





Determining Generic Teacher Competencies: A Measurable and Observable Teacher Competency Framework*

Bülent ALAN¹, Meral GÜVEN²

¹Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey  0000-0001-5057-0915

² Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey  0000-0002-4139-729X

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 09.03.2021

Received in revised form
18.08.2021

Accepted 09.10.2021

Article Type: Research
Article

ABSTRACT

Well-defined teacher competencies can serve as a reference resource for teacher candidates and a road map for teachers who need to equip themselves with new competencies to meet the rapidly changing demands of children and society. This study, which grounded on mixed methods research, aimed to develop a measurable and observable generic teacher competency framework. The study was conducted in three phases. The initial phase was comprised of the literature review on teacher competencies, interviews with teacher candidates, teacher trainers, and education experts on the current teacher competency framework developed by the Turkish Ministry of Education in 2017. The analyses revealed the need for a new framework since the current competency framework does not allow self-evaluation and cannot be used as a road map for teachers and teacher candidates due to the way it is structured. Based on the initial findings, the researchers prepared a draft competency framework, which was evaluated by 397 teachers through information forms and 52 teacher trainers representing all disciplines of educational sciences at a workshop organized by the researchers. The analyses resulted in a framework consisting of six competency domains, 31 sub-competencies and their performance indicators at four competency levels. The core competencies developed seem to be congruent with international frameworks; however, it is also a unique framework with its content, structure and approach. The generic teacher competency framework developed as a result of this study can be utilized for professional development of teachers and teacher candidates as a reference guide and be utilized for evaluation purposes with its measurable and observable performance indicators specified under sub-competencies. It can also be used for the assessment and accreditation of teacher education programmes.

© 2022 IJPES. All rights reserved

Keywords:²

Generic competencies; teacher competency framework; teacher education; teacher evaluation.

1. Introduction

Globalization has compelled countries and institutions to compete both in public and private sectors and has paved the way for well-qualified employees in every field. This has led governments to monitor the developments worldwide and compare and contrast their own resources, political, economic, cultural and educational systems (Gian & Bao, 2021; Paine, 2013; Strijbos, Engels & Struyven, 2015). With the rapid changes in information technologies, the knowledge and capabilities that people possess lose their value and this situation affects the type of knowledge and qualities people need to have to cope with the requirements of global developments (Çifçi & Karaman, 2019; Koenen, Dochy & Berghmans, 2015). The field of education is

*This article was produced from a doctoral dissertation entitled “Determining Generic Teacher Competencies and Designing a Pre-service Teacher Education Program Based on Competencies” and supported by Anadolu University, Commission of Scientific Research Projects, grant number: 1802E024 .

¹Corresponding author’s address: Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yunus Emre Kampüsü, Eskişehir/Türkiye
e-mail: balan@anadolu.edu.tr

Citation: Alan, B. & Güven, M. (2022). Determining generic teacher competencies: A measurable and observable teacher competency framework. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 9(2), 308-331. <https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.2.472>

not out of the scope of these developments. Factors like teachers' employability, advances in technology and informatics, ever-increasingly multi-cultural classrooms, accountability and transparency prompt countries to make radical changes in their education systems (Caena, 2013; Öztürk & Kafadar, 2021; Charteris & Smardon, 2015).

The world's changing conditions have changed the expectations of schools and teachers, too. Teachers are now expected to gain individuals with necessary skills that will enable them to perform the occupations that have not emerged yet, to use the technological devices that have not been invented yet and to solve the probable social problems that might come out (Schleicher, 2016). Hence, it is important for both beginning and experienced teachers to become aware of what is expected of them and continue their professional development to be competent enough throughout their careers more than ever. To this end, along with quality education, teachers at varying career steps need well-structured competency frameworks (CFs) to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses. Teacher preparation programmes also need such frameworks for objective assessment purposes.

1.1. The Concept of Competence and Competency-Based Education

Although “competence or competency-based” education has long been implemented in vocational education and teacher training (Coenen, Heijke & Meng, 2014; Koenen et al., 2015), there is not a consensus on the definitions of the words “competence” and “competency”. The two words are usually used interchangeably even though each holds slightly different meanings (Mulder, Guilkers, Biemans & Wesselink, 2009; Winterton, 2009), but for the purposes of this paper the words are treated as the same. Competence can be defined as expertise knowledge in a certain domain, including skills and dispositions. Competence refers to a certain level of achievement and also capacity to perform well in a professional situation and it is, therefore, occupational, social, and personal knowledge and skills gained upon completion of a course or programme (Braun, Woodley, Richards & Leidner, 2012; Oyerinde, Onajite & Aina, 2020; Strijbos et al., 2015). Hence, it is the combination of knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions specific to a professional context (Gian & Bao, 2021; Koenen et al., 2015; Sigfried & Wuttke, 2016).

