemented the advice or suggestions in practice. The advice was implemented the most of the times in jilla panchayat schools. However, advice was implemented by the teachers in ashram shala and EMRS every time. In private school, advice was implemented most of time. So, overall, it was found that advice of principals was prominently followed by most of the teachers of all types of the schools.

5.13.1.24. Teachers' Perception on Competency of Evaluators

- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas, private schools, JNV and EMRS perceived that their evaluators were competent. However, some of teachers of jilla panchayat did not find their evaluators competent. The two prominent reasons for incompetency were found such as lack of knowledge of personnel other than educators and need of more frequent teacher evaluation in the schools.

5.13.1.25. Effect of Teacher Evaluation on their Career

- According to all teachers of private schools and JNV, evaluation by principal provided them motivation for better work in their career. Some also believed

that evaluation by principal also affect administrative decision related to their career.

5.13.1.26. Follow-up Work after Teacher Evaluation

- Follow up work was done in all types of elementary schools by evaluators. Principals also conducted follow up work on the regular basis. Majority principals of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas observed that CRC coordinator did follow up work timely in their schools. However, majority of principals of private schools observed supervisors and principal of JNV observed vice principal doing the follow up work after teacher evaluation. So, overall majority of principals observed that CRC Coordinators doing follow up work.
- Frequent evaluation, guidance and training were implemented as follow up work by the evaluators in jilla panchayat schools. Guidance and training were followed as follow up work in ashram shalas, whereas, frequent evaluations were followed by guidance in private schools, JNV and EMRS.

5.13.1.27. Grade given on Teachers' Performance

- According to the principals, the grade was not given on the basis of teacher evaluation conducted by principals in all types of schools and grade was also not given after the review of teachers' report by the various reviewers.
- According to the teachers, there was no grading system by the evaluator or reviewers on their evaluation reports in all types of elementary schools after teacher evaluation or reviewing report by reporting or reviewing officers on the basis of teacher evaluation.

5.13.1.28. Documentation of Teacher Evaluation

- Majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, all principals of ashram shalas and EMRS documented their teacher evaluation data in logbooks whereas principal of JNV documented in readymade performas. In the case of private schools, the documentation was done in variety of ways. It was prominently found that they documented it in logbooks, principal's diary, in readymade formats or in teachers' file. So, overall, it was found the majority of principals documented the teacher evaluation data in the logbooks.

5.13.1.29. Writing of Evaluation Notes/Reports

- Teacher evaluation note/report was shown to the teachers in the jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV. However, note/report of teacher evaluation was not shown by the evaluators in the EMRS. But all the teachers of ashram shalas denied about seeing the evaluation note/report prepared by the evaluators. However, a very few principals stated that they showed note/report of teacher evaluation. So, overall majority of teachers were shown note/reports of teacher evaluation.
- The principals of jilla panchayat schools observed that the CRC coordinators showed the note/report of teacher evaluation to the teachers.
- According to principals and teachers, majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools showed logbooks after every evaluation as a part of regular practice and specially showed them when adverse remark was given. Some private schools also showed teacher evaluation note/reports like logbooks and confidential reports sometimes and readymade performs every time after every evaluation as a part of their regular practice. The JNV principal also showed the readymade Performa when adverse remarks were given and also as a regular practice. Majority of CRC coordinators showed teacher evaluation report as a part of regular practice. However, it was found that the BRPs only showed teacher evaluation note/report when asked

5.13.1.30. Review of Teacher Evaluation Report

- According to the principals, there was review of report system in JNV, and EMRS. In JNV the principal reviewed the teacher evaluation report written by the vice principal considering objectives completion, strengths, shortfalls, constraints and extraordinary achievement. The report was reviewed considering objectives completion, strengths, shortfalls and constraints as stated by the principal of EMRS. The review of evaluation report was important for the teachers because on the basis of teacher evaluation administrative decisions were taken.
- All principals of JNV and EMRS responded that remarks were not given by the reviewers on review of teacher evaluation reports.

5.13.1.31. Sending Teacher Evaluation Reports to Higher Authority

- In jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and private schools teacher evaluation reports written by principals were not sent to the higher authorities. However, CRC coordinators and BRPs sent their reports to state level SSA office and some reports to BRC Bhavan. The principal of JNV sent the report to the regional office and the principal of EMRS to the Tribal Department.

5.13.1.32. Power of Evaluators to take Action on Ineffective Teacher Performance

- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, all teachers of private schools and JNV believed that evaluators had power to take action against ineffective teacher performance. However, all the teachers of EMRS did not believe that the evaluator had power to take action. The majority of jilla panchayat teachers believed that the principal and educational inspectors had such power to take action against them. The ashram shala teachers believed this kind of power was in the hand of ashram shala Adhikaris. All the teachers of EMRS believed that power was in the hands of the Society responsible for functioning of the school and the Gujarat Government Tribal Department. So overall, it was found that majority of teachers of all types of schools believed that the principals, educational officers, ashram shala Adhikaris, government - Tribal department and Society had the power to take action against the teachers.
- The majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and JNV believed that they did not have any power to take action against the teacher on their poor performance. However, majority of principals of private schools and EMRS believed that they had the to take decisions on poor performance of the teachers. So, majority of principals believed that they did not have any power.
- Amongst Some principals of jilla panchayat schools who believed that they had power included power like giving notice to the teachers and taking corrective measure for teachers. Majority of principals of private schools had the power to relieve the teachers of their services.
- The majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools were undecided in their response to what kind of power they needed. However, some principals of jilla panchayat stated that they did not want any power whatsoever and some wanted the power of stopping the increment in the salary of teachers. The majority of

principals of ashram shalas wanted the power of stopping increment in the teacher's salary. The principal of JNV was undecided about his need of power.

5.13.1.33. Teacher Encouragement by Educational Personnel

- In jilla panchayat schools, the teachers were generally encouraged in two ways, one giving them certificates and second giving them recognition. The majority of principals also responded that in ashram shalas, teachers were encouraged by giving them certificates only. The CRC Coordinators and BRPs encouraged teachers by appreciating their work publicly and informing higher authority, providing guidance to them, training and building rapport with teachers and showing their positive attitude to the teachers. Teachers were encouraged by giving them increment in salary, certificates and awards in the private schools. In EMRS, teachers were encouraged by giving them awards of Rs.10000.

5.13.1.34. Training of Teachers

- The majority of CRC coordinators conducted training at CRC level and BRPs at block level for teachers.

5.13.1.35. Training of Evaluators for Teacher Evaluation

- The majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, private schools, JNV, EMRS and half the principals of ashram shalas had not taken any specific training for conducting teacher evaluation. Half of the private school principals and some of the principals of rest of the schools had undergone training. Amongst them, majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools had training of three days, whereas half the principals of private schools had training of 3 days and half had training of 15 days. But all of them had training of content which would be helpful for them to evaluate teachers.
- The majority of CRC Coordinators and BRPs did not have any specific training for conducting teacher evaluation. Those who reported about having training, they had undergone content/program training which could be helpful in teacher evaluation.

5.13.1.36. Paying more Attention on Novice Teachers

- It was found that in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS no extra attention was paid to the novice teachers and all were treated equally by the principals. However, it was also found that in private schools, principals paid more attention to the novice teachers and important reasons for paying

attention were to measuring find out their effectiveness in teaching, to help teachers to get acquainted with school culture and to provide guidance.

- An important reason for not paying extra attention to novice teachers was that the new and senior teachers had equal professional competence in jilla panchayat schools. In ashram shalas, equal teaching proficiency was demonstrated by new and senior teachers. So, no extra attention was given to the novice teachers. So overall, the reasons for not paying extra attention to novice teachers was that all teachers had equal professional competence and demonstrated it.

5.13.1.37. Taking Help of Staff for Teacher Evaluation if Needed

- Majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS did not take help of any other person in conducting teacher evaluation.. Amongst some who took help of staff members, the jilla panchayat principals and ashram shalas took help of senior teachers. The majority of private school principals took help of supervisors, whereas, the JNV principal took help of the vice principal.

5.13.1.38. Experience Sharing Meeting

- Experience sharing meeting was conducted for CRC coordinators and BRPs at the block level and district level once in a month with the higher authorities. According to CRC Coordinators and BRPs, meeting was effective.

5.13.1.39. Gunotsav

- The majority schools such as jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS had both self-evaluation and external components of Gunotsav in their schools
- There were different criteria for school selection every year in Gunotsav. The criteria for school selection done for Gunotsav in the previous year were found to be schools with low grade in the previous year, drastic change in school grades, schools not selected for external Gunotsav as yet and type of schools selected.
- Schools were informed about the arrival of external evaluators prior to evaluation. The school came to know about arrival of external evaluators one day before.

- In the Gunotsav two sources- Self-evaluation on the basis of student performance and evaluation by superiors on the basis of students' basic skills were implemented in all types of schools.
- Teachers were evaluated on the basis of basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic demonstrated by the students and evaluation of students on the core school subjects.
- All the teachers did remedial work for the basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic and subject content of the weak students.
- The teachers identified students for remedial classes on the basis of marks obtained by the students in reading, writing and arithmetic skills in the previous Gunotsav, conducting test and taking weak students in reading, writing, and arithmetic skills and taking test of students of std. 6 to 8 in core subjects and including the students with difficulties in the remedial program.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS did preparation for Gunotsav. They did preparation such as teaching aids preparation and collection of teaching learning material for reading, writing and arithmetic skills.
- In jilla panchayat schools, time allocation for remedial work was found to be one period to two periods. In ashram shalas and EMRS, the majority of teachers allocated two periods for remedial work.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and EMRS conducted remedial work during the time period prescribed by the government. However, the majority of teachers of ashram shalas conducted remedial work for the time period required according to the students' need rather than prescribed by the government.
- The majority of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS sent data of remedial work of the students to the SSA office.
- In jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS, surprise visits were taken by officers or resource persons to monitor remedial work.
- In jilla panchayat schools, principals, Block resource person, Cluster resource coordinators, BRC Coordinators and taluka primary education officers were visited the schools in surprise visits. In EMRS the principal took surprise visits.

However, in ashram shalas the principals and CRC coordinators took surprise visits to observe the preparation of Gunotsav program.

