

**TEACHER EVALUATION
IN THE
STATE OF KUWAIT**

Dr. Jasem Mohammad Al-Hamdan

- **Ph. D. in High Ed. Administration. Ohio state University, U.S.A. (1984).**
- **Dept. of Educational Administration & Planning, College of Education, Kuwait University.**

TEACHER EVALUATION IN THE STATE OF KUWAIT

Abstract

the Purpose of this study is to explore teachers', supervisors', and Principals' viewpoint toward Teacher' Evaluation in Kuwait Public Schools. Moreover, it aims to find if there are significant differences between participants' opinions according to their positions, nationalities, gender and educational areas.

The study sample is randomly selected from secondary schools in the five educational areas in the State of Kuwait. The sample consisted of 406 teachers, 32 principals, and 104 supervisors. A three - part questionnaire contains 35 items was used. These parts are the follow-up card, the comment form, and the evaluation criterion.

For the analysis of the data, spss was utilized to obtain frequencies, percentages, and chi-square to determine the differences between the respondents according to their demographic characteristics. The results showed that teacher evaluation program needs improvement in several points mentioned in the study.

Introduction

Before 1993, one evaluation program was used for all the employees working for the Ministry of Education in the State of Kuwait. That evaluation was conducted once a year, by May for teachers, and by December for others.

Two persons (the direct boss and his responsible) estimated a score out of one hundred for the evaluatee. Two aspects were evaluated: personality and job performance. Moreover, statments about strengths and weaknesses were added. In addition an approval should be obtained from the Director of the Department and from the Committee of Employees' Affairs (Ministry of Education, 1979).

In July, 1993, a ministerial decree was signed by the Minister of Education related to a new evaluation program for all Ministry of Education employees. This decree included the evaluation process and procedures (Ministry of Education, 1993 a). The new program has two main branches: persons who are working inside the schools, and the others who are working outside the schools, The procedures required three applications for three tools: the follow-up card as a daily and weekly record; mid-year comments on a remarks form; and the end-of-year evaluation criterion.

Each type of job has its own forms and procedures, except the follow-up card which is the same for all people who are working in the schools, including teachers (Ministry of Education, 1993b). The teacher should be evaluated by two persons, the supervisor and the principal, for his several activities through the three tools (Ministry of Education, 1993):

- 1 - The follow-up card is a daily and weekly record. It consists of demographic data, performance, training programs, infringements and punishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and visitors' remarks.
- 2 - The comments form is a mid-school-year evaluation. It is an open assessment. The teacher should be informed about its results. He should know his strengths and weaknesses in order to help him to improve and develop his performance in the second part of the school year. The comments form consists of three parts: efficiency items, self-evaluation (by the teacher), and opinions of the supervisor and the principal.
- 3 - The evaluation criterion is for the end of the school year assessment. By May, the evaluation should be sent secretly to the administration of the Educational Area. This criterion consists of four parts;
 - a) Data should be filled in from the follow-up card and the comments form. This is the responsibility of the vice-principal.
 - b) Evaluation items, which include nine items for administrative activities and eleven items for teaching activities. Filling in this part is the responsibility of the supervisor and the principal.
 - c) Self-evaluation part, which should be written by the teacher.
 - d) The fourth part is related to the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher.

This part is the responsibility of the supervisor and principal.

The score of the evaluation has three levels: «excellent», for a score of 90-100; «good», for 60-89; «poor», for 59 and less (Ministry of Education, 1993c).

Problem of the study

This Study attempts to evaluate the latest teacher evaluation program which was implemented in the school year 1993/1994 in Kuwait.

The Study tries to explore the perception of persons who are involved in this program. More than discovering the perceptions of the supervisors, principals and teachers, it is significant to compare their attitudes toward the teacher evaluation program. The participant's opinions can be very helpful in indicating the weak points of the program for the purpose of future strengthening and development.

This study attempts to answer the following two questions:

- 1 - What are the opinions of teachers, supervisors, and principals toward the teacher evaluation program?
- 2 - Are there significant differences between the perceptions of teachers, supervisors, and principals according to their positions, nationalities, gender, and educational area.