Bouley et al. (2015) argue that competence includes a willingness to perform a task in addition to skills and knowledge, implying that competence is a construct that includes personal characteristics such as values, beliefs, and attitudes toward teaching, as well as cognitive and situational skills, e.g., reasoning, that can be observed in the classroom (Bloemke & Kaiser, 2017). So, the concept of competence is flexible, adaptive and task and situation-specific (Kaendler, Wiedmann, Rummel & Spada, 2015).

There have been various competence approaches in vocational and teacher education: behaviourist, cognitive, generic, discipline-specific and holistic (Coenen et al., 2014; Mulder, Weigel & Collins, 2007; Pulham, Graham & Short, 2018; Strijbos et al., 2015). Behaviourist approach places emphasis on observing successful performers and differentiating them from low performers. Cognitive approach includes the use of all mental abilities. Generic approach focuses on the variation in performance as well, but with a special emphasis on underlying characteristics of high performers. Competencies in this approach gain importance within the context they are defined and CFs specify minimal standards (Sultana, 2009). Generic competencies are applicable to a variety of different occupational contexts and are critical to success (Strijbos et al., 2015; Young & Chapman, 2010). Hence, they are also called as core skills or key competencies (Young & Chapman, 2010). Specific approach deals with the field-specific theoretical knowledge and field-specific methods. Holistic approach deems competence as the combination of knowledge, skills, and social competencies, including behaviours, attitudes, values, and core and generic abilities.

1.2. Teacher Competencies

The history of determining teacher competencies (TCs) goes back to 1940s in the United States to recognize teaching as a profession (Call, 2018). Since then, in many countries, competencies have systematically been reviewed to be appropriate for the requirements of society. Even though some educators oppose defining competencies for teachers in prescriptive ways because of the complex nature of teaching, well-developed generic TCs are valuable guidelines and road maps for the professional development of teacher candidates, practicing teachers and teacher educators (Alqiawi & Ezzeldin, 2015; Hatlevik, 2017).

As a result of the Bologna Process, which aimed to establish comparable and coherent higher education systems across European countries, and with accountability issues, identifying generic competencies for bachelor programmes is necessary to ensure high-quality assessment (Blömeke & Kaiser, 2017; Braun et al., 2012). Therefore, determining the qualities and characteristics of good teachers and teaching practices over observable performance outcomes and integrating them into assessment systems is of great importance (Alqiawi & Ezzeldin, 2015). Competencies serve as a reference document for self-evaluation purposes (Koenen et al, 2015).

However, academic studies regarding generic TCs are limited in Turkey. The first systematic TCs were determined in 2006 (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, (Ministry of Education), MoNE, 2006) and they were renewed in 2017 (Turkish Ministry of Education, MoNE, 2017a), which is a long period to respond to changes and developments experienced in the country. The 2017 framework focuses on knowledge, skills, attitudes and values expected of teachers, an approach which is in line with international competency-frameworks (Caena, 2013; Council of Chief State School Officers, CCSSO, 2013; Jobs for the Future & the CCSSO, 2015). Nonetheless, some dimensions of the framework such as whether the competencies are observable, measurable and applicable for teacher development and evaluation and whether they can be used as a benchmark for quality teacher preparation programmes need to be examined thoroughly.

MoNE (2017b) published "Teacher Strategy Paper" (albeit it has been suspended due to heavy criticism from public) in 2017 with two major aims: 1) to put into practice a performance evaluation system to find out professional development needs of teachers on a periodical basis, and 2) to increase the quality of activities carried out for personal and professional development of teachers. However, according to 2017 Education Evaluation Report (TEDMEM, 2018) published in Turkey, the biggest problem in any kind of performance evaluation system is the vague statements and expressions used as competencies and performance indicators. The current teacher competency framework (TCF) (MoNE, 2017a) includes some principles, which must generally exist in the nature of teaching profession, and they are used as performance criteria such as acting in accordance with ethic codes, or showing empathy and tolerance in human relationships. In addition, the guidelines and descriptions of the rating to be used in performance evaluation should be specified clearly to present the expectations from teachers. For this reason, when establishing TCs, performance indicators should be specified in an observable and measurable way that allows for objective and reliable teacher evaluation (Strijbos et al, 2015; Taş & Bıkmaz, 2016; TEDMEM, 2018) and also helps in designing a curriculum based on competency-based education (Özcan, 2013).