- The major reasons for surprise visits in jilla panchayat schools included monitoring Gunotsav preparation, enhancing teaching and giving guidance to the teachers. The major reasons for surprise visit in ashram shalas comprised of monitoring Gunotsav preparation and to guide teachers whereas the major reasons for surprise visits in EMRS consisted of enhancing teaching. So, overall, enhancing teaching and providing guidance to the teachers were major two reason found for surprise visits in Gunotsav program.
- Majority of teachers of all types of schools found that the nature of principals was supportive. The majority of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas, found that the nature of CRC coordinators was supportive whereas, the majority of teachers of EMRS found their nature was neutral that is neither supportive nor unsupportive. Overall, it was found that CRC coordinators' behavior was supportive. The nature of BRPs and BRC Coordinators was found to be supportive in jilla panchayat schools whereas the teachers of jilla panchayat schools found the nature of educational inspectors and DPEO was supportive and neutral. The teachers of jilla panchayat schools found that the nature of TPEO was neutral. The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of EMRS found that the nature of external evaluators and liason officers was neutral whereas the majority of teachers of ashram shalas found that the nature of the external evaluators and liason officers was supportive during the Gunotsav day. So overall, it was found that the nature of external evaluators was neutral.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and all teachers of EMRS replied positively that the feedback was given by the evaluators. According to the teachers of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS, the feedback of principals and CRC Coordinators was found to be supportive. The teachers of jilla panchayat schools found that the feedback of BRPs, BRC Coordinators, education inspectors, TPEOs and DPEO was found to be effective. The majority of teachers of all types of schools found the feedback of external evaluators and liaison officers was effective.

- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS replied that they conducted self-evaluation in Gunotsav program fairly.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shala and all teachers of EMRS had no fear of Gunotsav. Some of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas stated that they felt fearful. Amongst those, majority had fear how the student would perform in front of Gunotsav evaluators, and also had fear of their student's fear in facing the evaluators. It was also found that besides these, majority of the jilla panchayat teachers had also fear whether the external evaluators would understand the local condition or not. So, overall, these three fears dominated the Gunotsav program.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS were satisfied with the grade obtained in Gunotsav. Some of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools were not satisfied with their grades. The reasons included technical fault in data entry which did not depict the real picture, hardworking teachers getting less grade, low performance of students due to hesitation in front of external evaluators.

5.13.1.40. Inspection

- There was inspection practice in jilla panchayat schools, and JNV. Majority of private schools had no inspection. However, one private school reported inspection practice.
- There were more than four members in the inspection panel in jilla panchayat schools. However, there were four members in the inspection panel in the private school.
- The majority of teachers of private schools had one time classroom visits during inspection in their career. Majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and JNV had more than four times classroom visits during inspection in their career.
- In private schools, time of observation allocated during inspection was 5 minutes to 10 minutes. In jilla panchayat schools and JNV the time of observation allocated during inspection was more than 15 minutes. The majority of JNV teachers reported 40 to 45 minutes whereas, in jilla panchayat schools, 1 period i.e. 35 minutes was allocated for classroom observation.

- Teachers of jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV schools did some preparation such as preparing TLM, checking written work of students, updating daily planning, collecting proof of project work and activities and practicing teaching lesson.
- In the jilla panchayat schools, the major dimensions considered for inspection were teaching methods, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, involvement of students, basic skills of learning of students, completion of syllabus, written work of students, completion of milestone (Pragna), identification of chhabadi/leader (Pragna) and attendance of students. In the private schools, major dimensions considered were teaching method, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, involvement of students, basic skills of learning of students, completion of syllabus, written work of students. In the JNV, the dimensions included were teaching method, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, involvement of students, completion of syllabus, written work of students. So, overall. it was found that common dimensions in all types of schools during inspections included teaching method, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, involvement of students, completion of syllabus, written work of students.
- Feedback was given after inspection in jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV. The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and private schools found that the feedback given by the inspection panel was effective, whereas in JNV, it was found that the feedback was very effective.
- It was found that the behavior of educational inspectors and inspection panel coming to all types of schools was supportive.
- Most of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of JNV replied positively about follow-up work done after inspection whereas majority of private school teachers replied that follow-up work was not done after teacher evaluation.
- The majority of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools, private schools and all teachers of JNV did not have any fear of inspection.
- The confidential report of teachers was filled up on the basis of inspection data in the jilla panchayat schools and JNV.

5.13.1.41. Self-evaluation

There was self-evaluation in jilla panchayat schools and JNV. The majority of private schools had no self-evaluation practice except one private school.

- Frequency of self-evaluation in jilla panchayat schools and JNV was once in a year whereas, frequency of self-evaluation was twice in a year in one private school.
- All teachers of one private school and JNV were found positive in their response about setting own performance objectives, whereas, jilla panchayat teachers were found negative in this regard.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, all teachers of one private school and JNV allocated sufficient time for self-evaluation.
- Questionnaire was used for self-evaluation in all types of schools.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools reported that the self-evaluation was focused on teaching learning process. In JNV, teaching learning process, co-curricular activities and organizing inter activity were aspects included in self-evaluation. In the one private school, aspects such as teaching learning process, community interface, co-curricular activities and organizing inter activity were included in self-evaluation.
- The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all the teachers of private schools and JNV evaluated themselves fairly and they also made efforts to develop deficient skills after self-evaluation.
- It was found that the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and private schools came to know about their development of deficient skills by comparing their performance with their own last performance. JNV teachers came to know about their development of deficient skills by comparing actual performance with the set targets.
- The majority of teachers of all three types of schools mentioned their achievement in the report. But along with this, majority of JNV teachers also added shortfall in their self- evaluation report.
- According to majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools the advantage of teacher evaluation was maximizing self-discovery, identifying strength and weakness and solution of problems. According to the majority of teacher of

private school advantage of self- evaluation was self-motivation whereas according to majority of teachers of JNV that maximizing self-discovery, self-motivation and identifying strength & weakness.

- No teachers of JNV faced any difficulty in self-evaluation. The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat felt difficulties in recalling for filling self-evaluation format and some of teaches of private schools in reporting achievements.

5.13.1.42. Teacher Evaluation System other than Government Systems

- Only the principal of EMRS was found to take initiative for students who would conduct teachers' evaluation on the basis of committee work which included both students and teachers of the schools. It depended upon students' feedback on the committee work of the whole week. On this evaluation done by the students, teachers were also given small rewards for their good job. All the teachers also felt comfortable in receiving feedback from the students and feedback was given in oral form.
- According to the principal and the teachers of EMRS, the advantage of this system was that healthy competitive environment encouraged teachers and students felt inspired to work better way.

5.13.1.43. Relationship of Teachers with Evaluators

- It was found that relationship of the majority of teachers of all types of schools with their evaluators including principals, vice principals, supervisors and ashram shala Adhikari were very good. The relationship of majority of teachers with their evaluators including CRC Coordinators BRC coordinators, BRPs, education inspectors, Gunotsav external evaluators were good.

5.13.1.44. Effective Sources of Teacher Evaluation

- According to the teachers, the self-evaluation component of Gunotsav program was found to be the most effective source of teacher evaluation in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. Evaluation by principal was found to be the most effective source of teacher evaluation in the private schools, JNV and EMRS.
- According to the teachers of jilla panchayat schools, self-evaluation made teacher free from tension. Self-evaluation was done honestly by teachers in the evaluation program such as Gunotsav, inspection and these programs were informed in advance. So, the teachers were able to prepare in a better manner.

According to the teachers of ashram shalas, the preferred programme was Gunotsav self-evaluation because the grade given in self-evaluation was usually good. According to teachers of JNV, good suggestions were given by the evaluator in the evaluation who was the principal. According to private school teachers, evaluators were supportive and helpful to the teachers in knowing their shortcoming. Besides this, positive attitude of principal to encourage teachers, proper guidance and advice to the teachers were major reasons for being this the favoured method. The teachers of EMRS gave other reasons for preferring evaluation by principal, such as guidance given by the evaluator and on the basis of evaluation, confidential report was filled up which affected their contract renewal.

5.13.1.45. Influence of Various Effects on Teacher Evaluation

The majority of teachers found the influence of sympathy effect, halo effect, status effect, effect of last evaluation and latest behavior effect and same as me effect on teacher evaluation.

- Sympathy effect was majorly found to affect the evaluation by principals in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS. It prominently affected the evaluation by vice principals and supervisors in private schools, Gunotsav and evaluation conducted by SSA staff resource persons in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas.
- Halo effect was clearly found to affect the evaluation by the principals in EMRS, however its effect was also shown on evaluation done by them in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas though it was comparatively less. This effect was also seen in the evaluators of Gunotsav and Inspection in jilla panchayat schools
- Status effect was prominently found in evaluation conducted by the principals of private schools.
- The effect of last evaluation conducted was prominently found in the evaluation by principals, Gunotsav evaluators, inspections in jilla panchayat schools.
- Latest behavior effect and same as me effect were prominently found in evaluation by principals conducted in private schools.

5.13.1.46. Difference between Regular Teacher Evaluation and Special Evaluation program

- According to CRC coordinators, BRPs there was a difference between regular teacher evaluation and special evaluation programs. Goal-oriented work and accuracy in work were major aspects which were found in special evaluation and these differentiated it from the regular evaluation.

5.13.2. Major Findings of Objective No. 2

Objective 2 To study the perception of school functionaries towards the present system of teacher evaluation.

5.13.2.1. Perceptions of Teachers towards Teacher Evaluation System

- **Teachers' Attitude towards Teacher Evaluation System**

The teachers of all types of schools had a positive attitude towards teacher evaluation and believed that it was an effective tool that focused on teacher's growth, confidence, accountability and increase in job satisfaction.

- **Teachers' Perception on Competency of Evaluators**

The teachers of all types of schools perceived that their evaluators were competent to evaluate the performance of teachers.

- **Teachers' Perception on Teacher Evaluation Procedure**

The perception of teachers of all types of schools was favourable towards teacher evaluation procedure which included timely evaluation, objective evaluation, frank and objective self-evaluation, performance -based student evaluation, provision of assistance to teachers, follow up work by evaluators and stress-free environment.

- **Teachers' Perception on Feedback**

The perceptions of teachers of all types of schools were favourable towards feedback which included effect of feedback on performance and negative feedback with specific and clear examples/ evidence and explanation.

- **Teachers' Perception on Teacher Evaluation Outcomes**

The perceptions related attitudes of the teachers of all types of schools were favourable towards teacher evaluation outcomes which included motivation of setting objectives,

encouragement to evaluate student effectively and keeping their records, finding own strengths and weakness, opportunity of experience sharing, data of teacher performance.

- **Teachers' Perception on Reward/Award**

Most of the teachers of all types of schools perceived that they got appropriate grade and rewarding teachers encourages them to perform better. Teachers desire words of appreciation for encouragement whether in form of grades or rewards.

- **Teachers' Perception on Satisfaction with Present Teacher Evaluation System**

The perception of teachers of all types of schools towards their own satisfaction was favourable.

