



FEEDBACK MECHANISMS OF SCHOOL HEADS ON TEACHER PERFORMANCE

Grethel Jean D. Congcong¹,

Manuel E. Caingcoy²ⁱ

¹Public School Teacher,
Kibawe Central Elementary School,
Kibawe, Bukidnon,
Philippines

²College of Education,
Bukidnon State University,
Malaybalay City,
Philippines

Abstract:

The use of performance feedback in the workplace has gained popularity over the years, yet school heads have been challenged in providing it to teachers. In the initial interview, they shared that evaluation results can impact teachers' motivation, and that feedback should be done carefully. However, they failed to clearly articulate a specific mechanism that had been applied in this vital role. Also, no studies have provided clear detail on the feedback mechanism used by school heads in the past. For this reason, a study explored the feedback mechanisms employed by school heads in conveying the performance evaluation results to teachers. This study employed a narrative inquiry, and interviews were conducted with five school heads and five teachers who were chosen purposively for this research. Responses were recorded using a voice recorder. These responses were transcribed and analyzed using thematic narrative analysis. Based on transcripts, the study identified six emergent themes, such as conversational (one-on-one), relational, reflective, technical, reinforcing, and properly situated mechanisms in conveying performance evaluation results to teachers. Thus, a new feedback mechanism framework was developed.

Keywords: performance evaluation, pre-conference, post-conference, teaching performance, feedback

ⁱ Correspondence: email bonetcongcong@gmail.com, caingcoymanuel@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The use of performance feedback in the workplace has gained popularity over the years. There has been growing empirical evidence (Sweigart, 2015) that it enhances people's efficacy (Taylor et al., 2012), promotes professional development (Dobbelaer et al., 2013; RAND Corporation, 2018), and improves performance (Cleaver et al., 2019; Archer et al., 2016; Coulumbe, 2011; Bennett, 2011; Jimenez, 2014; Cruz, 2013; Olivo, 2012; Holmes, 2013; Hemmeter et al., 2011). Specifically, performance feedback has been observed to have a significant impact on teachers' teaching quality (Scheeler et al., 2004; Hemmeter et al., 2011). Henceforth, there should be "*actionable performance feedback*" (Hattie, 2009), and teachers need quality feedback from their school heads to enhance instructional abilities (Park et al., 2014). In particular, effective utilization of feedback can be made possible by school administrators since they have a crucial role in ensuring quality instruction and learning in each classroom (Education for Excellence, 2012). Hence, performance feedback can inform teachers on their strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities to improve and address their limitations. Performance feedback enables teachers to understand their aptitude and shortcomings in certain aspects or areas of teaching.

Feedback is a part and parcel of the performance evaluation system, which includes the pre-conference, planning, actual observation in the classroom, post-conference, and follow-up. The post-conference is the most critical in which feedback takes place. Thus, school heads cannot disregard the importance of feedback as it creates a successful school environment and meets professional standards.

To realize such a vital role above, school heads should make time for teachers to evaluate their teaching, outline expectations to ensure quality teaching delivery, offer feedback for immediate action of teachers, and identify teachers' strengths. In this manner, teachers become feel confident if the feedback is supportive and aims for improvement. School heads also need to assure that evaluation results are purely evidence-based and performance-based without bias, discrimination, and prejudice (Concordia University, 2012). Based on experience, school heads have been challenged in providing feedback to their faculty. In an initial interview conducted before the actual data gathering, school heads shared that evaluation results can impact teachers' motivation and that feedback should be done carefully. However, they failed to clearly articulate a specific mechanism that they had been applying in this vital role.

Most of the previous studies did not cover the mechanism utilized by school heads in feedback, except that of Sweigart (2015) and Hussain et al. (2011). The former involved four teachers and used visual performance feedback (VPF) delivered in real-time using screen-sharing technology. The proponent did not introduce it as a form of feedback mechanism. The study indicated that the VPF may be an effective intervention for teacher behavior change, and it is recommended for a similar study with a more advanced design and a larger sample (Sweigart, 2015). The former involved curriculum experts and the Punjab Textbook Board as participants. It revealed that there was no continuous feedback mechanism given to implementers, the school principals, for the monitoring of the

curriculum (Hussain et al., 2011). Furthermore, Cassavant et al. (2012) recognized the importance of using the feedback mechanism for personal and professional improvement and progress.

It was crystal and clear that there was a limited literature on feedback mechanisms employed by school heads in performing their vital roles, performance evaluation, and feedback. The reality was clear that school heads lacked a common understanding of what feedback mechanisms are all about. These circumstances necessitate the exploration of the feedback mechanisms used by school heads to enrich the body of knowledge on the topic and to generate a new framework that can be used in future research and in improving practices in supervision of instruction in the field.