The purpose of this research study is to determine observable and measurable generic TCs along with performance indicators that can be used for professional development and evaluation purposes of teachers. In order to determine well- defined and well-examined TCs, which is a very comprehensive endeavor including social, economic and affective factors in a certain society along with teachers' individual differences with regard to concerning their characteristics, dispositions, values, beliefs and backgrounds, researchers should deploy and integrate different research methods, namely mixed methods research. This can allow them to benefit from both qualitative and quantitative data and guide researchers to answer research questions based on both narration and numeration with the participation of various stakeholders, which in turn might reflect the views of different groups and yield more valid results. The research questions posed for this study are as follows:

- 1) What are the opinions of
 - a) field experts (teacher trainers at universities)
 - b) candidate teachers and
 - c) education experts working for Ministry of Education with regard to whether there is a need for a new generic teacher competency framework?
- 2) What are the opinions of
 - a) teachers and
 - b) field experts concerning the draft teacher competency framework developed by the researchers?
- 3) What are the observable and measurable generic teacher competencies?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

This study is grounded on exploratory sequential design, which is one of the mixed methods (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Clark, 2011). Mixed methods enable researchers to use both qualitative and quantitative data to empower the research (Creswell, 2014; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Conducting a single study through mixed methods, researchers obtain, analyse and combine the data with findings and draw conclusions by incorporating qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. In this study, qualitative, quantitative and again qualitative data were obtained respectively by associating with each other. The study was conducted in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 academic years at Anadolu University, Faculty of Education (AUFE), Eskişehir, and MoNE in Ankara, Turkey.

2.2. The Validity and Reliability of Qualitative and Quantitative Data

The qualitative research paradigm seeks for trustworthiness, transferability, consistency and verification instead of reliability to enhance the quality of research (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2014). In this study, the first way to sustain trustworthiness was to obtain in-depth data. The qualitative data obtained in line with research questions were analysed in patterns and rather than summarizing, they were interpreted by the verification of direct quotations. Another way to obtain in-depth data is triangulation and it can be sustained through method, analyst, resource or point of view triangulation (Patton, 2014). This study deployed resource triangulation by obtaining data from field experts, MoNE experts and teacher candidates and this allowed researchers to collect rich data from participants owning different backgrounds, experiences, feelings and attitudes about the same topic. In addition, document analysis and interviews conducted in this study are method triangulation and in these ways the literature and participants' views were associated, which is important for the consistency of the findings. Expert evaluation is also another way to sustain trustworthiness. In this respect, inter-coder reliability was calculated and all the codes obtained from the interviews with field experts (86%), semi-structured interviews with teacher candidates (83%), focused group interview with teacher candidates (83%) and semi-structured interviews with MoNE experts (88%) showed agreement (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For the transferability, the raw data were described and presented to the interpretation of readers without adding any subjective comments. Finally, for the consistency of the study, the research was conducted in line with the principles of the selected research design and expert support was obtained throughout the study to sustain external verisimilitude.

The quantitative research data were collected from 26 schools and 397 teachers (125 primary schools and 272 subject matter teachers). According to Büyüköztürk, Akgün, Demirel, Karadeniz & Çakmak (2014), this sampling size is sufficient. For discrete variables, the sampling size for a population of 8000 people must be at least 367 at .05 significance level. When the research was conducted, the number of teachers working in Eskişehir was 8199 according to Provincial Directorate of Education and it included vocational and pre-school teachers too, which means the sampling size would be more reliable when these teachers are excluded.

2.3. Study Group

Because qualitative and quantitative research techniques were deployed in this research, the study group, population and sample were determined accordingly.

2.3.1. The Study Group for Qualitative Data Collection: Regarding the first research question “whether there is a need for a new generic TCF”, field experts, candidate teachers and MoNE experts were interviewed. Table 1 shows the participants.