5.13.2.2. Perception of Principals towards Teacher Evaluation System

- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on the role and goals of teachers, teacher accountability and attitude of teachers towards teacher evaluation. It was also found that the principals of all types of schools perceived the evaluation tools favourably. The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on preparation done by evaluators which included prior preparation and preparation of checking plans.
- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on effective utilization of time except EMRS who perceived the time was not used as per schedule. The principals of all types of schools except JNV perceived that teacher evaluation was time consuming procedure. The perception of principals of all types of schools except EMRS was favourable on the competency of evaluators which included academic knowledge and demonstration of lessons. The principal of EMRS perceived that he as an evaluator did not possess sound academic knowledge of different subjects.
- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on different sources of data which measured performance of the teachers effectively and that

included principal's observation, student evaluation and self-evaluation. These sources of data depicted the complete picture of teacher performance by classroom observation and evaluation of students and also inspired the teachers for self - development

- The perception of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools and JNV was favourable whereas perception of EMRS principal was not favourable on the review of performance done properly.
- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on giving feedback effectively which included frequent and timely feedback, recognition of the negative feedback with a constructive intention and encouraging performance by appreciating the teachers.
- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on the feeling of comfort during evaluation and on the regular follow up work done by the evaluators.
- The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on outcomes which included areas requiring improvement, enhancement of quality education through objective evaluation, measuring effectiveness of teacher performance through student evaluation, innovative ideas, providing a helping hand to novice teachers, learning through teacher evaluation, enhancing mutual understanding between principal and teachers, preparing professional development plans for teachers and giving extrinsic motivation to the teachers.
- The principals of all types of schools perceived satisfaction with the present teacher evaluation system.

5.13.3. Major findings of Objective No. 3

Objective 3 To identify the problems of teacher evaluation system in different types of schools.

The majority of the teachers found various problems in teacher evaluation system which included a fearful/stressful environment, evaluation just as a ritual, time constraints of evaluators, constraints of human resources, criticizing behaviour of evaluators, subjective evaluation, personal values and biases of evaluators, lack of effective communication and providing demotivating feedback.

5.13.3.1. Influence of Various effect on Teacher Evaluation

- **Fearful/ stressful environment**

A fearful /stressful environment was found during evaluation conducted by principals in private schools, jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. It was also found that a fearful and stressful environment was present to some extent during evaluation by education inspectors and external evaluation conducted by Gunotsav officials.

- **Evaluation just a Ritual**

The problem of evaluation conducted just as a ritual was found during evaluation by principals and CRC coordinators in jilla panchayat schools.

- **Time Constraints of Evaluators**

Time constraint was majorly observed in evaluation by principals in private schools and to some extent in rest of the schools. It was also found during evaluation by education inspectors, BRC coordinators, CRC coordinators and BRPs in jilla panchayat schools.

- **Constraints of Human Resources**

Constraints of human resources was found during evaluation by principals, BRPs, CRC Coordinators, BRC coordinators and education inspectors in jilla panchayat schools and to small extent in ashram shalas. However, it was not found to be a problem in private schools, JNV and EMRS.

- **Criticizing Behaviour of Evaluators**

Criticizing behaviour of Evaluators was found during evaluation by principals and education inspectors in jilla panchayat schools whereas such behaviour not found in other types of schools.

- **Subjective Evaluation**

Subjective evaluation was found during evaluation by principals in jilla panchayat schools and private schools. It was also found during the evaluation by education inspectors in jilla panchayat schools and in evaluation by supervisors in private schools

- **Personal Values and Biases of Evaluators**

Personal values and biases of evaluators were prominently found during evaluation by principals in jilla panchayat schools and private schools.

- **Lack of Effective Communication**

Lack of effective communication was found during evaluation by principals and supervisors in the private schools. It was also found during evaluation by BRPs and principals in jilla panchayat schools.

- **Demotivating Feedback**

Demotivating Feedback was found during evaluation by principals and supervisors in private schools and by educational inspectors in jilla panchayat schools.

5.13.3.2. Difficulty faced by Evaluator

- **Difficulties faced by Principals**

The majority of principals of all types of schools faced difficulties in the teacher evaluation system. Amongst them, the principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and private schools faced the same, major difficulties of time constraints and workload. However, the principal of EMRS did not face any difficulties.

- **Difficulties faced by the CRC Coordinators and BRPs**

The majority of CRC Coordinators did not face difficulties but majority of the BRPS found difficulties in teacher evaluation. The majority of CRC coordinator stated the reason of having excessive workload and BRPs stated the reason of time constraint.

5.13.3.3. Satisfaction with Present Teacher Evaluation System

- It was found that majority of principals of ashram shalas, private schools, JNV and EMRS were satisfied with the present teacher evaluation system whereas, the majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, private schools were not satisfied with the present teacher evaluation system.

Amongst the reasons behind teacher dissatisfactions, the administrative reasons included insufficient staff, principals as an untrained evaluator and not having special principals like HTAT principals. The procedure related reasons included not having a fixed time of evaluation programs such as Gunotsav, inspection. Lack of expert members in evaluation panel and more focus of CRC coordinators on collecting data rather than classroom observation were other reasons which affected the feedback and follow up work of the evaluators and consequently their evaluation work was not done timely. Another reason found by the principal was negative attitude and inefficiency of teachers. And one of the important reasons

was principal's workload which affects teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation was not done effectively.

- The majority of CRC Coordinators and BRPs were satisfied with the present teacher evaluation system. A Very few CRC Coordinators were dissatisfied because more focus on data collection was given rather than focusing on actual teacher evaluation.

5.13.4. Major Findings of Objective No. 4

Objective No 4. To suggest measures for improvement of teacher evaluation system

The majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools, EMRS except principal of JNV found that there was need of change in the present teacher evaluation system. However, the principal of JNV did not find the need of change in the present system. It was found that the majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and private schools did not find a need for change but majority of the teachers of ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS felt the need for change in the present teacher evaluation system. Those who felt need for change gave following suggestion

5.13.4.1. Teachers' Suggestions

1. Suggestions given by Teachers on Gunotsav

- Teachers of ashram shalas suggested that Gunotsav should be done in a regular fixed time every year and should be conducted by educational officers whereas, teachers of Eklavy Model Residential School also suggested that Gunotsav should be done in a regular fixed time every year.
- Teachers of jilla panchayat schools suggested that Gunotsav program should be conducted during a particular and appropriate time. The date should be given at the commencement of the school academic year and it could be conducted in in any semester, considering the syllabus of that semester only. They also added that Gunotsav should be conducted timely every year and surprise Gunotsav should also be conducted sometimes. The time duration for conducting Gunotsav should be increased from one day as one day for Gunotsav was not enough to evaluate the teachers work comprehensively. Every school should have the external and self-evaluation component of the Gunotsav at the same time annually. The other curricular aspects besides reading, writing and

arithmetic aspect should be included in the lower primary classes. An important suggestion was that the external evaluators should constitute functionaries from the area of education only.

2. Inspection

- Teachers of ashram shalas suggested that inspection should be conducted regularly as done earlier every year.
- It should be given at the beginning of the academic year or the date should be informed in advance prior to one week. Inspection should be conducted at a particular time; it should be completed by the end of February
- The inspection process related suggestions included that it should not be done like a ritual and should be fear free, build teacher competency and assess and evaluate creativity of children.
- Inspection should not be done by familiar, known individuals for greater objectivity. Kendra Shishak should not arrange inspection because Inspection done by them was not neutral; The TPEO or educational inspectors should be present there for a bias free inspection.
- During inspection feedback should be given regularly and effectively.

3. Teacher Evaluation by CRC Coordinators

- The teachers of ashram shalas gave suggestions on evaluation done by CRC coordinators. They suggested that more frequent visits should be taken by the CRC coordinators and guidance should be given to the teachers. There should be recruitment of CRC coordinators on a regular basis but even the in-charge CRC coordinators should take more visits and evaluate teachers. CRC coordinators should demonstrate lessons for the benefit of the teachers and give effective feedback to them.
- Teachers of Eklavy Model Residential school suggested that CRC coordinators should visit every class of every teacher.

4. Administrative Decisions

- All teachers of EMRS suggested that teachers who were working at temporary positions should be appointed as permanent staff on the basis of teacher evaluation.

5. Other Suggestions

- All teachers of JNV stated that there should be change in self-evaluation content and other component of child psychology should be added.
- The majority teachers of private schools suggested that latest teaching aids should be provided by the school authority.

5.14.4.2.Principals' Suggestion for Improvement of Teacher Evaluation System

1. Administrative

- Administrative decisions including punishable action should also be taken considering teachers on the basis of their evaluation in order to make work effective.
- Schools should have enough staff so that principals can evaluate properly. Every school specially those having std. 1 to 8 should be given 1 HTAT principal.
- There should always be complete recruitment of staff as per available vacancy so that they can visit classrooms and guide teachers that would be helpful in giving assistance to the principals.

2. Gunotsav and Inspection

- Date of Inspection should be communicated in advance at least a week ago. Inspection and Gunotsav schedule should be given at the commencement of the school academic year.
- Every school should have external evaluation in Gunotsav at the same time. Every external evaluator should make it mandatory to visit classrooms and test basic skills of students in Gunotsav.

3. Workload

- In small schools, principals take classes so, that they should not be involved in the evaluation process. For principals filling logbooks after teacher evaluation should not be compulsory as they were involved in teaching as well the administrative duties.

4. Teacher Evaluation Procedure

- The principals suggested some procedures related suggestions such as the resource persons should take more frequent visits of classrooms. The complete evaluation done by the CRC Coordinators should be conducted at least four

times in a year. Besides these, teacher evaluation should be done regularly and timely.

- It should be meaningful, not just like a ritual. Teachers should be given freedom to teach according to local conditions and be evaluated on that basis. Every evaluator should give feedback to the teachers to improve their performance efficiency. Teaching demonstration of lessons should be given by the evaluators if it is needed. The teachers should also follow instructions of the superior strictly. Encouragement should be provided to the teachers.
- The principals of private schools suggested that training on teacher evaluation should be given to the principals. Counselling teachers to digital learning should be provided.

5. Suggestions by CRC Coordinators

- The CRC coordinators suggested that every CRC coordinator should update their knowledge and skills on teacher evaluation timely and be aware of present governmental programmes going on for the teachers in education.
- They should have less paper work as it acts as a constraint. The CRC coordinators should pay more attention on monitoring rather than paying more attention on the collection of data.
- The CRC coordinators also suggested that to strengthen the teacher evaluation system the excellent performance of teachers should be appreciated after teacher evaluation. However, if expected improvement does not appear in performance of teachers after continuous efforts of evaluators, there should be provision of taking action against the poor performing teachers.
- They also suggested that on the basis of classroom observation, teachers should be assigned a grade and it should be noted in the service book.

6. Suggestions given by BRP

- After evaluation of each teacher, discussion should be done on a regular basis and on the basis of evaluation, there should be a procedure of taking action against teachers with poor performance if needed.
- The evaluation would be more effective if BRPs are given evaluation of teachers in their own subjects and they should not be involved in other activities.