Limitations of the Study

This study attempts to evaluate the Teacher's Evaluation Program on the secondary school level. It is limited for both male and female secondary schools. Other studies are recommended for other school levels.

Review of Literature

Many Studies have dealt with teacher Evaluation issues related to this study. These articles discussed training of evaluators such as principals, the link of teacher evaluation and development, excellent teaching and elements of teaching style, teacher evaluation and students' learning gains, using portfolios to evaluate teachers, evaluation forms and standard criteria.

Veir (1990), in his study "A Tale of two appraisal systems: Texas and North Carolina", reported that both states have developed similar systems of teacher appraisal. Both programs require direct observation of teachers for data collection, and both provide for training of

appraisers and orientation of teachers. Also, Airasian (1993), in his study, "Teacher Assessment: Some Issues for Principals", says that in most districts, teacher assessment has little influence on educational practice. He suggested that principals can enhance the success of teacher assessment by understanding its purpose. Likewise, Murphy (1996) addressed the goals of evaluation training. He said they are fairly to help individuals develop an understanding of the purposes and functions of evaluation as well as interpreting evaluation data; and to understand how their findings can be used in whichever process they are concerned with.

Gardner (1993) described teacher assessment programs for four Florida School systems that have attempted to link teacher assessment, development, and school improvement. Common components are identified, with collaboration, professional development, and accountability being among the most important areas of evaluation. Johnson (1993) looked at the next generation of evaluation. He proposed that teacher evaluation needs to move to the next generation to become a process facilitating teacher growth and development in a supportive and corporative way. Moreover, Haefele (1993) in his article "Evaluating Teachers: A Call for Change" said that formative evaluation should be emphasized over summative evaluation, and new approaches must use legal procedures and effective conferencing techniques. Motivation and development must become the focus of teacher evaluation. Also, Frase and Streshly (1994) criticized teacher evaluation. They warned of failure of providing feedback accompanied by substantive and practical suggestions that will prevent improvement and reduce teachers's internal motivation.

Dunn (1990) addressed six elements of teaching style, which include instructional planning, teaching methods, teaching environment, teaching characteristics and classroom management, student evaluation techniques and educational philosophy. Snowden (1992) in his report included a statement about what teachers should know and be able to do. The statement delineated five general propositions about excellent teaching:

- Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
- Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

- Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring.
- Teachers are members of learning communities.
- Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

Hult (1993) suggested another method to evaluate teachers using portfolios by which teachers learn from themselves. He ensured growth among teachers using portfolios for assessment. Besides, Gellman (1993) said that portfolio assessment can be a valuable tool in evaluating teachers if appropriate attention is given to reliability. For this method, Regan (1993) proposed a comprehensive portfolio for evaluating novice teachers and described critical incident portfolios for evaluating experienced teachers.

Schalock and others (1993), in their study entitled “Extending Teacher Assessment Beyond Knowledge and Skills: An Emerging Focus on Teacher Accomplishments”, argued that teacher assessment should be extended to include students’ learning gains, and described the conditions that must be met for that system.

Johnson (1992) ensured that teacher evaluation and supervision systems encourage improved job performance. He said that job descriptions and evaluation forms must have specific performance criteria and standards.

Methodology

The Sample

The subjects for this study are the persons who are involved in teacher evaluation programs. They are teachers, supervisors and principals.

The study sample is randomly selected from the five educational areas in the State of Kuwait. The subjects are 500 teachers, of whom 406 (81%) returned the questionnaire; 50 principals, of whom 32 (64%) participated; and 104 of 150 supervisors (69%) responded. Among them, there are 245 Kuwaitis and 279 non-Kuwaitis. From the sample,

264 males and 278 females. From the educational areas, there were 108 from Asma, 129 from Hawali, 131 from Frawania, 87 from Ahmadi, and 87 from Jahra.

The Tool:

For the purpose of this study, an opinionaire of three parts was used. These parts are the follow-up card, the comment from, and the evaluation criterion. Through these parts, the perceptions of persons involved in the teacher evaluation program are explored. For the purpose of comparing their perceptions, the respondents are asked to indicate their positions, nationality, gender of the school they are working in, and the educational area to which they belong. A space was provided at the end of the third part as an open-ended question for suggestions to improve the tools and procedures of the teacher evaluation program.