Table 1. *The Participants from Whom the Qualitative Data Were Collected*

Participants	Number
Field Experts	9
MoNE experts	6
Senior teacher candidates (face to face interviews)	7
Senior teacher candidates (Focus group interviews)	6
Total	28

As shown in Table 1, 28 participants constituted the qualitative study group who were determined based on the criterion sampling - one of the purposive sampling types (Patton, 2014). Because it encompasses all disciplines, half of the participants were chosen from the field experts and students of the Basic Education Department, Primary School Teaching Programme. Another major objective of the study was to design a model programme based on competencies (which is out of the scope of this paper). Therefore, the rest of the participants were chosen from the field experts of Educational Sciences Department, Curriculum and Instruction Programme. Finally, the criterion in selecting MoNE experts was taking active roles in determining TCs at MoNE.

2.3.2. The Population and Sample for the Quantitative Data Collection: The population of the study were class and subject matter teachers working at primary and secondary levels in Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı districts of Eskişehir, Turkey. The number of teachers working in these districts were 5405 and 2794 respectively in 2018-2019 academic year. Stratified sampling, which is used when sub-groups already exist in a certain population (Büyüköztürk et al., 2014), was employed in choosing teachers. For the purposes of the study, vocational and pre-school education institutions were excluded from the population. The researchers obtained data from eight regions in Tepebaşı district and six regions in Odunpazarı district. Table 2 shows the school regions and teachers from whom the data were collected.

Table 2. *Regions, Schools and Teachers From Whom the Quantitative Data Were Obtained*

Districts	Education Regions	Schools	Number of Teachers
Tepebaşı	10 / 8	16	269
Odunpazarı	8 / 6	10	128
Total	14	26	397

2.4. Data Collection Tools

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were developed for the study. Table 3 presents the data type, data collection tools, implementation purposes, and from whom the data were collected.

Table 3. *Data Type, Data Collection Tools and Participants*

Data Type	Type of Data Collection Tool	Name of the Data Collection Tool	Purpose of Data Collection Tool	Participants to whom Data Collection Tools are Implemented
Qualitative	Semi-Structured Interviews	Interview form for field experts on 2017 generic teacher competencies	To obtain the opinions of field experts on 2017 generic teacher competencies	Nine field experts working for AUFE
		Interview form for teacher candidates on 2017 generic teacher competencies	To obtain the opinions of teacher candidates on 2017 generic teacher competencies	Seven teacher candidates studying at AUFE
	Focus-Group Interview	Teacher candidates focus group interview form on 2017 generic teacher competencies	To obtain the opinions of teacher candidates on 2017 generic teacher competencies	Six teacher candidates studying at AUFE
	Semi-Structured Interviews	Interview form for MoNE experts on 2017 generic teacher competencies	To obtain the opinions of MoNE experts involved in determining 2017 generic teacher competencies	Six MoNE experts working for General Directorate for Teacher Training and Development
Quantitative	Information Form	Information form on generic teacher competencies	To find out the opinions of primary and subject matter teachers on draft generic teacher competencies	397 teachers in Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı districts in Eskişehir county.
Qualitative	Workshop Form	Teacher competencies workshop form	To determine the opinions of field experts on draft teacher competency framework developed based on document analysis and teacher views	52 field experts from five different universities.

2.5. Data Collection and Analysis

Qualitative, quantitative and qualitative data collection processes were followed respectively in this study. After document analysis on teacher competencies, the semi-structured interviews with field experts and teacher candidates who volunteered to participate in the study were conducted at AUFE. The researchers also conducted interviews with the education experts working for the General Directorate for Teacher Training and Development of MoNE in Ankara as they were the ones who took part in developing the current generic TCF effectuated in 2017.

The content analysis method was employed in the analysis of the interviews. The researchers sought to obtain more in-depth data to increase the trustworthiness of the qualitative phase of the study by interpreting the data in patterns by relating them to each other. Data verification, resource verification and also document analysis were the methods employed to enhance the quality of the study (Patton, 2014; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2014).

In the second phase, the study's quantitative data were collected from teachers through draft generic TCF developed by the researchers based on the analysis of initial data obtained from interviews and literature review. After getting the legal and ethical permissions from Eskişehir Provincial Directorate of Education, the draft TCF prepared as an information form was presented to teachers working in the 2018-2019 academic year. The form consisted of seven competency domains and 301 performance indicators and each indicator was evaluated by the participants in terms of appropriateness. Descriptive frequencies of the performance indicators were calculated and they were later referred to in determining the final version of the TCF along with the data obtained from the Generic TCs Workshop.