5.14. Discussion of Major Findings

5.14.1. Need and Objectives of Teacher Evaluation

The need for teachers' evaluation was found in the jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools, JNV and EMRS. Enhancing the quality of education was a common objective found in all types of schools where as providing guidance was a common objective in all types of schools except JNV. Besides these, measuring effectiveness of teaching was an objective in both ashram shala and JNV; motivating teachers in JNV and EMRS whereas to know proficiency and professional readiness of teachers in private schools and JNV. The study also found the observing effectiveness of teaching practice in jilla panchayat schools, and educational planning in private schools as an important objective. It is clear that all the school functionaries believed that there is need of teacher evaluation system for the purpose of monitoring with a view to take corrective measures and to provide guidance for professional development, ensure quality of education and for administrative purpose. This is consistent with the findings of the study of Wacha (2013) which indicated that negative perception of teachers towards teacher evaluation system yet they can't deny the potentiality of teacher evaluation in improvement of teaching and learning and have possibility if it reformed'. So, there is need of teacher evaluation system in the elementary school. Campbell (2014) also supports by stating that if teachers are educated the purpose of teacher performance evaluation and how it can support their work and if done in an environment that trust, collegiality and collaboration. In the present study the objectives of teacher evaluation were found accurate, achievable and timebound in in all types of schools. Whereas, measurable, realistic criteria were found in the objectives of teacher evaluation in the majority schools of jilla panchayat, ashram shalas, private schools, EMRS except JNV. In JNV the criteria of teacher evaluation were not found measurable and realistic may be because the standard of teacher evaluation is very high very high which the teacher may not be able to achieve.

5.14.2. Teacher Evaluation System Decided by Government

Teacher evaluation system was decided by the government in the jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS except the private schools. The private schools have no intervention of the government in area of teacher evaluation. So, they can develop a system of staff development following their vision and objectives of the

institution. The government decides the norms and the criteria for establishing and running the schools which are followed by the schools but the government does not interfere directly in classroom practices. So, schools by themselves can take measures to improve classroom practices through teacher evaluation or any other staff development program.

5.14.3. Teachers' Involvement in deciding Objectives, Formats and Process

Teachers of all types of schools were involved in deciding their own objectives of achievement for evaluation. However, JNV teachers besides deciding their own objectives of achievement, they were also involved in deciding objectives of teacher evaluation. The government program is decided by the apex body of State Education Department. So, the objectives of teacher evaluation were decided by the government itself, at the school level, the teachers can decide the achievement of own objectives only. But in JNV suggestions from the teachers were incorporated in deciding objectives of teacher evaluation which was good sign of involving teachers. One of the reasons may be a more democratic environment in JNVs and teachers having a voice. In all types of schools, teachers got support and resources from the school authorities to fulfill teacher evaluation objectives.

The teachers' suggestions were not taken in the designing of teacher evaluation format in the teacher evaluation process. The probable reasons were that even at present, teacher evaluation is just in process majorly found at the area of formative evaluation; but in some cases, in private schools, it is treated as a summative evaluation tool in taking decisions specially for the tenure of teachers. So, therefore teachers are not interested to demand for their involvement in designing the evaluation format and they accept the decisions of authority easily. According to Hill (2017) for effectiveness and acceptance of teacher evaluation the school culture is important as well as teachers should be involved in development and implementation evaluation system.

5.14.4. Standard /Criteria for Teacher Evaluation

The majority of the principals of all types of schools, CRC coordinators and BRPs communicated criteria of teacher evaluation which were communicated to them in oral mode. The common criteria for teacher evaluation found in the all types of schools was to measure learning outcomes of students.

At the school level, the emphasis on learning outcomes of the students in teacher evaluation was commonly found. The schools assume that the learning outcomes of students is a proof of teacher achievement as well as it ensures the classroom teaching-learning process effectiveness. Besides this, content mastery, teaching learning procedure related criteria, implementation of circulars, programs and training criteria were followed in schools to measure effectiveness of teachers. It is a good sign that evaluators and teachers were aware of the criteria on which teachers were evaluated. This is consistent with the study of Lollis (2014) which suggested that the principals must take care to set clear expectation and clarity on criteria of evaluation and ensure the culture of trust and avoid the cultivating impression of subjectivity and nepotism. Nelson (2015) also mentioned precise criteria as one of the major three most critical components in teacher evaluation system. In the present study, the majority of evaluators communicate criteria in an oral mode and they are basically based on learning achievement of the students which indicates it's a result-oriented criteria. The criteria that had the greatest influence on student achievement were: alignment of instruction, appropriate sequence of instruction, appropriate materials, monitoring of student performance and attendance, interacting with students in at-risk situations, having an intervention plan in place, having a campus wide program of action and the campus rating attribute Hutto (2001). All these should be taken care while evaluating teacher on the basis of students' performance. These standards of teacher evaluation are important. Pham (2013) revealed that administrators and principals hold more positive views toward the process of implementing standards because administrators believe that it provides more specific and reliable feedback. Doherty (2009) suggested to develop differentiating rubrics for different teaching position.

5.14.5. Availability of Readymade Format/Performa for Teacher Evaluation

There were available readymade format/Performa for teacher evaluation in all types of schools such as format of evaluation by principal, Gunotsav format, inspection format and CRC format, BRC coordinator and BRP evaluation format and supervisor format. In JNV evaluation format used by principal was also used by the vice principals.

The teacher evaluation tool is an important instrument for evaluating teachers effectively. The principals stated they could identify the effective teacher through the teacher evaluation instrument they used, using only classroom observation as the basis of evaluation (Clark, 2014). The findings of the study of Mazzagatti (2015) also

suggested that the evaluation instrument has the potential to impact the classroom through targeted professional development when meaningful reflection and conversations are held about instruction about instruction in the classroom. The tool should not be faulty as Coutler (2013) revealed that the principal found new evaluation tool cumbersome and unrealistic with current structure of time and resources allocated in the educational system and also lack in the ability to fairly evaluate teachers.

5.14.6. Teacher Evaluation by Superiors

In elementary schools, there was more than one evaluator who evaluated teachers in each type of schools. The principal emerged as a common superior authority in all types of schools taken for the study who evaluated their teachers in their schools. The CRC Coordinators were a common evaluator in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala and EMRS whereas BRC coordinators and BRPs also evaluated in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. The vice principals were found as an evaluator in private schools and JNV. The supervisors as evaluators were found only in some private schools who evaluated teachers. The principals, CRC coordinators, vice principals and supervisors were regular, frequent evaluators whereas, BRC coordinators and BRPs were evaluators who selected the schools randomly and evaluated the teachers. The BRC coordinators were regular in their evaluation but evaluated teachers randomly visiting classroom with a view to monitor the work of CRC coordinators too. So, overall, it was found that there were various sources of data collection in the elementary schools for teacher evaluation. It aligns with the recommendation of Gholam (2012) who states that gathering multiple sources of evidence about teacher practice, taking into account what an effective teacher should know and be able to enhance student achievement.

The evaluation by superiors was a common method in all types of schools as a source of teacher evaluation data in all types of schools whereas, self-evaluation was found in jilla panchayat schools and JNV. At the school level, evaluation by principals was common in all types of schools, evaluation by vice principal in JNV and private schools and evaluation by supervisors in private schools was found. Evaluation by SSA staff included CRC coordinators was found in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS whereas BRPs and BRC coordinators evaluated teachers in both jilla panchayat schools and JNV. The evaluation by inspection panel was found in jilla panchayat schools, JNV. Besides these, JNV also used the technique of reviewing performance in

their school. It is good to have various methods of teacher evaluation in elementary schools. This is aligned with the study of Gravenor (2011) which recommended that there should be the use of multiple measures of teacher evaluation chosen by teachers who have reached master or professional status such as portfolios, action research, surveys, self-evaluation. Doherty (2009) also recommended use of multiple sources of data of teacher evaluation.

The observation technique and student performance assessment were commonly used in all types of schools. The principals believed that observation techniques gave complete picture of the performance of teachers. The study of Gaudino (2008) also found that several principals stated that they only do formal observations because “it’s required” and it is found that teachers are well prepared in formal observation. The study of Scot & Chad (2005) supports that 98% of principals of sample use classroom observation, 67% of principals of sample used at least one of other evaluation method in combination with classroom observation when evaluating teacher. MacCalla (2014) also strongly recommended classroom observation for inclusion in a comprehensive teacher evaluation system as it provides a unique portrayal of teacher effectiveness. However, the study of Himmelein (2009) contrary revealed the reason of dissatisfaction is the teacher evaluation based on formal classroom observation that they don’t believe that formal teacher evaluation process is useful in determining teacher effectiveness. It is seen that performance assessment of students is a common method specially in testing basic skills of learning of students in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas because foundational literacy achievement is the very first step of SSA towards quality education.

5.14.7. School Visits for Teacher Evaluation

The CRC coordinator is a common evaluator at the cluster level and BRP at block level whose major function is to hold hand of the teachers as resource persons to observe classroom, to assess students to know effectiveness of teaching. CRC coordinators had only own centre. Therefore, CRC coordinators can visit majorly 6 schools in a week and 5 to 12 times same schools in a year which were selected on the basis of planning done by the state SSA office, Gujarat. CRC coordinators can frequently visit but BRP has all schools of the block under his jurisdiction so that his frequency of school visits were 4 times in a year. Their frequency of visit may be less than the CRC coordinators.

However, in the era of technology teachers can contact via their mobile phones for the guidance from resource persons like the BRPs.

5.14.8. Frequency of Teacher Evaluation

The annual frequency of evaluations by principals was more in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS than JNV. Majority of principals indicated that they observed sixteen or more teachers in a year (Bullis, 2014). The frequency of evaluation by vice-principals was reported equally thrice in a year in both private school and JNV which was less than evaluation by supervisors of private schools. The reason could be that in the private schools, where the vice principal and supervisors were available, their frequency of evaluation was more in the schools in comparison of evaluation done by the principals. The probable reason could be that they have fixed duties and work accordingly whereas, principals have many extra work and hand external work and can't work following rigid schedules. In jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS the principal is only one evaluator at the school level, so the principal could effectively manage the teacher evaluation. The frequency of evaluation of teachers depends upon the size of the teaching staff and workload of the principals and other evaluators.

In case of BRC Coordinator the prominent frequency was one or twice in a year because the majorly monitoring work is responsibility of CRC coordinators and BRPs. But there is also need of checking the work of resource person staff. So, BRC Coordinator monitors selecting school and class randomly approximately 20% schools. BRC Coordinator could visit same school one time or more than one time as per his schedule or randomly.

The frequency of evaluation by educational inspectors, teacher trainer and pedagogy coordinator were once in a year because teacher trainer and pedagogy coordinator randomly checked schools of district. Generally, the education inspector has charge of TPEO in Tapi district as posts are found to be vacant and therefore, they not able to evaluate work of teachers frequently but evaluate randomly. However, the opposite stated in the study of Arp (2013) came with two most important finding that neither the amount of time teachers was evaluated nor the years of teaching experience were significant factors in analysis.