2. Objectives and Question

This study explored the feedback mechanisms utilized by school heads in performance evaluation with their teachers in the Kibawe West District. The following question guides the exploration:

- What are the feedback mechanisms employed by public elementary school heads in performance evaluation?

3. Material and Methods

This study employed a narrative inquiry to explore the topic under investigation. Narrative inquiry is a new approach usually used to understand experiences through stories or narratives (Riesman et al., 2008). It has been widely accepted as a research method across disciplines of social sciences, which includes the field of education. As such, the story is shaped, interpreted, and made meaningful by the inquirer. The researchers personally met each of the participants in their respective stations or offices. They presented and hand-in in communication or endorsement from the university official. During that time, a copy of the informed consent form was given to every school head and teacher. Once the participant had accepted the invitation, they also agreed on the dates for the interview.

This qualitative research used a semi-structured interview as a guide in collecting the data or stories. The interview guide was composed of open-ended questions. These are formulated to provide an answer to this problem. Each of these would lead participants to tell their stories in feed-backing the evaluation results. Also, they are crafted based on the objectives of the study. Primarily, these were utilized to gather the needed data or narratives.

The researchers had observed all applicable ethical principles and practices before, during, and after the conduct of the study. One of these ethical considerations was the need to seek first for the permission and approval of the school head, Public Schools District Supervisor, Schools Division Superintendent, and other DepED superiors for the formal conduct of this research. Second, the researchers gave orientation to the participants as to their roles and the extent of participation needed. This orientation also

covered the purpose and objectives of the interviews and the study at large. Moreover, the researchers ensured that the participants would be objective and honest on telling their stories or experiences relevant to the problem.

Using an interview guide, the study conducted semi-structured interviews with 5 school heads and 5 teachers in the field. Data were organized and analyzed using the thematic narrative technique of Riesman (1993, 2000) as the analytical framework. This framework follows three steps. First, each transcript was read very closely. This allows researchers to detect the apparent narratives that answer the research problem. Second, the apparent narratives or excerpts were grouped according to the identified themes. This stage allowed researchers to experience deeper immersion in the text. In the third stage, the researchers were looking into the commonalities and similarities among excerpt narratives concerning the themes. The study derived themes from the common narratives and used them to support the discussed themes.

4. Results and Discussion

The discussion of results is organized based on the purpose of the study, which is to explore the feedback mechanisms employed by the public elementary school heads to teachers. Accordingly, one of the best practices was to design and refine an evaluation system with feedback and support in mind (Education First, 2015). Studies find feedback as a powerful method for changing performance (Fuchs et al., 1986; Hattie, 2009; Walberg, 1999). This reminds the school heads of their role not only to evaluate teachers' classroom performance. They need to use data and information derived from the classroom observation for a very critical component of an evaluation system, the feedback itself. When the school heads were asked how they conveyed the results of performance evaluation to teachers, several mechanisms came out from their narratives. The emerging themes include the-one-on-one or conversational, reinforcing, relational, reflective, technical, and properly situated mechanisms. The narratives of the school heads are supported by narratives from teachers.

4.1 Conversational or One-on-One mechanism

The conversational mechanism is one of the emerging themes. Accordingly, school heads conducted a pre-conference (SH1, SH4). This was done before the classroom observation took place. During this time, the school heads check the lesson plan and activities if they are aligned with the lesson objectives. In this mechanism, teacher-participants give their testimonies relevant to this practice. One of them said, *"She conducted a pre-conference and prepare her pre-observation checklist before she observes my classroom teaching"* (T4). The other teacher participant echoed, *"My school head informs me before she sits... she conducted a pre-conference.... If weaknesses were noted, we have a dialogue on how to improve it"* (T1).

On the contrary, the post-conference was done by school heads after class observation (SH1, SH3, SH4). During this phase, the school heads and teachers discussed how the class went whether the objectives were met, or some areas need to be corrected or improved. Among the five school heads, one of them mentioned that doing a post-

conference with teachers is a form of conversation, and it should be a one-on-one (SH4). This mechanism was strengthened by the narratives from teachers as some of them said, "My school head conducted a post-conference" (T1), "My school head informed me with the result of my performance through post-conference..." (T2), and "He calls us to his office one by one and then gives us his advice and observations in improving our classroom instructions during post-conference..." (T3). It is the narrative of T3 that describes this mechanism as one-on-one. The following narratives of school heads indicate this mechanism:

"I ran through the process of conducting a pre-observation conference before they delivered the lesson and post-observation conference after the teacher finished her lesson using the classroom observation tool." (SH1)

"There are steps to be followed (pre-conference, observation proper, post-conference) to ensure that the activity is properly demonstrated...To communicate the result of the performance evaluation to teachers is through doing post-conference...It is a one-on-one conversation between the teacher and the school head how the performance evaluated... feedbacking is the "one on one" contact between school head and teacher." (SH4)