The final qualitative data collection process was the well-attended workshop on generic TCs organized by the researchers in AUFE. During this workshop, 52 field experts representing all fields of educational sciences participating from five different universities scrutinized and evaluated the draft TCF. The difference of this TCF from the TCF evaluated by the teachers was its reduced number of performance indicators under each sub-competency and its structural organization. The TCF comprising of seven competency domains and 36 sub-competencies evaluated by the field experts defined performance indicators as competent and non-competent in the shape of two columns. The left column showed the competent, and the right column showed non-competent performance indicators. Appendix A shows a sample sub-competency and its performance indicators.

Each workshop group examined and evaluated the framework in terms of structure, content, language, appropriateness, redundancies and whether competencies and performance indicators were measurable and observable. The field experts proposed some new competency domains and sub-competencies they believed the TCF should include. They also proposed some alternatives to the organization of the framework. The study groups then compared and shared their evaluations and views on the proposed competencies. Finally, the researchers analysed the feedback obtained from the field experts on each competency item and finalized the TCF.

2.6. Ethical

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed.

Ethical Review Board Name: Anadolu University Ethics Committee

Date of Ethics Evaluation Decision: 31.01.2018 Ethics Assessment Document Issue Number: 6805

3. Results

The findings are presented according to the research questions and in the order of the phases followed in the study. The first research question was whether there is a need for a new generic TCF. The emerging themes related to TCs are presented below.

3.1. The Opinions of Field Experts on Current TCF

Content analysis of the interviews conducted with field experts yielded six main themes. Table 4 shows these themes and sub-themes.

Table 4. Themes and Sub-Themes Emerged from the Interviews with Field Experts

General Themes	Sub-themes
1- A holistic and simplified study	
2- Education faculties and generic competencies	- Theoretical nature of the program - Implementations aiming at teaching the skills, values and attitudes and insufficiency of the courses - Lack of motivation for generic teacher competencies - Lack of regulation knowledge
3- The problems in implementing generic competencies	- Non-functionality of competencies - Non-measurable and non-observable competencies
4- The deficiencies of competencies	- Insufficient personal and professional development dimensions of competencies - Lack of general knowledge dimension
5- The problems with performance evaluation	- The need for guidance for self-evaluation - Guidance for course content and teacher training implementations - Guidance for teacher qualities

As shown in Table 4, the first theme reflects the opinions of the field experts on current TCF. They believed that the 2017 TCF developed by MoNE was a "holistic and simplified TCF" consisting of the three dimensions of knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values, unlike the previous 2006 TCF, which included six main competency domains, 31 sub-competencies, and 233 performance indicators, making it difficult to measure and observe. Therefore, it was not suitable to serve as a realistic reference framework for teacher education and teacher evaluation. The second theme was on "education faculties and generic competencies". The field experts believed that education faculties successfully teach the knowledge dimension because of the curricula focusing mainly on theoretical but neglecting practical aspects. They also thought there are some problems related to teaching necessary values and attitudes to teacher candidates, which results in lack of motivation. One of the sub-competencies under professional knowledge competency in 2017 TCF is the regulation knowledge. According to the field experts, this is one of the problems teacher candidates have difficulty when they are employed since they lack knowledge regarding their rights, duties, and responsibilities and the current curricula don't cover such issues.

Thirdly, the field experts believed there are some problems in implementing the current TCs. TCs are not functional since they are not taken into consideration in selecting, training and employing teacher candidates. Besides, the competencies are not measurable and observable because they are too general.

The fourth theme was "the deficiencies of competencies". According to the field experts, the competency domains lack some important issues regarding teacher qualities. They believed adding some other competency domains into the current framework would help develop a more comprehensive and realistic TCF. They believed the first important deficiency of the framework is concerning professional development. They thought there should be more competencies regarding personal and professional development of teachers. Some competencies that will help teachers follow international literature, conduct action research, solve emerging problems, collaborate with colleagues and other organizations should be added to the framework. They also suggested that the general knowledge dimension of the framework should be improved.

The last theme was about the "problems with performance evaluation". MoNE projected to use the current competencies in the performance evaluation of teachers (MoNE, 2017b). The field experts objected to using these competencies in teachers' performance evaluation due to possible drawbacks. Instead, they proposed using the (revised and improved version) competencies for self-evaluation and professional development. In addition, the field experts believed that a well-developed TCF should be used as a reference document in designing the curricula of teacher training programmes.