5.14.9. Timely Conduct of Teacher Evaluation

It was observed that evaluation by principals that in jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV, self-evaluation was conducted timely most of the time. Evaluation by supervisors and vice principals was also conducted timely most of the time in the private schools and JNV also had timely evaluations by vice -principals most of the time.

In jilla panchayat schools and ashram shala, it was reported that Gunotsav was conducted timely most of the time according to the teachers. However, in EMRS, Gunotsav was sometimes conducted timely. The reason behind Gunotsav not being conducted timely was its involvement of government functionaries and government body participation in it. So sometimes it was conducted in the first semester sometimes it had been also conducted in second semester as observed in the past. This finding is in conformity with the finding of the study carried out by Patel (2020) which inferred the suggestion that Gunotsav program should be conducted at the end of the semester. There was timely conduct of teacher evaluation by CRC coordinators because it was specified in their job chart. In private schools, evaluators such as supervisors and vice principals were important part of the school system and ensured that they evaluate teachers timely in their schools most of the time.

5.14.10. Time Devoted on Individual Teachers

Therefore, it was found that 20 minutes to one period (35 minutes) was the common time allocated by the principals of all types of schools. It is part of duty of principal to manage time for teacher evaluation in their schools. One period of evaluation was sufficient time for teacher evaluation because major aspects of teaching can be observed in this duration.

5.14.11. Prior Declaration of Date of Teacher Evaluation

The date of inspection and Gunotsav was given prior to evaluation in the jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS because they were government programs. In the Gunotsav program the date was known to all. But the schools were not told whether the schools had external evaluation or not well in advance. The schools were informed about external evaluation at least one day in advance. The purpose behind was that

every teacher should be serious and work keeping in mind the external evaluation which included a team of external evaluator and liaison officer who would come in their school. The present study revealed that majority of superior did not give any schedule in advance except the principal of JNV who shared it in advance with his teachers. The intention of principal could be to observe that to what extent teachers could perform better and what kind of potential teachers could show if informed well in advance. The teachers of JNV gave priority to updation of records of their classes as they were being evaluated on student performance. Every teacher probably wanted to show effective aspects of student performance to their principals on which they were evaluated. This would motivate them to perform better.

5.14.12. Preparation for Teacher Evaluator

The majority principals of jilla panchayat schools, private schools and one principal of JNV, CRC Coordinators and BRPs did some preparation before going to evaluate teachers. However, the majority of principals of ashram shalas, private schools and one principal of EMRS did not do any preparation before going to evaluate their teachers. The evaluators would have done preparation because they know the importance of the teacher evaluation and are serious about improving the quality of the schools. The probable reasons of principals not doing preparation could be they had heavy workload and time constraints. It was seen some of the preparation by the various principals were reading books, evaluating lesson plans, reviewing early performance, preparing Performa and other related record. Preparation is necessary as the study of Campbell (2014) revealed that the teacher performance evaluation system does have the potential to impact teacher development, support teachers' work, holding teachers accountable, and influencing student achievement and school-wide effectiveness, if carried out properly by the administrators who are equipped with the necessary skills. Therefore, it is cleared that this the evaluators should possess sound knowledge of academic as well as pedagogy.

5.14.13. Dimensions of Performance Evaluation of Teachers

Teaching learning process and curricular activities were common basis in all the types of schools on which teachers were evaluated. These were common basis probably because if the process is effective, the decided outcomes would definitely be achieved.

The basic of performance evaluation of teachers comprised all the components of classroom observation including teaching methodology, classroom management, use of TLM, use of technology, student participation, syllabus coverage and attendance of the students, Planning and follow up work were major areas included in dimensions of teaching in all types of schools. It also included performance of the students and result to measure effectiveness of outcomes of teacher performance directly. Specially in Gunotsav program, evaluation of student performance was major aspects of deciding effectiveness of the teachers. The dimensions related to pragna such as identification of chhabdi and milestone were important dimensions. These are the major areas where teachers' competence needs to be demonstrated to improve the quality of education. Both teachers and principals were well aware of various dimensions of teacher evaluation.

The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas, private schools, JNV and EMRS perceived that their evaluators were competent to evaluate them in dimension in which their teachers were evaluated. However, some of teachers of jilla panchayat did not find their evaluators competent. The two prominent reasons for incompetency were found such as lack of knowledge of personnel other than educators and need of more frequent teacher evaluation in the schools. The evaluators should possess sound academic knowledge and expert in skill of evaluating teachers using various methods and skills. The probable reasons may be as found in study carried out by Frasier (2017) that principals often lack the training and time resources to evaluate teachers in a high-stakes manner and to simultaneously provide constructive feedback to allow for systematic improvements.

The present study came with the founding that principals of all types of schools, CRC coordinators and BRPs had not taken any specific training of teacher evaluation for evaluator. Those who reported about having training, they had undergone content/program training which could be helpful in teacher evaluation. The evaluators should be given training. Insufficient training as one of the reasons of dissatisfaction with present teacher evaluation system (Wormeester, 2005).

5.14.14. Window Observation on Teacher Performance

It was found that the principals believed that window observation by them was effective in improving teacher performance in all types of schools. However, half of the

principals of private school disagreed with this method of observation. The study of Doherty (2009) also suggested walkthroughs. The purpose of principals may be to observe teachers' performance while walking in corridors due to time constraints. They found it effective because it possibly took less time and could be done every day. However, the private school principals disagreed because they had enough staff including supervisor and vice principal for classroom observation and discussion with the teachers about teaching practice. So, they can conduct proper observation time to time.

5.14.15. Adequate Co-operation

Generally, the principals, CRC coordinators and BRPs got adequate support of their teachers because the relationship of evaluators with their teachers was good. Besides, this it was compulsory for teacher as part of duty. So, every teacher has to cooperate with evaluator. It was also teachers always aspired to improve their proficiency in performance and also to prove their self-worth. So, other people also notice their effort and this inspired them to work better. Teacher evaluation is part of staff development process and if teacher understand the objectives of teacher evaluation positively, then no question of non-cooperation will arise in the evaluation of teachers.

5.14.16. Feedback and Follow-up Work

The teachers got feedback after teacher evaluation. In comparison of EMRS teachers the rest of the teachers of other schools got feedback most of the time. Gaudino (2008) stated that teachers stressed on the importance of feedback given by principal. According to the principal, evaluators such as CRC Coordinator and BRP in jilla panchayat schools, supervisors in private schools, vice principal gave feedback timely. Besides the timely feedback, the feedback given by the principals, vice principals, supervisors, CRC Coordinators, BRPs, BRC. Coordinators and educational inspectors were also found effective.

The vice principal in JNV and CRC coordinator in EMRS considered feedback essential in teacher evaluation process. This could be because the teachers can understand their level of performance and also identify their strength and weakness. So, accordingly teachers can modify their teaching strategies. Frasier (2017) observed rightly in his study that "On going feedback by observer who identifies good teaching in context is

more valuable and motivating to teachers than a summative assessment. Feedback given by the evaluators was positive the most of the time and sometimes a combination of both positive and negative feedback was given together. No evaluator gave only negative feedback, It can be interpreted that evaluator believed that positive feedback is effective than negative feedback. And negative aspect should be told with constructive

The majority of teachers of all types of schools did not feel any difficulties to accept suggestions given by their evaluators. The majority of CRC coordinators and BRPs found their guidance was followed by the teachers most of the times. This could be probably because mutual trust was present and teacher believed that their guidance is effective. In this regard, the study of Frasier (2017) revealed that the evaluation climate and culture, or evaluation scenario of school may also influence the ways in which teachers find evaluation motivating and how teachers approach feedback from evaluation. The study of Jaffurs, (2017) also supports that it is also found that the overwhelming majority of teachers embraced the post conference as the most impactful part of the entire evaluation process in building teacher quality; the least impactful was preconference.

Overall, it was found that advice of principals was prominently followed by most of the teachers of all types of the schools. It means that principal gave good feedback and having good trustworthy relationship between them. This result is in contradiction to the study carried out by Frasier (2017) that principals often lack to provide constructive feedback simultaneously to allow for systematic improvements. The teacher will not follow advice if having reasons as study of Gaudino (2008) revealed that teacher stressed important of feedback given by principal but it is found that principals were not giving as felt by teachers as a sign of trust and compliment that; and discuss their professional practice collaboratively with both colleagues and administrator.

Generally, the principals, CRC coordinators and BRPs got adequate support of their teachers because the relationship of evaluators with their teachers was good. Besides, this it was compulsory for teacher as part of duty and aspiration to improve their proficiency in performance and also to prove their self-worth

Guidance and training were commonly implemented as follow-up work by the evaluators in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas. whereas, frequent evaluation was conducted along with guidance in private schools, JNV and EMRS and jilla panchayat schools. This training programs conducted for the teachers could be the allocation of funds specially for in-service training of teachers in the budget of SSA.

It was found that there was no grading system on the basis of teacher evaluation conducted by principals in all types of schools and grade was also not given after the review of teachers' report by the various reviewers. Grade was given only in Gunotsav. But feedback giving system was present and awards and s reward were given to the teachers to encourage them.

5.14.17. Effect of Teacher Evaluation on their Career

According to all teachers of private schools and JNV, principal's evaluation provided them motivation for better work in their career. The probable reasons were that feedback of evaluators solved the problems of teachers and words of appreciation realized teacher's self-worthiness and aspired them to work better. So, it results in the development of the culture of mutual understanding and trust for sharing and caring. But Some teachers also believed that evaluation by principals also affected administrative decision related to their careers. This is supported by the study of Clark (2014)that "The results indicated Nebraska public school principals evaluated for teacher effectiveness and dismissed teachers identified as ineffective by administrators. However, they also counselled teachers out of the profession rather than give teachers a notice of nonrenewal or termination.

5.14.18. Documentation of Teacher Evaluation

Overall, it was found that the majority of principals documented the teacher evaluation data in various forms. Logbook was found to be commonly used by majority of principals specially of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS to document teacher evaluation data. However, principal of JNV used the readymade Performa. In the case of private schools, the documentation was done in variety of ways. It was prominently found that they documented it in logbooks, principal's diary, in readymade formats or in teachers' file. It was seen that the documentation of teacher evaluation data was taken very seriously in all types of schools, probably because written records can be stored an act an evidences of teacher performance. This data can be used as

proof if any complaint made against the school system. Teachers' evaluation data is not used for promotion and increment in government schools as used in private schools

Teacher evaluation note/report was shown to the teachers in the jilla panchayat schools, private schools and JNV and also by CRC coordinators as a part of regular evaluation. However, note/report of teacher evaluation was not shown by the evaluators in the EMRS and ashram shalas. The report was shown probably because a lot of chance of improvement when the teachers know their weaknesses and feel motivated when they see their strengths. The report was not shown in ashram shala it could be because evaluation report was not written in detail.