"As a school head, I always conduct a post-conference after class observation." (SH3)

This mechanism indicates a good practice among school heads because conveying the result of performance evaluation through classroom observation was done confidentially and exclusively between the teacher and the school head. Professional dialogue and sharing between teachers and school heads can be harnessed and can improve the quality of teaching (Lan, 2001). Damanik (2014) supports this finding that during the one-on-one discussion or the dialogue between the school head and the teacher, they can discuss what happened in the class during observation. Hence, the school head will assess the teaching procedure and will provide suggestions on how instruction can be improved so that learning can be facilitated, and that teachers' skills and capabilities will improve.

However, a case study reported that teachers preferred written principal feedback, and they wanted to respond to the principal in writing. They said that feedback was desirable. These teachers intend to review and revisit the feedback several times to ensure an accurate interpretation of what the principal was communicating with them. Teachers also desire to respond to their principal in writing so that they may be meticulous in their communication back to the principal (Kelly, 2014).

It was claimed that encouraging teacher-led dialogue and reflection during debriefing is among the best practices. Debriefing here is equivalent to a post-conference session between teachers and school heads (Southern Regional Education Board, 2017). On the other hand, a study used visual performance feedback (VPF) delivered in real-time using screen-sharing technology. This study claimed that VPF may be an effective intervention for teacher behavior change, and it is recommended for replication with a more sophisticated design and larger sample (Sweigart, 2015).

In a study, the findings revealed that evaluation reforms gave a usual framework and language that aided principals' feedback conversations with teachers. It claimed that the quality of feedback teachers receive through the evaluation process depends critically on the time, and training evaluators have to provide individualized and actionable feedback. Thus, school principals should spend time and exerted efforts to give substantial feedback on teachers' performance to improve (Gilmore et al., 2016).

Providing accurate and meaningful feedback with a rich conversation with teachers is vital to improving teaching and learning (Archer et al., 2016). Effective feedback must be specific, practical, and focused on improvement. After the conversation, the teachers leave the venue with a clear idea of how to put a strategy into immediate use. Feedback should hone teachers' abilities to analyze their practice. For this, teachers need to be meaningfully engaged in feedback conversations (Archer et al., 2016).

In a face-to-face conversation between the teachers and the principals, the latter recommended keeping the tone of the voice informal so that the former can be less nervous, and they can be open to sharing. The informal conversation may provide opportunities for principals to ask quick questions, and the former can share more information and reflection on the lesson (Park et al., 2014).

4.2 Relational Mechanism

The relational mechanism is another way school heads communicate the performance evaluation results to teachers. Having good relations with colleagues at work is very vital for productivity and efficiency as well. Thus, developing a very good rapport and connection to teachers is important for them to obey school rules and policies as well as for them to deliver quality teaching to learners.

As manifested in the narrative, school heads are friendly and show a warm climate with teachers (SH2). Also, the tone of voice, body language, and eye contact are necessary to show a connection to the teacher during conferences. This only means that the school heads are trying to calm and relax their teachers before feed-backing. They try to establish a non-threatening atmosphere. Moreover, the school heads can make use of their tone of voice to lighten up the mood of teachers during the discussion without dominating. By doing so, the teachers will be positive enough to accept the suggestion and advice from the school heads, which will eventually lead them to improve performance. One of them shared (SH2) that discussing very well to the teachers gives the confidence to listen and to share about their strengths and weaknesses in-class observation. Thus, teachers would express fully what they felt during the conference when it was more relational.

Narratives from the school heads somehow find support from the teacher's narrative. One teacher expressed that, *"My school head communicated the result of my performance in a polite manner"* (T1). This finding is supported by Bredeson (2000), who contends that the role of the school principal is to encourage, nurture, and support teacher learning. Hence, school heads should show care to motivate teachers for their growth and development in their careers.

Also, Marshall (2010) adds that the school head should evaluate the teacher's performance with humility. In this way, the teachers would feel safe and not threatened with the school head's approach. Thus, the school head should display collegial interactions and a nurturing attitude before teachers. This emerging theme is indicated in the following narratives of school heads:

"Create a warm friendly and internal climate (tone of voice, body language, eye contact) ...with her (teacher) answers, be an active listener...." (SH2)

"It can boost confidence to share and listen well, particularly in addressing their problems and priority needs like enhancing their skills to increase the quality performance of learners...." (SH1)

"School head and teacher in a private room it is because the teacher can express his or her feelings freely or burst out what things to be improved." (SH4)

4.3 Reflective Mechanism

The reflective mechanism is another way in which the school heads communicated the results of teachers' performance after class observation. This mechanism works when the school heads would simply ask questions about the class observation. These questions will then lead the school heads to identify the weaknesses and strengths of teachers. This mechanism is indirect and non-confrontational. Eventually, the reflective mechanism may improve teaching after the post-conference, especially there is a follow-up with actionable tasks.