Validity and Reliability

Face validity was conducted. The three parts of the instrument were givento professors, teachers, principals and supervisors. As a result of their revision, some items were refined and restructured. For reliability of the instrument, alpha was .79, which reflects high reliability.

Data Analysis

For the analysis of the data, SPSS was utilized to obtain frequencies, percentages, and chi-square (χ^2). The chi-square was used to determine the difference between the respondents according to their demographic data. The significance level of χ^2 was set at .05.

Findings and Discussion

The first question of the study inquired about the perceptions of teachers, supervisors, and principals toward the teacher evaluation program. Tables I, III, and V show respondents' views toward the program's three tools. The second question intended to find out whether there are differences among the respondents' perceptions according to their position, nationality, gender, and educational area. Tables II, IV, and VI demonstrate the responses's differences on the three instruments of the teacher evaluation program. (Appendix A)

The Follow-up Card

The statements related to the follow-up card are:

- 1) There is difficulty in filling out the follow-up card.
- 2) The follow-up card reduces teacher absence.
- 3) It reduces the short leaves.
- 4) The way of recording short leaves does not consider emergency cases.
- 5) The follow-up card gives a comprehensive view about the teacher.
- 6) It reflects the positives of the sincere teacher.
- 7) It reflects the shortcomings of the poor performer.
- 8) The card is reflected in following-up activities.
- 9) It motivates the teacher to be more sincere in his work.
- 10) The follow-up card should be considered an effective tool in the evaluation process.
- 11) I suggest ignoring the follow-up card.
- 12) I suggest using the follow-up card after modifying some of its items.

In Table I, perceptions of respondents toward the follow-up card indicate that most of the respondents (60% or more) agree or strongly agree with items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 12, while the other five items have had less than 60% of the agreement, as follows: 1, 15.5%; 5, 59.8%; 8, 50.7%; 10, 47.2%; and 11, 48.2%. Table I also shows that 40% or less of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree on items 1, 8, 10, and 11.

According to their perceptions, most of the teachers, principals, and supervisors believe that the application of the follow-up card reduces teacher absence and short leaves. Also, it reflects the positives of the sincere teacher and the shortcomings of the poor performer.

Moreover, it motivates the teacher to be more sincere in his or her work. The follow-up card was perceived to have shortcomings, however. Most of the participants say that the way of recording short leaves does not consider emergency cases; and half of them think that there is difficulty in filling out the follow-up card. Therefore, almost half of the teachers, principals, and supervisors suggest ignoring the follow-up card, while the others suggest that the follow-up card should be considered an effective tool in the evaluation program after modifying some of its items.

In terms of responses' differences according to their variables, Table II presents that information. Regarding the position, items 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 showed significant differences at .05 level among the teachers, principals, and supervisors toward the follow-up card, while there were no differences among the participants toward items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8. Regarding nationality, items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 12 appeared to have significant differences between Kuwaitis and non-Kuwaitis. The gender variable has three significant differences that are on items 2, 3, and 8. The educational areas have no significant differences between the items, except on item 1.

Comments Form

The statements related to the comments form are:

- 1) Comments form gives the opportunity for teachers to participate in the process of performance evaluation.
- 2) Comments form contributes to enhancing teacher self-evaluation.
- 3) Informing of the grade of evaluation causes problems between the teacher and his boss.
- 4) Comments form leads teachers to develop their performance in the second half of the year.
- 5) Five scale grades reduces gaining high scores.
- 6) When the teacher scored less than he expected, that makes him less active.

- 7) I suggest to have only the principal for items 1-9.
- 8) I suggest to have only the opinion of the principal on the third part of the form which relates to the positives and negatives.
- 9) I suggest reducing the itmes from 20 to a suitable number without affecting the comprehension of the items.
- 10) I suggest not to inform the teacher of the score unless it is a poor grade.
- 11) I suggest sparing the comments form.
- 12) I suggest using the comments form with some modification.