5.14.19. Review of Teacher Evaluation Report

According to the principals, there was review of report system in JNV, and EMRS. In JNV the principal reviewed the teacher evaluation report written by the vice principal considering objectives completion, strengths, shortfalls, constraints and extraordinary achievement. The report was reviewed considering objectives completion, strengths, shortfalls and constraints as stated by the principal of EMRS. The review of evaluation report was important for the teachers because on the basis of teacher evaluation administrative decisions were taken. The principals of JNV and EMRS responded that remarks were not given by the reviewers on review of teacher evaluation reports.

5.14.20. Sending Teacher Evaluation Reports to Higher Authority

In jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and private school teacher evaluation reports written by principals were not sent to the higher authorities. So, it means that evaluation conducted by principals was not summative in nature but formative. Its purpose was to maintain and improve classroom practice by providing guidance. Only one private school sent the report to the trustee's office. This means the report was reviewed by them for may be for taking administrative decisions. However, CRC coordinators and BRPs sent their reports to state level SSA office and some reports to BRC Bhavan such as specially data of student evaluation in Gunotsav. The purpose could be to collect the data of teacher performance of all state level and form training program or take any other measures for staff development accordingly. The principal of JNV sent the report to the regional office and the principal of EMRS to the Tribal Department to take administration decisions related renewal of the teaching contract.

5.14.21. Power of Evaluators to take Action on Ineffective Teacher Performance

The responses of teachers and principals regarding power of evaluators found was to be different specially in jilla panchayat schools. The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, all teachers of private schools and JNV believed that evaluators had power to take action against ineffective teacher performance except teachers of EMRS. The majority of jilla panchayat teachers believed that the principal and educational inspectors had such power to take action against them because they perceived the principals as strong the first higher authority whose instructions were always to be followed by the teachers. The ashram shala teachers believed that this kind of power was in the hands of ashram shala Adhikaris. All the teachers of EMRS believed that the power was in the hands of the Society which was responsible for functioning of the school along with the Gujarat Government Tribal Department. The power of final decision about their tenure is in the hands of society. This further clarifies that the teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS believed that the principals as evaluators do not have as much power as found in jilla panchayat schools.

The majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and JNV believed that they did not have any power to take action against the teacher on their poor performance. Actually, every principal has minimum power to give notice and to take corrective measures for improvement and report to the higher authority special in the case of government schools. Any punishable action cannot be taken by the principals even if they are poor performing teachers in the school. Therefore, the principals felt that they didn't have any power. However, majority of principals of private schools and EMRS believed that they had the power to take decisions on poor performance of the teachers. Amongst Some principals of jilla panchayat schools who believed that they had power included power like giving notice to the teachers and taking corrective measures for teachers. The majority of principals of private schools had the power to relieve the teachers of their services. The probable reasons for private schools were that as some of principals are founder of schools and other reason is that some of principals are close to the trustee and seen as trustworthy can influence the decision related teacher tenure, increment in salary. This is aligned with the study of Clark (2014) "The results indicated Nebraska public school principals evaluated for teacher effectiveness and dismissed teachers identified as ineffective by administrators.

However, they also counselled teachers out of the profession rather than give teachers a notice of nonrenewal or termination.

The majority of principals of jilla panchayat schools and the principal of JNV who stated that they did not have power were undecided in as to what kind of power they needed. However, some principals of jilla panchayat and ashram shalas stated that they did not want any power whatsoever and some wanted the power of stopping the increment in the salary of teachers. Those principals who were undecided about having the kinds power or didn't want any power seem to be satisfied with the government systems, norm decided by the government.

5.14.22. Teacher Encouragement by Educational Personnel

Nelson (2015) revealed that only 21% of teachers agreed that an ideal evaluation system should be tied to financial rewards as a component of teacher evaluation. However, the present study came with the findings that increment in salary as a reward and encouragement was found only in private schools. Actually, increment in salary is a reward for performing better. But the most of the teachers belonging to government school do not perceive like a reward for encouragement but considered as it their right. The private schools are always interested to retain their best teacher. Therefore, they gave reward in terms of increment in salary according to their performance.

5.14.23. Paying more Attention on Novice Teachers

It was found that in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS no extra attention was paid to the novice teachers and all were treated equally by the principals on the ground of demonstrating equal profession competences. However, it was also found that in private schools, principals paid more attention to the novice teachers and the important reasons for paying attention were to measuring measure their effectiveness in teaching, to help teachers to get acquainted with school culture and to provide guidance.

In jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala, JNV and EMRS, the probable reason of not paying more attention to novice teachers could be that the teachers of new generation possess sound academic knowledge as they are appointed after clearing Teacher Eligibility Test (TET), and have good knowledge of infosavy skills. As they are young and active, they take the responsibility without supervision of principal, they conduct many activities. In case of private schools, the novice teachers may be fresh and may

not qualified the test like TET and therefore the need of orientation program by the schools is required.

5.14.24. Assistance in Conducting Teacher Evaluation

The principals of all types of school did not take help of any other person in conducting teacher evaluation as it was considered to be sole duty of principals. In Jilla panchayat schools every teacher works for eight periods every day. So, they are not able to help principals. Without any help the principal randomly evaluates the teachers. In case of private schools, the majority of principals took help of supervisors, whereas, in case of JNV, the principal took help of the vice principal. They have official responsibility to ensure effective classroom teaching practice. So, they conduct evaluation. In Jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS there are no posts of supervisors or vice principals, therefore, principals do not get help for teacher evaluation.

5.14.25. Experience Sharing Meeting

Experience sharing meeting was conducted for CRC coordinators and BRPs at the block level and district level once in a month with the higher authorities. According to CRC Coordinators and BRPs, the meeting was effective. In the meeting probably general observations of CRC coordinators and BRPs were shared. With them, their higher authorities also share their experience of school visits and reasons for problems in school if any and the solution are shared with the respective functionaries of SSA and also provide guidance.

5.14.26. Gunotsav

The teachers of jilla panchayat schools and EMRS conducted remedial work during the time period prescribed by the government. However, the majority of teachers of ashram shalas conducted remedial work for the time period required according to the students' need rather than prescribed by the government. The basic learning is part of teaching specially in lower primary school so that they can do remedial work on regular basis too but in upper primary school teachers have to allot special time for basic skill learning along with their curriculum transaction. According to the majority of principals Gunotsav was more effective in std. 1 to 5 for educational achievement(Patel, 2020).However, the principals also believed that remedial work after diagnosis was useless for intelligent students and according to teachers remedial work was waste of time for intelligent students (Patel, 2020). An important suggestion emerged from this

study was that the other curricular aspects besides reading, writing and arithmetic should be included for evaluation in the lower primary classes.

In jilla panchayat schools, principals, Block resource person, Cluster resource coordinators, BRC Coordinators and taluka primary education officers visited the schools in surprise visits but in EMRS the principal only took surprise visits. However, in ashram shalas the principals and CRC coordinators took surprise visits to observe the preparation of Gunotsav program. Monitoring is really important part of evaluation by superiors. This is consistent with the study of Patel (2020) that suggested that intensive monitoring should be done during remedial work after Gunotsav and teachers found the monitoring during remedial class was effective. Besides this, the DIET lecturers also suggested that during whole year monitoring should be continued intensively. The probable reasons for frequent monitoring in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shala and EMRS could be that the higher authorities are serious about teacher evaluation and chasing their targets this also makes teachers serious about their works. In this process the evaluators can provide guidance to enhance teaching practice of the students. All these may be done by surprise visits by most of the evaluators. The teachers of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas and EMRS sent data of student remedial work to the SSA office. The purpose of this data could be for the analysis of progress made by the schools, block, district or state at various level.

The nature of evaluators found supportive or neutral who visited the classroom prior to Gunotsav for formative evaluation or Gunotsav Day. Prior Gunotsav was formative evaluation process where improvement was given priority to do work better. The teachers of all types of schools found the feedback of evaluator who came for Gunotsav monitoring including principals, CRC Coordinators, BRP, BRC coordinators, education inspector, TPEO and DPEO effective as well as he feedbacks given by external evaluators and liaison officers were effective. Majorly, the evaluators evaluate teachers, appreciated the attempt of teachers, gave suggestion for improvement and also gave the next target of achievement. On the basis of effectiveness of feedback, it can be inferred that monitoring was effective. This is agreed with the finding of the study of Patel that 72.76% teachers found the monitoring during remedial class was effective.

The majority teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS replied that they conducted self-evaluation in Gunotsav program fairly. This is

in contrary to the study carried out by Patel (2020) revealed that teachers and principals believed that the more subjectivity was found in students' evaluation by teachers in self-evaluation components of Gunotsav. The two suggestions in this regard emerged in the present study such as surprise Gunotsav should also be conducted sometimes and every school should have the external and self-evaluation component of the Gunotsav at the same time annually. The teachers of ashram shala and principals also added that an important suggestion was that the external evaluators should constitute functionaries from the area of education only. The obtained result is in conformity with the study carried out by Patel (2020) that majority of teachers, principals, BRC Coordinators and DIET lecturers suggested 100% schools should be evaluated by the external evaluators. Gunotsav should be neutral to make fruitful. Every external evaluator should make it mandatory to visit classrooms and test basic skills of students in Gunotsav.

The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shala and all teachers of EMRS had no fear of Gunotsav. The obtained result is in contradiction with the study of Patel (2020) which suggested that due to Gunotsav, there was one kind of fear found in students and teachers which should be removed. on the basis of grade given to the teachers, no administrative decision was taken. The data was used for formative purpose. So, Only Some of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas felt fear regarding the performance of the students and fear of unfamiliar evaluator. So, The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of ashram shalas and EMRS were satisfied with the grade obtained in Gunotsav.

The important suggestions related to time which was emerged from this study were that Gunotsav program should be conducted in a fixed regular, particular and appropriate time in a regular fixed time every year. The date should be given at the commencement of the school academic year and done timely. Patel (2020) According to the BRC coordinators Gunotsav should be conducted at the end of the year and according to the teachers, Gunotsav program should be conducted at the end of the semester.

5.14.27. Inspection

The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and JNV had more than four times classroom visits during inspection in their career in comparison to private schools. The Experice of inspection was depended on the length of career of teachers because it is the one of the oldest systems of evaluation of teachers and school. The teacher

experienced teachers that inspection was done effectively though they had fear of it earlier. In private school, time of observation allocated during inspection was 5 minutes to 10 minutes. In jilla panchayat schools and JNV the time of observation allocated during inspection was more than 15 minutes. The majority of JNV teachers reported 40 to 45 minutes whereas, in jilla panchayat schools, 1 period i.e. 35 minutes was allocated for classroom observation. In private schools, the time of classroom observation was less than other types of schools. It is possible that the approach of the inspection panel in jilla panchayat school and JNV is being taken seriously and the inspection panel have enough number of members to conduct evaluation. In JNV for the whole school evaluation, three days are allotted, So, they have enough time to observe each and everything effectively. On the basis inspection and evaluation of principal and vice principal, annual confidential report is filled up. The finding of the study of Chavada (2015) contrary stated that present inspection model was found less helpful to check implementation of comprehensive evaluation in the schools, to measure effectiveness of teachers' educational and professional readiness.