3.2. The Opinions of Teacher Candidates on Current TCF

On current competencies, face-to-face and focus group interviews conducted with teacher candidates enrolled at AUFE resulted in five themes. Table 5 shows these themes.

Table 5. *Themes and Sub-Themes Emerged from the Interviews with Teacher Candidates*

General Themes	Sub-themes
1- Incognizance of teacher candidates	
2- Need for additional competencies	
3- Non-functionality of competencies	
4- Gap between theory and practice	- Insufficient practicum period - Practical courses - Course period
5- Benefits of competency framework	- Self-evaluation - Content selection - Guidance for job selection

The first emerged theme was the “incognizance of teacher candidates” about TCs. The teacher candidates stated that they hadn’t been aware of the competencies until they became senior students. They added that their competencies and expectations weren’t adequately emphasized during their university education.

Another theme was “the need for additional competencies”. Just as field experts, the participants stated that the current framework should have covered some other competencies on digital skills, special education, multi-culturalism, integrative development of pupils and regulation knowledge. With the increasing role of digitalization of education and also with the increasing number of refugees emigrating into Turkey, the teacher candidates underlined the necessity of being well-equipped and being taught in-depth for such issues during their education.

Like their teachers, teacher candidates stated that the current competencies are non-functional, which was another emerging theme. They expressed that some teachers they observed during their practicum didn’t possess the current competencies and the supervisors didn’t inspect them. Therefore, these competencies don’t make sense in practice.

The fourth theme was “the gap between theory and practice”. The teacher candidates believed that their university courses were highly theoretical and they didn’t have adequate opportunity to reflect on theory. For this reason, they deemed themselves knowledgeable enough in theory, but they felt they didn’t gain some competencies specified in TCF due to lack of practice. Related to this, they thought their practicum period was limited to test theory and to gain the necessary attitudes and values about teaching.

The final theme was “the benefits of competency framework”. The teacher candidates believed that having such a TCF might help them become aware of their strengths and weaknesses. It could be a helpful tool for self-evaluation and they can use it as a reference to keep track of their professional development. The teacher candidates also believed that these competencies could be utilized as a basis in course design and contents can be selected and organized according to competency domains. Finally, the teacher candidates stated that a well-prepared TCF might be a good guide for those who want to study at education faculties and could help them decide whether they are appropriate for the teaching profession. This will result in selecting more appropriate and motivated teacher candidates and eventually enhance teacher qualities.

3.3. The Opinions of Education Experts Working for MoNE on Current TCF

The analysis of the interviews with MoNE experts working in the team that prepared the current -2017- TCF yielded five themes. Table 6 shows these themes.

Table 6. *Themes Emerged from the Interviews with MoNE Experts*

Themes
1- A well-attended study
2- Teachers’ views
3- Measurability and observability of competencies
4- Compatibility with international literature
5- Continuity and updateability of competencies

The first emerging theme was “a well-attended study”. The MoNE experts stated the current TCF is a product of various participants such as academicians from universities, teachers, different directorates of MoNE, Vocational Qualifications Authority and people who worked in the preparation of former TCF. However,

MoNE experts also stated that these competencies reflect the Ministry perspective since most of the participants involved in the study team were either the employees of MoNE or MoNE affiliated institutions. They thought that if more teachers' views had been obtained, a more realistic and different TCF would have been yielded, which was another theme that emerged.

The third theme was "measurability and observability of competencies". Most of the MoNE experts admitted that majority of the current competencies are not measurable and observable. They added that it can only be inferred whether a teacher has the command of a particular competency specified in the framework. On the other hand, some experts asserted that competencies do not need to be measurable and observable since the framework is an official document showing what is ideal. Moreover, they also thought that expressing competencies in a measurable and observable manner is a challenging endeavour.

The fourth emerging theme was "compatibility of the competencies with international literature". The MoNE experts stated that competency determining studies in Turkey commenced making the Turkish education system aligned with European Union (EU), which started with Bologna Process. To this end, after reviewing the TCFs prepared by EU and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), they decided to prepare a framework encompassing competencies under a triple structure, namely, *knowledge, skills, attitudes and values*. They thought such a structure is so logical and comprehensive that it includes almost all qualities a teacher should possess.

The final theme was "continuity and updateability of competencies". The experts believed that the TCF isn't an ultimate and sacred text, but they rather deemed it a document that should be developed and updated upon constructive criticism and feedback from all stakeholders. The experts acknowledged that there isn't an end point in competency determining studies and there might be some deficiencies since the competencies are written from the perspective of the Ministry, and it is, therefore, a process that needs to be sustained.