Table III presents respondents' perceptions toward the comments form. It indicates that 62% and more of the respondents agree or strongly agree on items related to the comments form, except items 8, 10, and 11. On item 8, 48% agreed and 37% disagreed. On item 6, 54% agreed and 40% disagreed, while on item 11, 39% agreed and 46% disagreed.

According to participants' perceptions, most of them believe that the comments form gives the opportunity for teachers to participate in the process of the teacher evaluation program. Furthermore, it contributes to enhancing teacher self-evaluation, and leads them to develop their performance in the second half of the year. On the other hand, most of them criticize the scoring of the comments form.

They found that five scale grades reduces the likelihood of gaining high scores, and informing a teacher of his grade most frequently causes problems between the teacher and the principal, especially when the teacher scored less than was expected. Furthermore, that makes him less active in his job.

To improve the comment form and procedure, some suggestions were generally agreed upon by the participants: the teacher must not be informed of his score unless it is a poor grade; evaluating items 1-9 and the third part of the form should be done only by the principal; also, the 20 items of the form should be reduced to a suitable number

without affecting its comprehension. Even so, they suggest using the comments form as a part of the teacher evaluation program with the above modifications.

Table IV represents the responses' differences on the comment form. The three positions have differences existing among them on all items 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12. In terms of gender, differences are found on items 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 12. There were no differences among the respondents, except on item 10, according to the educational area.

Evaluation Criterion

The statements related to the evaluation criterion are:

- 1) The evaluation criterion encourages teachers to be more disciplined in their work.
- 2) It contributes to developing self-evaluation.
- 3) Five scale grades reduce gaining high scores.
- 4) Problems will arise upon telling teacher his score if it is less than what it was in the comments form.
- 5) It is a main resource in determining the teacher's training needs.
- 6) This criterion encourages enrolling in the training programs.
- 7) The first part of this criterion could be reduced because it is already listed in the comments form.
- 8) It reduces absence.
- 9) It measures different aspects of the teacher's activities.
- 10) I suggest reducing the items to a suitable number.
- 11) I suggest reducing the five scales to three.

In Table V are recorded the perceptions of participants toward the evaluation criterion. Most of the participants agree or strongly agree (64% and more) on all the statements related to the evaluation criterion. Only item 11 has an agreement of 57%. That reflects the common

perceptions toward the implications of the performance evaluation criterion. The participants believe that the performance evaluation criterion measures different aspects of the teachers' activities, reduces their absence, and encourages them to be more disciplined in their work. Furthermore, it contributes to developing self-evaluation, and it is a main resource in determining the teachers' training needs, which encourages them to enroll in the training programs. The participants also believe that problems arise upon telling a teacher his score if it is less than what it was on his comments form. Furthermore, the five scale grades reduces gaining high scores. Therefore, they suggest reducing the five scales to three and the items to a suitable number.

In terms of responses' differences on the evaluation criterion, Table VI indicates that the position variable has significant differences on items 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, and 11. Nationality has significance on items 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10; and the gender variable has significant differences only on items 4, 8, and 10, while the responses have no differences according to their educational areas.

The Respondents' Comments

At the end of the questionnaire, there was an open-ended question. Room was provided for respondents to suggest comments to improve the teacher education evaluation program. A clear cooperation was shown from the participants; hence, 229 teachers, 51 supervisors, and 28 principals recorded their comments. Furthermore, most of them gave two comments or more.

Teachers indicated several issues related to their evaluation. The most frequently raised ones were:

- 1 - The master teachers should participate in the teacher evaluation process. He views the teacher's activities more than the supervisors and principals do.
- 2 - The evaluation program should concentrate on teaching activities rather than administrative issues.
- 3 - The self-evaluation part should be reduced from the program.