In a particular narrative (SH4), it indicates that the school head asked particular questions like what went well in the lesson today? What surprised you in the lesson today? Which task engaged the learners? Although these questions from the school heads were simple at first, they were very objective looking back at class observation routines and procedures. Also, the school head (SH4) asked questions particularly on what did not transpire teachers during the presentation of the lesson or what part of the presentation was difficult. These questions are processing questions for the teachers to reflect on how well they had prepared the lesson and how well they had performed during class observation.

With the narrative above (SH2), a school head added that he stimulates his teachers to think critically in this manner the teacher can push his or her limits on what he/she can do when situations arise in the classroom. This question simply cultivates and nurtures the reflective attitude of the teachers. This not only helps them a lot for their class observation or delivering their lesson, but it will also sharpen their minds- their critical decision-making and handling the learners. Thus, school heads must continually allow teachers to practice reflective teaching to help teachers become more critical thinkers themselves and become responsible and accountable in their teaching. Three teachers narrate. *"He does not pinpoint my weakness but he allows me to reflect my strengths and weaknesses"* (T1), *"It is through this communication, where the teacher like me would be able*

to identify my strengths and weaknesses...the part where I did not do good. I take it as my lesson and with that I look for means and ways for me to perform better”(T3), and “I started to be cautious on my negative areas, I thoroughly think ideas on how to overcome my weakness and continue doing my positive areas or strengths...I was able to know the areas I can maintain and develop and in my weak areas I was able to identify the areas I have to improve on...she asks me questions on how I can improve myself.” (T2). The actual narratives from school heads are shown below:

“...begin with question and smile, what went well in the lesson today? What surprised you in the lesson today? Which task engaged the learners?” (SH2)

“This time, the teacher was asked by the school head what things did not transpire during the presentation of the lesson. what part of the presentation they found some difficulties?” (SH4)

“The alternative approach, in which the observer hopes to stimulate the teacher to think critically and thereby broaden the scope of what she/he will do in the classroom situation.” (SH2)

This finding supports the point of Harrison et al. (2006), who stressed that the learning process for teachers must be about their teaching practice. Teachers should learn how to find ways to improve their teaching performance. Hence, learning from their teaching experience must be followed by the teacher’s reflection. Donald et al. (2006) added that teaching is a complex activity that requires teachers to think about or reflect on what they do. Henceforth, good teachers can become even more effective by reflecting on teaching. Reflecting own professional practice is promising. It influences teachers to improve and make some modifications to teaching practices that one might have thought before. For this reason, school heads should provide teachers with the opportunity to reflect after being observed in the classroom (Feeney, 2007).

Asking teachers to identify and share examples of the impact of their instruction on student learning and behavior, preparing targeted questions to probe for teachers’ insights, promoting self-reflection, reviewing teachers’ current professional learning plans and recommending aligned resources, and collaborating with teachers to revise plans to include action steps and follow-up opportunities are some of the evolving practices among administrators (Southern Regional Education Board, 2017).

In a qualitative study, findings revealed that administrators provided feedback that was anchored within their experience as teachers and administrators and sought ways to make their feedback more meaningful way. Hence, school administrators need to learn how to work across these cultures to support school-wide instructional improvement (Lochmiller, 2015).

The main objective of an effective teacher evaluation system is primarily to inform, improve, and enhance instruction and teaching-learning outcomes. Teacher evaluation helps provide teachers with meaningful data and feedback on areas of instructional

strengths and areas for improvement (Holmes, 2013). Almada (2010) stressed that the conduct of meaningful teacher evaluation is one of the best professional development assistance and services that schools and districts can provide to teachers. The teacher evaluation system helps teachers understand the strengths and areas that require further improvement. This system motivates teachers to reflect on their teaching and instructional practices. It also helps them recognize and showcase the areas of excellence and the areas that require intervention and assistance.

Through the implementation of the teacher evaluation system, teachers work together with administrators to identify the strengths and achievements in terms of classroom management. The results of this evaluation serve as bases in determining rooms for improvement and areas for refinement in case of shortcomings and insufficiencies. Through this system, teachers are also motivated to pursue various options for professional development (Austin, 2010). The reflective prompts are the mainstay of teacher feedback. These prompts need to be asked to teachers to consider how they approach their craft and what might improve it. By this, feedback resembles the mentoring, which is known as *"cognitive coaching"*. In this, a mentor helps others learn how to become more effective by building a habit of disciplined self-reflection (Archer et al., 2016). In contrast, a study concluded that the formal observation process does not promote the development of reflective practitioners (Brownlow, 2018).