The teachers suggested that date of inspection should be given at the beginning of the academic year or the date should be informed in advance prior to one week. Inspection should be conducted at a particular time; it should be completed by the end of February. The reason for this suggestion could be that inspection is conducted but it is not at the same time every year because probably the planning of taluka education office is sometimes sudden and may be schedule is given suddenly. The schools are often not prepared and may need time. Therefore, the teachers felt the date of inspection should be given in advance. The inspection should not be done by familiar, known individuals for greater objectivity. Kendra Shishak should not arrange inspection because Inspection done by them was not neutral; The TPEO or educational inspectors should be present there for a bias free inspection. These suggestions emerged because the post of education inspector often vacant and sometimes they are given the charge of TPEO. So, most of the time it probably depends upon the vision of TPEO at the Block level about planning of inspection and who will be the leader. The TPEO probably orders sometimes Kendra shikshak to complete the work of inspection. In case inspection panel was formulated at the block level, with teachers, HTAT principals and CRC coordinators belonging to different CRC centres and were given responsibility of inspecting other than their Kendra's schools, the panel would be more objective. The

responsibility of inspection given to the kendra shikxak who would make panel and select the members from same kendra, so the inspection would be subjective, it was suggested that the TPEO or educational inspectors should be present there for a bias free inspection, should not be done like a ritual, should be fear free, build teacher competency, assess creativity of children. It was found during inspection feedback should be given regularly and effectively. The reason for irregular and ineffective feedback could be that sometimes two schools were taken in same day. So, probably sometimes oral suggestion was not given effectively due to shortage of time. Teachers of ashram shalas suggested that inspection should be conducted regularly as done earlier every year as the probable reasons for this may be the shortage of staff and other evaluation programs such as Gunotsav and evaluation by the resource person already exist in their schools. So overall, it can be said that the inspection system of JNV was effective than any other types schools. The majority of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools, private schools and all teachers of JNV did not have any fear of inspection as earlier.

Most of the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and all teachers of JNV replied positively about follow-up work done whereas majority of private school teachers replied that follow-up work was not done after teacher evaluation.

5.14.28. Self-Evaluation

All teachers of private school and JNV set own performance objectives, whereas, jilla panchayat teachers were found to be working on already set objectives. The goal setting was recommended by Beaty (1989). The area of self-evaluation in jilla panchayat schools was just on teaching-learning process whereas in JNV it extends to cocurricular activities and organizing inter school activities, whereas, private schools included community interface activities. In comparison to jilla panchayat schools, more aspects of performance self-evaluation were included both in JNV and private schools. Besides these aspects, Sonsanya -Tellez (2010) found that the participating teachers also examined their own values, beliefs and customs that were formerly unexamined.

It was found that the teachers of jilla panchayat schools and private schools came to know about their development of deficient skills by comparing their performance with their last performance. The JNV teachers came to know about their development of deficient abilities by comparing their actual performance with the set targets. The study

of Beaty (1989) found that self-evaluation which includes comparison of performance to standards, analysis and ranking of teaching strength and self-observation of teaching is considered somewhat effective. Here, it appeared that no schools had a system of comparing with standards but it was found that JNV teachers compared with the set target.

In the process of self-evaluation, the teachers of jilla panchayat felt difficulties in recalling their quantitative data specially for filling in the self-evaluation format. The evaluation can be problematic when preparation is absent, terms and roles as poorly defined and no resources are available (Frimannsdottir, 2010). In this regard, Hayenes (1988) suggested not to give importance to the end-product only, but also the process used to achieve the end product and balance them.

At the end of the process, the teachers of all three types of schools mentioned their achievement in the report. But along with this, the majority of JNV teachers also added weaknesses in their self- evaluation report. The advantages of self-evaluation such as maximizing self-discovery, identifying strength and weakness was found commonly in jilla panchayat schools and JNV, whereas self-motivation was found in private schools and again in JNV. The solution of problems was also considered as an advantage by the teachers of jilla panchayat schools. This may be possible because they get an opportunity to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses and also get solutions to their problems. This result is aligned with the study of Graham (2004) which revealed that the teacher using the self-evaluation process were aware of their own strengths and weaknesses and sought out knowledge to improve their teaching skills. In this sense the study of Ahuja (2000) rightly observed that self -evaluation is the most effective and the most efficient staff development technique.

5.14.29. Teacher Evaluation System other than Government Systems

In the field of teacher evaluation, it was generally found that in case of schools run by government bodies the teacher evaluation systems were decided by them. Other than the government decided evaluation system, only principal of EMRS initiated one small experiment of conducting teacher evaluation by the students on the basis of committee work which included both the students and the teachers of the schools. Though it is small initiative, it may show the way of conducting evaluation by the students in elementary education considering some dimensions of classroom teaching and

behavioural aspects of the teachers. It may not be possible in small classes but at least such evaluation can be conducted in class seven and class eights. It can be useful to collect direct observation of students. It can be used as one of the components of teacher evaluation along with other evaluation practices. It is not advisable to solely depend upon evaluation by students at the elementary level because students are not very matured but at the same time their views are important. This could be helpful for the teacher to know the perception of students towards their teaching.

5.14.30. Relationship of Teachers with Evaluators

It was found that relationship of the majority of teachers of all types of schools with their evaluators were very good. It could be because the evaluators are democratic in nature, approachable to the teachers and give them due respect. On the importance of relationship of principals with teachers, the study of Sonsanya Tellez (2010) reflected that they think that the principal must be a collaborative leader that engenders trust and creates a space for dialogues which requires humility and invitation to explore ideas on the part of the principals. This is in accordance with the with the study of Haynes (1988) that also recommended to create an atmosphere conducive to collaborating planning in buildings by principal.

5.14.31. Effective Sources of Teacher Evaluation

According to the teachers, the self-evaluation component of Gunotsav program was found to be the most effective source of teacher evaluation in jilla panchayat schools and ashram shalas as it was free from tension, done honestly by teachers, teachers were informed in advance and the grade given on the basis self-evaluation was usually good. The teachers respond favourably to the self-evaluation procedures and willing use them because they have practical information, effective communication and valid and usable procedure (Struyk,1990). Evaluation by principal was found to be the most effective source of teacher evaluation in the private schools, JNV and EMRS. According to the teachers the major reasons of this source being effective were good suggestion given by the principals, principals being supportive and helpful to the teachers in knowing their weaknesses, positive attitude of the principal and proper guidance to the teachers. Besides this confidential report of teachers was filled up by the principal which affected their contract renewal in EMRS. The principals believe that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to help teachers improve (Himmelein, 2009). Posada & Modesto

(2005) also stated that the principal plays a vital role primarily as the support provider. Ramirez and Alfredo (2005) further stated that the principals utilized the comprehensive teacher evaluation system to provide support to teachers in need of assistance.

5.14.32. Influence of Various Effects on Teacher Evaluation

The majority of teachers found the influence of sympathy effect, halo effect, status effect, effect of last evaluation and latest behavior effect and same as me effect on teacher evaluation.

The sympathy effect was prominently found to affect the evaluation by principals in jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas and EMRS. It also affected the evaluation by vice-principals and supervisors in private schools, in the Gunotsav program and in evaluations conducted by SSA staff. The reason could be that in the same schools the teachers working with the evaluators together may influence the evaluators to be sympathetic to the them.

The Status effect was prominently found in evaluations conducted by the principals of the private schools. The status of the teachers i.e being senior or junior affected his evaluation. The reasons for this effect could be the belief of the evaluators the senior teachers give better performance. The effect of last evaluation conducted was prominently found in the evaluation by principals, Gunotsav evaluators, inspections in jilla panchayat schools. The Latest behavior effect and same as me effect were prominently found in evaluation by principals conducted in private schools. The probable reasons for 'same as me' effect could be the principals are excellent in their performance and the expect excellent performance from their teachers. However, it may result in dissatisfaction of principals if teachers do not perform as per their expectations. The reasons for the 'latest behavior effect' could be that very often the evaluators are able to remember only the recent performance of teachers.

5.14.33. Perceptions of Teachers towards Teacher Evaluation System

The teachers of all types of schools had a positive attitude towards teacher evaluation and believed that it was an effective tool that focuses on teacher's growth, confidence, accountability and increase in job satisfaction. Campbell (2014) revealed that teachers see the value in teacher performance evaluation. They understand that teacher

performance evaluation can provide both opportunities for individual teacher growth and development, and at the same time holding teachers accountable. The teachers perceived that their evaluators were competent to evaluate the performance of teacher. The reason could be that they believed that the evaluator had knowledge of content and of the government program, method of teaching, and mechanism of evaluation.

Favourable perception of teachers regarding timely evaluation could be conducted due to the adequate number of human resources available such as Cluster resource centre coordinators, timely evaluation in each and every school was possible. Most of teachers evaluated themselves frankly and objectively. The reason could be teachers. The reason could be teachers do not have any fear because of performing effectively following the standards. (put other support) Most of the teachers believed that student performance gave a correct picture of teacher's performance. The teachers perceived that they get proper assistance after their evaluation was conducted. The study of Himmelein (2009) also supports the purpose of teacher evaluation is to help teachers improve. Most of the teacher didn't find the evaluation environment stressful as it is part of the school practice. Adhered to procedures is one of the three most critical components in teacher evaluation system found in the study of Nelson 92015). So, it should always take care.

The perceptions of teachers of all types of schools were favourable towards feedback which included effect of feedback on performance and negative feedback with specific and clear examples/ evidence and explanation. The findings of the study resembled with the study of Gholam & Kobeissi, (2012) who revealed in their study is to provide teachers with useful feedback and give them opportunities to improve in areas in which they score poorly. Almost half of the teachers were either neutral, disagreed or strongly disagreed to negative feedback given with specific and clear examples explanation, and evidence while the other half perceived it positively.

Most of the teacher's perception towards outcomes of teacher evaluation such as objective setting, encouragement to evaluate students effectively, finding their own strength and weakness, experience sharing, reliable data of teacher performance were found positive. The elementary teachers perceived the district teacher evaluation system as having a stronger impact on improved teacher instruction, sustained school improvement, increased student learning and elevated professional growth (Doherty, 2009). Most of teachers have positive belief that teacher evaluation provides sufficient

and accurate, reliable and credible data of teacher performance. The teachers perceived that they got appropriate grade and rewarding teachers encourages them to perform better. Teachers desire words of appreciation for encouragement whether in form of grades or rewards. It is not necessary to have it in the form of financial reward. Nelson (2015) revealed that only some teachers agreed that an ideal evaluation system should be tied to financial rewards as a component of teacher evaluation. The teachers were satisfied with present teacher evaluation system. The reason could be as Jaffurs (2017) found importance of culture as well as involvement of teacher in development and implementation for acceptance of teacher evaluation system.