- 4 - A training session related to the teacher evaluation program is needed for supervisors and principals.
- 5 - In terms of whether the teacher should be informed about the result of his evaluation or whether it should be confidential, the teachers' opinions vary. Some of them claim that the publicity of the results creates problems among and between the teachers, principals, and supervisors. Other teachers suggest that they must be aware of their results. Still others say that principals and supervisors should discuss their evaluation with teachers and inform them about strengths and weaknesses without telling the grade of the evaluation unless it is poor.
- 6 - A fourth level of the grade should be added, which would then give "excellent", "very good", "good" and "poor".
- 7 - The comments form and evaluation criterion have many items (20 items). Therefore, items can be reduced, especially since some of them were included in other, e.g. item 11 related to knowing the subject can be integrated with 12 (preparing the subject), and 13 (introducing the information). Also, item 16 about teacher student relation can be included with item 20 which is about solving students problems.
- 8 - Some of the items, such as item 5 (which is related to decisions and administrative policies) in the comments form and evaluation criterion needs more clarification. By that, all readers have the same interpretation.
- 9 - Some of the items are difficult to measure, such as item 8 which is about "taking care of public facilities".
- 10 - Each subject should have special item. Therefore, evaluating each teacher should differ according to the activities of his subject matter.
- 11 - some teachers suggest annulment of the new teacher evaluation program. Others say that its disadvantages are greater than its advantages. Meanwhile, others indicated that the program will be more useful after an intensive revision and modification.

According to the finding and respondents' comments, it seems that there is an agreement with the results of previous studies. For instance, training the evaluaters and orientation of teachers about their evaluation program, (Veir, 1990, Airasion, 1993, and Murpny, 1996. Also, growth and development programs for teacher should be linked with teacher evaluation results, (Grander, 1993, Johnson, 1993, Hae-teles, 1993, and Frase and Streshly, 1994). Furthermore evaluation program should concenrate on teaching activities, (Snowden, 1992, and Dunn, 1990).

Recommendations

The findings of the study revealed that the program needs improvement at the following points:-

- 1 - The urgent leave should be reduced, since it will have a negative effect on the evaluation results.
- 2 - It is not necessary to inform the teacher about his/her evaluation score in the middle of the school year. It has created many problems in the school social climate. It is more important to discuss the teacher's strengths and weaknesses with him.
- 3 - Teacher evaluation needs to emphasize teaching activities rather than administrative issues.
- 4 - One more level, "very good", is suggested to be added to the evaluation scale to become "excellent", "very good", "good", and "poor".
- 5 - It is suggested also to separate the self-evaluation part from the program.
- 6 - The senior teacher (Department Head) should have a greater role in the evaluation of teachers.
- 7 - Furthermore, evaluating teachers should be in accordance with the job description of the teacher's content area.

In general, a teacher evaluation program would be more effective if it considers the above recommendations and the opinions of the participants involved in this study.

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait

Appendix A

Table I. Perceptions toward Follow-Up Card

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	48	8.9	171	31.5	44	8.1	209	38.6	70	12.9
2	33	6.1	80	14.8	47	8.7	270	49.8	112	20.7
3	28	5.2	93	17.2	47	8.7	273	50.4	101	18.6
4	26	4.8	95	17.5	55	10.1	213	39.3	153	28.2
5	32	5.9	90	16.6	96	17.7	247	45.6	77	16.2
6	28	5.2	83	15.3	66	12.2	233	43.0	132	24.4
7	25	4.6	115	21.2	71	13.1	231	42.6	100	18.5
8	29	5.4	141	26.0	97	17.9	225	41.5	50	9.2
9	22	4.1	98	18.1	76	14.0	274	50.6	72	13.3
10	41	7.6	152	28.0	93	17.2	213	39.3	43	7.9
11	31	5.7	185	34.1	65	12.0	157	29.0	104	19.2
12	32	5.9	92	17.0	49	9.0	281	51.8	88	16.2

Table II The Responses' Differences on Follow-Up Card

Items	Title		Nationality		Gender		Educational Area	
	χ^2	Significance	χ^2	Significance	χ^2	Significance	χ^2	Significance
1	6.17	.62	.63	.95	4.18	.38	30.7	.01*
2	10.3	.24	11.5	.02*	10.06	.03*	14.6	.55
3	8.46	.38	6.26	.17	10.4	.03*	20.6	.19
4	10.1	.25	10.4	.03*	4.31	.36	24.9	.07
5	18.6	.01*	7.10	.13	4.26	.37	22.1	.13
6	16.1	.04*	12.1	.01*	3.80	.43	18.03	.32
7	20.09	.01*	5.75	.21	.81	.93	12.1	.73
8	11.1	.19	10.9	.02*	13.1	.01*	16.2	.43
9	23.3	.002*	6.87	.14	4.29	.36	13.0	.11
10	18.05	.02*	9.75	.04*	4.57	.33	16.2	.43
11	30.2	.0001*	15.6	.003*	1.33	.85	17.8	.33
12	15.08	.05*	14.4	.005*	2.54	.62	23.6	.09
D.F.	8		4		4		16	