4.4 Reinforcing Mechanism

Another mechanism that the school heads practiced when feedback the result of performance evaluation is by giving reinforcement. This mechanism operates when the school head gives positive feedback on the performance of the teacher after class observation. In it, the school heads look at the good side or the strengths of the teacher in the delivery of the lesson instead of criticizing their weakness. As reflected from the sole narrative of a school head (SH1), positive feedback helped teachers perform better the next time. The narratives and testimonies of the four teachers somehow strengthened this claim. As one of them mentioned that, *"he also appreciates my good points during my lesson.... Usually, my school head recognizes and appreciated my good points. He sometimes encourages my colleagues to follow my good points"* (T1). The teacher was made a model for her colleagues. By doing this, the school head expressed confidence in the teacher. Another teacher recalled, *"For my strength, I am much very happy if he appreciates it because I work hard for it for my learner to understand more and have life-long learning...."* (T3). With these two narratives, reinforcing mechanisms are in the form of verbal appreciation by acknowledging what they did best and by encouraging other teachers to emulate the ones who demonstrated their best during a classroom observation. This was also claimed by another teacher, *"When I perform well be it in the classroom or school, my school head recognizes my performance by giving certificates. She also encouraged my co-teachers to perform well"* (T2) and another teacher added, *"My school head gave me a certificate of recognition for my excellent and exemplary performance. She told me to keep up the good works and do everything I could to perform well"* (T4). Noticeably, the giving of the certificate has reinforced teachers in doing their best in teaching. This is far beyond simply expressing the affirmation of

school heads through verbal means. In this mechanism, school heads are appreciative of the effort exerted by the teachers. The school heads need to ensure a balance between the giving of positive and negative feedback to teachers. One school head mentioned:

“Giving positive feedback can also help them to perform well in the classroom.” (SH1)

Consequently, the giving of positive feedback does not end there in the conference or the feedback session. School heads’ positive feedback can bring about various effects on teachers’ performance and confidence. The use of reinforcement mechanisms can increase school leaders’ performance as they enhance teaching quality, target developmental areas, provide strong motivation to teachers, facilitate teachers’ performance improvement, allow measurement of training effectiveness, enhance teachers’ self-awareness, and it supports continuous learning (Moore, 2009).

4.5 Technical Mechanism

The giving of technical assistance was also found in the narratives of the school heads as they communicate teachers’ evaluation performance. As a school head, one should be adept with the pedagogical aspect of teaching the learners. Hence, a school head can provide aid and assistance for those struggling or beginning teachers in the school. In this way, teachers will be guided and that they will be able to perform their jobs in providing quality education. As to giving technical assistance, the school heads have different approaches to how they did it. In the specific narrative (SH2), he discussed to his teachers the new approaches to develop their teachings like the supervisory approach, alternative approach, and non-directive approach. This is a good practice because the school head is giving options for the teacher to choose from for his class. Hence, the teacher should be able to recognize what approach to use for his class.

Another way of extending technical assistance, the school head (SH4), revealed the modeling of teaching strategy. In this way, the teacher will just observe first on how the school head handles the class. Then, after the school head’s demonstration, the teacher will apply it to his teaching. Conducting training for teachers is another technical assistance that the school head provides to teachers. Evident in the narrative (SH3) that the school head planned and conducted seminars or training for teachers to improve their performance in-class observation. At the school level, these training and seminars are done through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions which are reflected in another narrative (SH4). This technical assistance was done by the school head to all teachers, especially those who needed the most technical assistance. Hence, many teachers benefited from the learning action cell session and eventually improved their teaching performance.

Moreover, the giving of technical assistance was evident in one narrative who explained that their school heads discussed with them during the conference on how to improve their weaknesses. The teacher shared, *“...give suggestions as to how I can improve myself. She always made sure that she advises on how to improve my self during classroom discussion”* (T2). This mechanism is evident in school heads’ narratives:

“Introducing her some approaches to improve teaching, such as supervisory approach, alternative approach, and non-directive and others.” (SH2)

“...the school head would give some suggestions or even model to teach teaching strategy or let the teacher observe one of the best teachers in school. (SH4) To address the areas that teachers perform poorly is the LAC-Learning Action Cell. In this, teachers who are performing poorly will be given attention as to their weakness so that they will be guided properly for their teaching performance for improvement.” (SH4)

“Plan and conduct seminars or training to improve teachers’ performance.” (SH3)

Scheeler et al. (2004) support the finding above that feedback should help teachers improve their weaknesses in teaching. Thus, school heads should provide specific and particular suggestions for the improvement of the teachers’ performance. Also, it should be corrective and constructive to create an impact on teachers as they enhance their teaching skills. However, it was found in a study that principals need support too to develop their capacity in learning-centered leadership. Providing feedback for principals has been identified as a viable, cost-effective method for principals to develop their capacity in learning-centered leadership (LCL), yet feedback alone may not be sufficient to stimulate changes in leadership behaviors. Coaching with feedback may enhance principals’ learning-centered leadership (Goff et al., 2015).