As a result, the interviews conducted with field experts, teacher candidates and MoNE experts revealed that the current TCF needs improvement. The TCF effectuated in 2017 isn't comprehensive enough and it should include some other competency domains considering the current needs of students, teachers and society. The structure of the competencies categorized under three major domains as knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values is too general. The way they are written and expressed hinders them from being measurable and observable for teacher training, development, and evaluation purposes. Therefore, the researchers prepared an alternative TCF and the following part presents the findings regarding the TCF preparation process and the final outcomes, respectively.

3.4. The Opinions of Teachers on Draft Generic TCF

The second research question posed for this study was "How do teachers and field experts evaluate the draft TCF?". To this end, the preliminary TCF was asked to teachers via an information form. The draft TCF was evaluated by 397 teachers and the descriptive frequencies of each competency item were calculated. An exemplary frequency result is presented in Appendix B. The teachers evaluated the performance indicators regarding whether the indicators were appropriate under certain competency or sub-competency field. The performance indicators with low frequencies were eliminated from the framework. In addition to frequencies, written feedback and suggestions from teachers on the appropriateness, requirement, and clarity of each performance indicator were also considered. Based on the results, the second draft of the TCF was developed to be presented to the field experts.

3.5. The Opinions of Field Experts on Draft Generic TCF

The draft TCF was evaluated by 52 field experts from five different universities at "Generic Teacher Competencies Workshop". The field experts worked in five groups and they scrutinized each competency domain, sub-competency and performance indicator. Then they shared the group decisions with other groups. General views of the field experts on the proposed competencies are as follows:

1. The field experts believed that the structure of the draft framework consisting of performance indicators defined as "competent" and "non-competent" isn't logical. The participants proposed removing all "non-competent" performance indicators from the framework to not show the negative indicators and behaviours. Instead, they thought expressing the competencies via a grading scale would be more appropriate.

2. The field experts suggested changing the titles of some competency domains since they do not reflect the performance indicators. They also added that the titles and some performance indicators weren't coherent and therefore, they needed to be revised even though the performance indicators were appropriate.
3. The field experts believed that there were some redundant performance indicators and they needed to be reduced and purified.
4. The field experts thought that competency expressions and performance indicators were supposed to be written according to the principles of objective writing. They also reported that the use of "difficult" adjectives (e.g. the most, the first, very, close) or adverbs (e.g. almost) should be avoided in measuring, evaluating and interpreting performance indicators.
5. The field experts suggested that sub-competencies should be re-organized in a correlational order and for this reason, some sub-competencies should either be combined or some performance indicators should be written under different sub-competencies for a logical flow.
6. The field experts suggested that the whole framework should be reviewed in terms of clarity, measurability and comprehensiveness. They also added that ambiguous expressions, terminologies, and concepts in performance indicators that different people might interpret in different meanings should be removed.
7. Finally, the field experts in each group evaluated and rated all sub-competencies and performance indicators under each competency domain as "appropriate" and "inappropriate" and proposed alternative ones for the sub-competencies and performance indicators they thought as inappropriate. Besides, they suggested to add some different sub-competencies such as research skills, technology literacy and general knowledge into the TCF.

As can be seen above, the opinions of field experts on the draft TCF were towards the framework's structure, content, and comprehensiveness. The views of field experts were considered, and some substantial changes were made on the TCF. The following part explains the features of the final version of the generic TCF.

3.6. The Generic Teacher Competency Framework (GTCF)

The GTCF developed as a result of this study adopts an integrated approach to determining TCs by incorporating a generic approach (which distinguishes the underlying qualifications of superior teacher performance from average teacher performance) and a holistic approach (which considers competent teachers with the requisite cognitive, functional, social, and ethical competencies). The GTCF consists of six generic competency domains, 31 sub-competencies and performance indicators defining these competencies at four competency levels. Performance indicators are defined from level A (the highest) to B, C and D (the lowest). The reason behind this structure lies in the findings obtained from the participants. The participants emphasized that the performance indicators need to be measurable and observable. Besides, the Generic Teaching Competency Workshop carried out with the field experts was highly influential in the final version of the framework by transforming it into a quadruple graded structure. In addition, the researchers were inspired by some competency frameworks (CCSSO, 2013; Danielson, 1996; MoNE, 2006) in the finalization of the GTCF.