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait
Table III. Perceptions toward Comments Form

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	15	2.8	82	15.1	71	13.1	337	62.2	37	6.8
2	19	3.5	96	17.7	45	8.3	329	60.7	53	9.8
3	25	4.6	99	18.3	54	10.0	205	37.8	159	29.3
4	14	2.6	74	13.7	95	17.5	278	51.3	81	14.9
5	7	1.3	81	14.9	45	8.3	227	41.9	182	33.6
6	16	1.8	98	18.1	76	14.0	241	44.5	117	21.6
7	23	4.2	96	17.7	75	13.8	232	42.8	116	21.4
8	32	5.9	171	31.5	80	14.8	180	33.2	79	14.6
9	6	1.1	53	9.8	77	14.2	284	52.4	122	22.5
10	57	10.5	157	29.0	38	7.0	185	34.1	105	19.4
11	25	4.6	224	41.4	84	15.5	152	28.0	57	10.5
12	28	5.2	105	19.4	69	12.7	269	49.6	71	13.1

Table IV. The Responses' Differences on Comments Form

Items	Title		Nationality		Gender		Educational Area	
	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance
1	13.7	.08	5.16	.27	9.19	.05*	23.9	.09
2	26.8	.0007*	11.9	.01*	1.86	.76	12.1	.73
3	33.8	.00004*	10.1	.03*	25.4	.0004*	12.3	.72
4	10.8	.20	6.10	.19	4.01	.40	15.8	.46
5	20.5	.008*	4.16	.38	15.9	.003*	17.8	.33
6	16.6	.03*	11.2	.02*	3.68	.45	15.5	.48
7	8.80	.35	4.83	.30	6.23	.18	13.8	.60
8	46.4	.0000*	2.76	-.59	9.71	.04*	19.8	.33
9	20.4	.01*	11.1	.02*	11.6	.01*	15.6	.47
10	56.1	.04*	9.06	.05*	5.73	.21	26.1	.05*
11	18.6		9.69	.04*	6.54	.15	20.3	.20
12	15.6		14.1	.006*	9.98	.04*	7.13	.97
D.F.	8		4		4		16	

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait
Table V. Perceptions toward Evaluation Criteria

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	18	3.3	105	19.4	47	8.7	274	50.6	98	18.1
2	20	3.7	93	17.2	55	10.1	314	57.9	60	11.1
3	12	2.2	86	15.9	45	8.3	260	48.0	139	25.6
4	16	3.0	80	14.8	63	11.6	278	51.3	105	19.4
5	8	1.5	76	14.0	96	17.7	311	57.4	51	9.4
6	18	3.3	95	17.5	81	14.9	300	55.4	48	8.9
7	7	1.3	98	18.1	86	15.9	261	48.2	90	16.6
8	17	3.1	110	20.3	55	10.1	294	52.4	76	14.0
9	15	2.8	74	13.7	60	11.1	323	59.6	70	12.9
10	7	1.3	71	13.1	59	10.9	300	55.4	105	19.4
11	22	4.1	134	24.7	75	13.8	217	40.0	94	17.4

Table VI. The Responses' Differences on Evaluation Criteria

Items	Title		Nationality		Gender		Educational Area	
	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance	χ^2	Signifi- cance
1	9.19	.32	6.77	.14	3.82	.43	16.4	.51
2	21.4	.006*	11.04	.02*	2.81	.58	11.05	.80
3	26.09	.001*	.49	.97	2.40	.66	24.5	.07
4	33.2	.00005*	7.7	.10	21.5	.00002*	23.1	.10
5	12.4	.13	16.3	.002*	2.18	.70	11.3	.78
6	10.5	.22	17.4	.001*	2.73	.60	20.7	.18
7	47.7	.0000*	6.97	.13	4.89	.29	17.3	.36
8	3.01	.93	8.27	.08	9.12	.05*	22.5	.12
9	12.1	.14	16.1	.002*	5.26	.26*	25.2	.06
10	18.5	.01*	17.8	.001*	10.6	.03*	12.2	.72
11	18.8	.01*	7.41	.11	5.22	.26	19.6	.23
D.F.	8		4		4		16	

*Significant difference at .05 level.