Some studies pointed out the importance of the capacity building of school heads to be effective evaluators and providers of quality feedback to teachers. Effective feedback is ensured when it is facilitated well (Goff et al., 2015; Rand Corporation, 2018; Hussain et al., 2011). Expert support involves the sharing of expertise of the school heads about content and practice focused on the individual needs of teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). *“High-quality professional learning frequently provides built-in time for teachers to think about, receive input on, and make changes to their practice by facilitating reflection and soliciting feedback” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 4).*

4.5 Properly Situated Mechanism

School heads communicated to teachers the evaluation results in a proper venue. This theme emerged from the narratives that feed-backing was properly situated. It took place in a venue where the teacher and school head could have exclusive dialogue and discuss privately very important details on the results of class observation. Certainly, the conversation is between the school and the teacher. Hence, a place or room enough for the teacher and school head to discuss the confidential aspect of performance evaluation is advised. In one narrative (SH2), a school head ensures that he will be able to look for a quiet space to dialogue with the teacher concerned. This is very important because the conversation should be free from distractions and noise for the teacher and school head to communicate well with a complete understanding of how the classroom observation went. A narrative (SH4) amplified that the teacher and the school head should be in a private place during feed-backing after the classroom observation. This only implies that

the discussion between the teacher and the school head in this situation is taken as confidential and should only be discussed by the two of them. The narratives below illustrate this mechanism.

"I find a quiet space for dialogue." (SH2)

"Through feedback ... between the school head and teacher in a private room." (SH4)

Rooney (2017) posited that the conference between the teacher and the school must be situated in a room where both can discuss well the results of the evaluation with no disturbance. Thus, the setting or the location of the meeting will allow both parties to feel comfortable when having the conference. The moment school heads conduct feedback sessions it should take place in a comfortable setting (Range et al., 2013, as cited in Coe et al., 2014). One of the given tips was to choose the right time and place for the feedback. School heads are cautioned to never give feedback to the public. Some individuals who like performance-related discussions outside the workplace (ACT Government, n.d.).



Figure 1: Grethel's Feedback Mechanism Framework

This study developed the feedback mechanism framework to understand how school heads convey the performance evaluation results to teachers. In this framework, results were carried through relational, conversational, reflective (RCR), reinforcing, technical, and properly situated (RTPS) mechanisms. Both groups of participants affirmed that these mechanisms have eventually improved teachers' performance. The RCR mechanisms placed in the second layer of the framework for they are believed to be the most effective. The RTPS mechanisms were also deemed effective but not as effective as the first three. These six mechanisms were employed during the post-conference, or after the teachers were observed in class.

School heads communicate performance evaluation results by establishing rapport at the beginning of their post-conference. In this, school heads were ensuring and maintaining good relations with their teachers. These practices constitute the so-called relational mechanism. School heads communicated the results through one-on-one

conversations with teachers. But this does not mean they did not put into writing the results of performance evaluation or record anything during class observation. They use evaluation instruments as a reference when they give feedback to teachers.

The reflective mechanism was used when school heads allowed teachers to recall what went wrong, or what went right in the delivery of their lesson during a classroom observation. They also allowed teachers to retrospect their strengths and weaknesses in teaching. Most participants shared that teachers performed well in classroom management, while they usually performed poorly in utilizing teaching strategies. With this mechanism, the school heads do not communicate the performance evaluation directly. Instead, they allowed teachers to judge their performance. Thus, feed-backing becomes indirect and non-confrontational. In this mechanism, school heads did not want to be intimidating to teachers.

After the actual classroom evaluation, some school heads provided certificates, recognized them, and expressed affirmations to boost their confidence, and enhance motivation to do well the next time. This refers to the reinforcing mechanism practiced by school heads. It was acknowledged by teachers and it was observed by school heads that the former have difficulties in utilizing strategies. To address this, the latter had extended technical assistance to teachers and conducted another classroom observation to monitor progress in teachers. They mentor them and teach them how to use those strategies. Some school heads have even demonstrated in their class how to use these strategies in their class. With this, school heads have applied technical mechanisms. The giving of feedback to teachers was done by school heads in a proper venue. Normally, it was held in their offices. It was done privately, where nobody could hear what they were to discuss. This practice is called a properly situated mechanism.