5.14.34. Perception of Principals

The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on the role and goals of teachers, teacher accountability and attitude of teachers towards teacher evaluation. This is aligned with the study of Goldstein (2003) which revealed that the principal perceived positive effect of the teacher evaluation program on teaching practice and accountability. It was also found that the principals of all types of schools perceived the evaluation tools favourably. The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on preparation done by evaluators which included prior preparation and checking of lesson plans.

The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on effective utilization of time except EMRS who perceived the time was not used as per schedule. The principals of all types of schools except JNV perceived that teacher evaluation was time consuming procedure. It means that the principals prioritize teacher evaluation in providing enough amount time to it.

The perception of principals of all types of schools except EMRS was favourable on the competency of evaluators which included academic knowledge and demonstration of lessons. The principal of EMRS perceived that he as an evaluator did not possess sound academic knowledge of different subjects. The reason could be he accepted reality that 6 to 12 there are many subjects that he could not learn everything but should tried to learn because Nelson (2015) findings indicated the competent evaluator is one of the most critical components of teacher evaluation system.

The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on different sources of data which measured performance of the teachers effectively and that included principal's observation, student evaluation and self-evaluation. These sources of data depicted the complete picture of teacher performance by classroom observation and evaluation of students and also inspired the teachers for self -development. In the study of Chad (2005), principals of sample use classroom observation, 67% of principals of sample used at least one of other evaluation method in combination with classroom observation when evaluating teachers. The study of Himmelein (2009) revealed that the principals are most open to including informal observation, observations of interaction with colleagues, parents and students and measures of student progress into the formal evaluation.

The perception of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas private schools and JNV was favourable whereas perception of EMRS principal was not favourable on the review of performance done properly. The reason could be that it is done doing effectively considering every aspect or biasness may be existed. The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on giving feedback effectively which included frequent and timely feedback, recognition of the negative feedback with a constructive intention and encouraging performance by appreciating the teachers. In study of Glowacki & Heather (2013) it was found that respondents reported that they evidenced a good ability to provide feedback to the teachers. The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on the feeling of comfort during evaluation and on the regular follow up work done by the evaluators. It could be possible that they are habituated and evaluators evaluate them positive attitude.

The perception of principals of all types of schools was favourable on outcomes which included areas requiring improvement, enhancement of quality education through objective evaluation, measuring effectiveness of teacher performance through student evaluation, innovative ideas, providing a helping hand to novice teachers, learning through teacher evaluation, enhancing mutual understanding between principal and teachers, preparing professional development plans for teachers and giving motivation to the teachers. The principals of all types of schools perceived satisfaction with the present teacher evaluation system. The reason could be that they perceived the system is working effectively.

5.14.35. Problems and suggestions for Teacher Evaluation System

The majority of teachers of jilla panchayat schools, private schools were not satisfied with the present teacher evaluation system. The majority of the teachers of ashram shalas, JNV and EMRS and few of teachers of jilla panchayat schools and private schools felt the need for change in the present teacher evaluation system. The majority of the principals of jilla panchayat schools, ashram shalas, private schools, EMRS except principal of JNV found that there was need of change in the present teacher evaluation system. The time constraints and constraints of human resources, work load was observed as major problems of evaluators in teacher evaluation. The probable reasons of time constraint could be heavy workload, insufficient staff, lack of time management, lack of delegation skills of principals, lack of infosavy skills and dependency on transportation. The majority of the BRPs found problems in teacher evaluation because of time constraints. The BRPs lacked time for teacher evaluation because every BRP does not have an equal number of schools, it depends upon the size of the block. Besides these, the administrative reasons that emanated from the study included insufficient staff, principals as an untrained evaluator and not having special HTAT principals in many schools who would have more time for administrative duties like conducting evaluations. The procedure related reasons included not having a fixed time of evaluation programs such as Gunotsav, inspection. Lack of expert members in evaluation panel and more focus of CRC coordinators on collecting data rather than classroom observation were other reasons which affected the feedback and follow up work of the evaluators and consequently their evaluation work was not done timely. However, human constraint was not found to be a problem in private schools, JNV and EMRS. The principal of EMRS did not face any difficulties and the majority of CRC Coordinators also did not face difficulties.

The Ashram shala teachers suggested more frequent visit of CRC coordinators or incharge CRC coordinators and the vacant posts should be filled up. There should always be complete recruitment of staff as per available vacancy so that they can visit classrooms and guide teachers that would be helpful in giving assistance to the principals. The charge of CRC coordinators was given to the HTAT principal who had responsibility of his own schools. So, their major role was observed in data collection, coordinating training or other programs such as science exhibition, innovation fair and monitoring in special programs such as Gunotsav, mission Vidya. The Teachers of

Eklavy Model Residential school suggested that CRC coordinators should visit every class of every teacher. The CRC coordinators should avoid random selection in case the same class of the teacher was selected. So, every teacher's class can be observed and testing the students could be possible. All teachers of EMRS suggested that teachers who were working at temporary positions should be appointed as permanent staff on the basis of teacher evaluation. The final decision of permanent recruitment should be taken on that basis. One suggestion from teachers of JNV emerged that other component of child psychology should be added as an evaluation dimension.

The principals of jilla panchayat schools suggested that administrative decisions including punishable action should also be taken considering teachers on the basis of their evaluation in order to make work effective. On the basis of evaluation, memo or achievement certificate is given to the JNV teachers after review of confidential report with self-evaluation, remarks of vice principal, principal and inspection panel head i.e., the assistant commissioner of Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti regional office. In private schools, most of the staff is not recruited as permanent staff, so directly School Trust or on the basis of principals' feedback the teachers can be terminated easily. Schools should have enough staff so that principals can evaluate effectively. In jilla panchayat schools, the probable reason could be that due to less recruited education inspectors, the inspection was often conducted under the leadership of a responsible person. The SSA staff focus on formative teacher evaluation. So, CRC Coordinators also suggested that there should be provision of taking action against the poor performing teachers and on the basis of classroom observation, teachers should be assigned a grade and it should be noted in their service book. The BRP also suggested that on the basis of classroom observation, teachers should be assigned a grade and it should be noted in the service book. In small schools, principals take classes so, that they should not be involved in the evaluation process. For principals filling logbooks after teacher evaluation should not be compulsory as they were involved in teaching as well the administrative duties.

Besides these, the suggestions given by the superiors was that demonstration teaching of lessons should be given by the evaluators if it is needed. The teachers should also follow instructions of the superior strictly. Encouragement should be provided to the teachers. The principals of private schools also made an important suggestion that training on teacher evaluation should be given to the principals. Providing counselling to teachers on digital learning should be provided. The CRC coordinators suggestions

comprised of updating knowledge and skills of teachers timely, awareness of government program, less paper work and major concentration on monitoring rather than paying more attention to the collection of data. After evaluation of each teacher, discussion should be done on a regular basis and on the basis of evaluation, there should be a procedure of taking action against teachers with poor performance if needed.

5.15. Educational Implication of the Present Study

The present study was a survey of teacher evaluation system at the elementary level. The data of the study leads towards the inferences of the present study. The findings of the study and its interpretation helped to the researcher to derive following educational implications for the present study.

1. District Institute of Education and Training (DIET)

- DIET, a responsible machinery for providing training to teachers and principals that evaluators should be provided training on teacher evaluation considering various evaluation methods and techniques.
- As the result of teacher evaluation, by CRC coordinators, BRPs, principals and other resource persons the identified teachers with a need for training should be provided by the DIETs.

2. Education Department Gujarat

- It should develop the system of teacher job accountability in the elementary schools on the basis of data analyzed from the various sources of teacher evaluation. The excellent performance of the teachers should be encouraged by giving them monetary rewards, extra increment should also be given. However, action should be taken against the poor performance of the teachers who not able to achieve the targets despite continuous training.
- Schools having one to eight standards should be provided HTAT principals as they have administrative duties and less teaching making regular and timely teacher evaluation possible.
- For the regular and timely inspection under the leadership of educational Inspector, the more educational inspectors should be recruited as the existing number is not enough.

- The self-evaluation tool designed by the Education Department of Gujarat should have dimensions of values, beliefs and customs along with psychological variable of students.

3. Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan

- The SSA that monitoring team should visit frequently for formative teacher evaluation and hand holding and provide effective guidance and hand holding to teachers and also observe the impact of their already given guidance in the past.

4. School Management Trust

- The self-evaluation tool designed by the school management trust should have dimensions values, beliefs and customs along with psychological variable of students.

5. University Education Department

- University Education Department should design and conduct teacher evaluation training for principals and teachers.

5.16. Suggestions for Further Research

The present research is not the final research in the field of teacher evaluation practice in school education. This study gives insight about present practice in this field. This will be helpful to facilitate research related to this field. On the basis of experience, the researcher would like to share some suggestion for further research. These will be helpful to the researchers to get ideas for the exploration of the present field in the future.

- Studies on teacher evaluation system in the different types of elementary, secondary and higher secondary schools may be conducted at different districts and at the state level.
- Studies on inspection practices can be taken up in the elementary schools and higher secondary schools.
- Studies on various innovative practices in the field of teacher evaluation can be conducted at different levels in school education and higher education.
- A study on the effectiveness of Gunotsav 2.0 can be conducted in the elementary schools of Gujarat.

- A study can be conducted on the effectiveness of monitoring by CRC coordinators, BRPs and other SSA staff.
- A model can be developed for teacher evaluation at the school and higher education level.
- Standardization of tools for teacher evaluation can be developed to measure the effectiveness of teacher performance.

5.17. Conclusion

It is clear from the findings of the present study, the teacher evaluation emerged as one of the ways to ensure the quality of education. It has been found that teacher evaluation exists in all types of schools. There were various sources of teacher evaluation such as teachers' self-evaluation, evaluation by superiors including principals, educational inspectors, SSA officials -CRC coordinators and BRPs. There was no practice of peer evaluation found in any type of schools. The teachers were found to be aware of teacher evaluation objectives and criteria on which they were evaluated which shows the present-day teachers are well acquainted with the evaluation system. The perceptions of the teachers and principals were found favourable towards teacher evaluation which means largely the existing evaluation system in government and private school is being conducted effectively. The teachers found self-evaluation and evaluation by superiors as the most effective methods and therefore the importance other sources of teacher evaluation must be made familiar to the teachers. The major problems of teacher evaluation are time constraints and heavy workload of evaluators and this must be look into by the government and the private machinery. The government must conduct training for all evaluators on teacher evaluation in a mission mode. Though inspection is being conducted at the primary level in most of the schools the shortage of the educational inspectors must be looked into and the inspection system must be observed as reliable and trustworthy by the stakeholders. Teacher evaluation system at the primary level is of paramount importance and can be seen as a lifeline as learning outcomes of learners depend on effective teaching learning practices.