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait
Appendix E

Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

Please put the number that reflects your answer in the opposite square

1. *Title* ☐

Teacher (1)

Supervisor (2)

Principal (3)

2. *Nationality* ☐

Kuwaiti (1)

Non-Kuwaiti (2)

3. *Gender of School* ☐

For Boys (1)

For Girls (2)

4. *Educational Area* ☐

Asemah (1)

hawali (2)

Farwaneyah (3)

Ahmadi (4)

Jahra (5)

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait Follow-Up Card

Please put a $\sqrt{\quad}$ under the answer which reflects your opinion:

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Decided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	There is difficulty in filling out the follow-up card.					
2	The follow-up card reduces teacher absence.					
3	It reduces the short leaves.					
4	The way of recording short leaves does not consider emergency cases.					
5	The follow-up card gives a comprehensive view about the teacher.					
6	It reflects the positives of the sincere teacher.					
7	It reflects the shortcomings of the poor performer.					
8	The card is reflected in following-up activities.					
9	It motivates the teacher to be more sincere in his work.					
10	The follow-up card should be considered an effective tool in the evaluation process.					
11	I suggest ignoring the follow-up card.					
12	I suggest using the follow-up card after modifying some of its items.					

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait Comments Form

Please put a $\sqrt{\quad}$ under the answer which reflects your opinion.

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Decided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Comments form gives the opportunity for teachers to participate in the process of performance evaluation.					
2	Comments form contributes to enhancing teacher self-evaluation.					
3	Informing of the grade of evaluation causes problems between the teacher and his boss.					
4	Comments form leads teachers to develop their performance in the second half of the year.					
5	Five scale grades reduces gaining high scores.					
6	When the teacher scored less than he expected, that makes him less active.					
7	I suggest to have only the opinion of the principal for items 1-9.					
8	I suggest to have only the opinion of the principal on the third part of the form which relates to the positives and negatives.					
9	I suggest reducing the items from 20 to a suitable number without affecting the comprehension of the items.					
10	I suggest not to inform the teacher of the score unless it is a poor grade.					
11	I suggest sparing the comments form.					
12	I suggest using the comments form with some modification.					

Teacher Evaluation in Kuwait Performance Evaluation Criterion

Please put a $\sqrt{\quad}$ under the answer which reflects your opinion.

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Decided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	The evaluation criterion encourages teachers to be more disciplined in their work.					
2	It contributes to developing self-evaluation.					
3	Five scale grades reduces gaining high scores.					
4	Problems will arise upon telling teacher his score if it is less than what it was in the comments form.					
5	It is a main resource in determining the teacher's training needs.					
6	This criterion encourages enrolling in the training programs.					
7	The first part of this criterion could be reduced because it is already listed in the comments form.					
8	It reduces absence.					
9	It measures different aspects of the teacher's activities.					
10	I suggest reducing the items to a suitable number.					
11	I suggest reducing the five scales to three.					