5. Generalization

Based on findings, it was generalized that school heads had used varied feedback mechanisms in conveying the results of classroom observation. With these mechanisms, school heads carried out their responsibilities in the supervision of instruction and performance appraisal. Usually, school heads utilize them during the post-conference. The one-on-one (Conversational) mechanism is more advantageous because the school heads can observe the body language of teachers and their manner of receiving the feedback. It would allow school heads to understand teachers with what went right or what went wrong during observation. This would enhance school heads' empathy. The relational mechanism can promote rapport and warmer work climate between teachers and school heads. This would invite teachers to be open-minded in receiving feedback. The reflective mechanism, which is indirect and non-confrontational, may boost the confidence of teachers, empower them, and can promote ownership of solutions to recognized difficulties in teaching be it content-related or pedagogy as long as it is a product of reflection; the reinforcing mechanism may increase the motivation of teachers to perform well in teaching learners; and in a properly situated mechanism, school heads prefer a formal way in carrying out feedback to teachers.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations may help concerned individuals and groups: School heads may maximize classroom observation and feedback by implementing both more frequently to provide teachers with more opportunities to learn and improve their functions, skills, and capabilities. Eventually, it would have a direct impact on learners' learning, academic achievement, and quality of education at large; School heads may empower master teachers or senior faculty in conducting classroom observation and in providing effective feedback using a wide range of mechanisms. They need to send them to training that enhances their skills as evaluators, mentors, and effective communicators. After all, these individuals would be empowered to assist school heads in performing classroom observation and in giving the feedback; School heads can maximize the learning action cell (LAC) sessions where teachers discuss and enhance teachers on teaching approaches and the use of strategies. This is to increase support and technical assistance. Those who are excellent teachers can help school heads mentor the struggling beginner teachers; School heads may continue to recognize teachers' efforts and hard work before or during the classroom observation by giving them presents, awards, and certificates to boost their confidence and self-efficacy. This form of recognition to teachers would not only be beneficial to those who performed well, but also to those who need improvement. This can be their source of motivation to perform their best on classroom observation; School heads may require teachers to do a reflective journal or diary where they can write resolutions after their observation or feedback sessions. Consistent reflection can help teachers find solutions to the problems they have encountered in the classroom. With this, school heads can ask them to write a reflection every after the feedback session or even without classroom observation to promote reflective practices; Future researchers may conduct quantitative research with a bigger sample on school heads' feedback mechanism used in relaying to teachers the classroom observation performance. This is to validate the results of the present study. Future researchers may conduct a quantitative study and develop a scale and constructs from the current findings. This is to evaluate the propositions of the generated framework; and future researchers may use Grethel's Feedback Mechanism Framework as a theoretical framework of their future studies, which may help them explain the same phenomenon.

Acknowledgments

The researchers are deeply indebted to people who had been part of this endeavor, especially the officials of Bukidnon State University and DepEd- Bukidnon Division, and participants and their school heads for providing them an enabling environment, support, and participation. For these, thank you.

About the Author(s)

Grethel Jean Congcong is a public elementary school teacher in the Bukidnon province, Philippines. She is an alumna of Bukidnon State University and currently finishing her Master of Arts in Educational Administration program at the same university.

Manuel Caingcoy is a faculty of the graduate programs at Bukidnon State University. He is teaching both at the masters and doctorate programs, specifically Educational Administration. He has been teaching foundations and major courses. He finished his Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Administration and Master of Arts in Education major in Administration and Supervision. His interests in research include educational advocacy and organizational behaviors.

References

- ACT Government, n.d. The art of feedback: giving, seeking and receiving feedback. <https://bit.ly/2weeBBz>
- Almada M, 2010. The Importance of Teacher Evaluation. <https://bit.ly/2Gyx6DY>
- Archer J, Cantrell S, Holtzman S L, Joe J N, Tocci C M, Wood J, 2016. Better Feedback, for Better Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improving Classroom Observations. Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Brand.
- Austin J, 2010. Teacher Evaluation. The Education Journal, 2, 43-47.
- Bennett K, 2011. Teacher Evaluation. <https://bit.ly/2tgaccM>
- Braun H, 2010. The Role of Teacher Evaluation. The Teacher's Journal, 2, 68-75.
- Brownlow M B, 2018. The Role of the Formal Observation in Promoting Reflective Practice. Dissertation 305. National Louis University. <https://bit.ly/3aEDIwp>
- Coulombe G, 2011. Why Teacher Evaluations are Important to Both Successful and Unsuccessful Students. <https://bit.ly/2TI8z3j>
- Cleaver S, Detrich R, States J, 2019. Overview of Performance Feedback. The Wing Institute. <https://bit.ly/37qRIII>
- Coe R, Aloisi C, Higgins S, Lee E M, 2014. What makes great teaching? Review of the Underpinning Research. Center for Monitoring and Evaluation, Durham University, The Sutton Trust.
- Cohen J, Goldhaber D, 2016. Building a More Complete Understanding of Teacher Evaluation Using Classroom Observations. Educational Researcher, 45(6), 378–387. <https://bit.ly/2VtKpgs> DOI: 10.3102/0013189X16659442
- Concordia University-Portland, 2012. Classroom Observation Feedback: What Teachers Should Expect. <https://bit.ly/2wJSQdu>
- Cruz A, 2013. DepED Concerns Relevant to RPMS and LIS. <https://bit.ly/2TJFpR6>
- Danielson C, 2011. Evaluation that Help Teachers Learn. www.edugauge.contents.search.danielson-charlotte.pdf
- Darling-Hammond L, 2014. One piece of the whole: Teacher evaluation as part of a comprehensive system for teaching. American Educator, 38(1), 4–13, 44.