References

- Airasian, P. (1993). Teacher assessment: Some issues for principals. **NASSP Bulletin**, 77, 55-65.
- Dunn, Kenneth (1990). Teaching styles. **Instructional Leadership Series**, National Association of secondary school principals, Reston, Va.
- Embassy of the State of Kuwait (1995). **Education in Kuwait** (Washington, DC).
- Frase, L. (1994). Lack of accuracy, feedback, commitment in teacher evaluation, **Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education**, 8 (1) 47-57.
- Gardner, D. (1993). Assessment systems in Florida designed to link teacher performance assessments, professional development, and school improvement. **Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education**, 7 (3), 207-216.
- Gellman, E. (1993). The use of portfolios in assessing teacher competence: Measurement issues, **Actions Teacher Education**, 14 (4) 39 - 44.
- Haefele, D. (1993). Evaluating teachers: A call for change. **Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education**, 7 (1) 21 - 31.
- Al- Hamdan, J. (1981). A survey of master teachers' assessment of the content of two course of study taught during the 1980 - 1981 academic year in the 4th year of the public Secondary Schools in Kuwait, Unpublished master thesis, Ohio University, Athens, OH.
- Hult, C. (1993), Using portfolios to evaluate teachers: Learning from ourselves, **Journal of Teaching Writing**, 12 (1) 57 - 66.
- Lambert, E. & Lambert, L. (1992). **The other Kuwait**. Worthington, OH, Lee R. Lambert & Associates Publishing.
- Johnson, J. (1992). Performance - Based Teacher Evaluations: A Necessary Component for Effective Schools. **Contemporary Education**, 63 (2), 142 - 45.

- Ministry of Education (1990). Evaluation Report Form (In Arabic) Kuwait.
- (1992). Follow-up Card, in Arabic, Kuwait.
- (1992). Comments Form, in Arabic, Kuwait.
- (1992). Evaluation Criterion, in Arabic, Kuwait.
- (1992). The Development of Education, International Conference on Education, Kuwait.
- (1993). Ministerial decree, no. 164/1993, in Arabic, Kuwait.
- (1993). School Staff Evaluation Forms Manual, in Arabic, Kuwait.
- (1994). The Development of Education, International Conference on Education in Arabic, Kuwait.
- Murphy, D. (1996). The Evaluator's Apprentices: Learning to Do Evaluation. **Evaluation**, 2 (4), 321-338.
 - Regan, H. (1993). Integrated portfolios as tools for differentiated teacher evaluation: A proposal. **Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education**, 7 (4) 275 - 290.
 - Shmidt, C. (1994). Verbal versus nonverbal cues in evaluations of teaching. **Journal of Research and Development in Education**, 27(2), 118 - 125.
 - Schalock, H. (1993). Extending teacher assessment beyond knowledge and skills: An emerging focus on teacher accomplishment. **Journal of Personnel of Evaluation in Education**, 7 (2) 105 - 133.
 - Snowden, Joan (1992). National Board for professional Teaching Standards-Up date. **ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education**, Washington, D.C.
 - Veir, C. (1990). **A Tale of Two Appraisal systems: Texas and North Carolina**. Texas, U.S.A.

تقويم المعلم بدولة الكويت

د. جاسم محمد الحمدان(*)

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تعرف وجهة نظر كل من المدرسين والموجهين والنظار تجاه تقويم المعلم في مدارس التعليم العام الثانوية في الكويت بشقيها البنين والبنات. وكذلك معرفة إذا كانت هناك فروق ذات دلالة بين إستجابات المشاركين في الدراسة تجاه برنامج تقويم المعلم. إختيرت عينة عشوائية من المدارس الثانوية الثانوية في المناطق التعليمية الخمس، حيث تكونت العينة من ٦٠٤ مدرساً، و٣٢ ناظراً، و١٠٤ موجهاً.

وكانت أداة الدراسة عبارة عن إستبانة مكونة من ٣٥ فقرة موزعة على ثلاثة أقسام تناولت أدوات تقويم المعلم. لتحليل البيانات تم الاستفادة من برنامج SPSS للحصول على التكرارات والنسب وإختبار كاي^٢ لمعرفة إن كانت هنالك فروق ذات دلالة بين استجابات المشاركين بناء على مركزهم الوظيفي ونوعيتهم وخبرتهم ومناطقهم التعليمية.

أظهرت الدراسة بأن تقويم المعلم في المدارس الثانوية يحتاج إلى تعديلات معينة، هذه التعديلات تم الإشارة إليها في الدراسة.

(*) دكتورة في إدارة التعليم العالي من جامعة أوهايو - الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية عام ١٩٨٤م.

- قسم الإدارة والتخطيط التربوي - كلية التربية جامعة الكويت.