- Dobbelaer M J, Prins F, van Dongen D, 2013. The impact of feedback training for inspectors. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37 (1), 86-104. <https://bit.ly/3cdfbjz>
- Dorety K M, Jacobs S, 2015. State of the states 2015: Evaluating teaching, leading and learning. National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Education First, 2015. Giving the Teachers the Feedback and Support They Deserve: Five Essential Practices.
- Feeney E J, 2007. Quality feedback: The essential ingredient for teacher success. *The Clearing House*, 80 (4). 191-197.
- Finnegan S, 2016. Teacher and Principal Perceptions of a New Evaluation Program for Teachers (A Dissertation). The College of William and Mary in Virginia.
- Garet M S, Wayne A J, Brown S, Rickles J, Song M, Manzeske D, Ali M, 2017. The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals (NCEE 2018-4001). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee>.
- Hanushek E A, 2011. The economic value of higher teacher quality. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(3), 466–479.
- Hattie J, 2009. Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
- Hemmeter M L, Snyder P, Kinder K, Artman K, 2011. Impact of performance feedback delivered via electronic mail on preschool teachers' use of descriptive praise. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(1), 96–109.
- Hill H, Charalambos Y, Kraft M, 2012. When rater reliability is not enough: Teacher observation systems and a case for the generalizability study.
- Holmes C, 2013. Objective of an Effective Teacher Evaluation. <https://bit.ly/2WULg8s>
- Jimenez J, 2014. Perceptions and Feedbacks of Teachers on RPMS Implementation. <https://bit.ly/2SFvChH>.
- Kelly S, 2014. A Case Study Examining Teacher Response to Principal Feedback of Classroom Observation. Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership for Learning Dissertations. Paper 1. <http://smo.do/zXoLK9>.
- Kimball S, Milanowski A, 2009. Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 34-70.
- Marzano R, 2012. Two Purposes of Teacher Evaluation. <https://bit.ly/2BtyUen>
- Myung J, Martinez K, 2013. Strategies for Enhancing the Impact of Post-Observation Feedback for Teachers. A Brief. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. <https://bit.ly/2TB1OoI>.
- Oliva M, Mathers C, Laine S, 2009. Effective evaluation. *Principal Leadership*, 9 (7) 17-21.
- Olivo F H, 2012. Objectives of Results-based Performance Management System. <https://bit.ly/2GASCbl>.
- Park S, Takahashi S, White T, 2014. Developing an Effective Feedback System: A 90 Day Cycle Report. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- Poertner S, Miller K M, 1996. *The Art of Giving and Receiving Feedback*. Coastal Training Technologies.
- RAND Corporation, 2018. *How do teachers perceive feedback and evaluation system: A Policy Brief*.
- Riesman C K, 2008. *Concluding Comments*. In Andrews M, Squire C, Tamboukou M, Eds. 2008. *Doing Narrative Research*. Sage Publications.
- Riesman C K, 2008. *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. CA, USA: SAGE Publications.
- Riesman C K, 2000. *Analysis of Personal Narratives*. Boston University.
- Riesman C K, 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Scheeler M C, Ruhl K L, McAfee J K, 2004. *Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers: A Review*. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 27(3), 59-70. <https://bit.ly/2tfR9m7>
- Southern Regional Education Board, 2017. *Feedback on Teaching: A Fresh Look*. shorturl.at/pAIJV.
- Stronge J H, 2010. *Evaluating what good teachers do: Eight research-based standards for assessing teacher excellence*. Eye on Education.
- Sweigart C A, 2015. *The effects of real-time visual performance feedback on teacher feedback*. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2082. ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. <https://bit.ly/2MLzWbg>
- Taylor E S, Tyler J H, 2012. *The effect of evaluation on teacher performance*. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-51.
- Westley A, 2011. *The Benefits of Effective and Quality Teacher Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Learners*. <https://bit.ly/32zAh7j>.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).