In GTCF, A level performance shows the master level teachers whose practices prove their quality in every aspect of teaching profession. This is a very high-level performance that many teachers might not reach throughout their careers. All classroom practices take place smoothly in their classes and their students are well-motivated, are aware of their responsibilities and work in collaboration. B level teachers have deeply grasped the concepts in a particular competency field and meet its requirements. This refers to experienced teacher performance. These teachers have comprehensive knowledge of their subject-matter and curriculum, know their students' needs and interest and have a wide range of teaching strategies and techniques. C level performance indicates teachers who have grasped the fundamental concepts at a particular competency. Their successful practices are irregular and, therefore, this level usually reflects the performance of a typical teacher candidate. This is the lowest acceptable level of a newly recruited teacher for the evaluation purposes. D level performance signifies teachers who haven't yet grasped the fundamental concepts of a particular subject-matter. So, those teachers need to repeat the basic knowledge of their field. Finally, D level is the performance that hinders a teacher candidate from getting a teaching licence. The GTCF specifies competencies for teachers

at different stages of their careers because teaching is a complex profession (Hatlevik, 2017), and the very same performance cannot be expected of them (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011). The structure of the GTCF also seems to be complying with literature, reflecting the views of participants and it can be used for both professional development and evaluation purposes (Blömeke & Kaiser, 2017; Braun et al, 2012; Alqiawi & Ezzeldin, 2015).

The performance indicators at a particular level in GTCF show what a teacher knows and can do. Each generic competency domain and sub-competency is explained separately, but it doesn't mean that the competencies are acquired independent from each other. For instance, a teacher who shows A level performance at the first sub-competency "2.1. Teacher has the knowledge of related discipline and uses it effectively" under the second generic competency domain "Content Knowledge and Teaching", will most likely perform level A or B at the second sub-competency, "1.2. Teacher selects and uses methods and techniques appropriate to the objective and content" under the first generic competency domain, "Learning and Teaching Process" because to choose appropriate methods and techniques, it is a prerequisite to have a command of subject-matter knowledge and how to convey it. So, both sub-competencies are interrelated. Appendix C shows the final version of the GTCF.

4. Conclusions, Discussions and Recommendations

This study revealed that the TCFs developed by MoNE in 2006 and 2017 don't have the observable and measurable competencies; therefore, a new TCF was developed. The literature on TCs shows that countries have various CFs. There is no consensus on the core competencies (Schreens & Blömeke, 2016); however, those CFs have some commonalities (Strijbos et al., 2015; Young & Chapman, 2010). The most common competencies across countries are related to communication with students and colleagues, self-reflection, life-long learning, leadership, higher-order thinking skills, information processing, responsibilities, ethics and teamwork (Strijbos et al., 2015). When the GTCF is analysed closely, all of these common competencies can be seen with their performance indicators at varying degrees since competence can be observed in performance.

According to Bouley et al. (2015), teacher competencies can be divided into professional knowledge and non-cognitive aspects. Professional knowledge encompasses content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PDK), including knowledge of students' cognition, typical student errors, knowledge of representations and explanations, and knowledge of tasks as instructional tools. Non-cognitive aspects include belief system, self-efficacy and self-regulation. The GTCF holds a similar approach, too.

The GTCF is also congruent with international literature. It includes both cognitive knowledge (CK, PCK): 1. Learning and Teaching Process; 2. Content Knowledge and Teaching; 3. Classroom Management; 6. Assessment and Evaluation) and non-cognitive (values, attitudes, beliefs, self-efficacy, self-regulation, self-evaluation: 4. Effective Communication with Stakeholders; 5. Professional Development and Responsibilities) aspects of teacher competence (Blömeke & Kaiser, 2017; Koenen et al., 2015; Siegfried & Wuttke, 2016). The sub-competencies vary from special education, adaptive teaching, higher-order thinking skills, techno-pedagogical skills, determining task difficulty, effective communication, teamwork, self-evaluation to assessment skills, which is also similar to the international CFs.

The GTCF seems to be similar with the bachelor degree competence model of Strijbos et al., (2015) in a way they categorize the competencies a teacher candidate needs to have. Strijbos et al., (2015, p.29) formulated competencies in three clusters as; conceptual, people and personal. Conceptual competencies refer to problem-solving, thinking skills, creativity and information processing, and examples to these competencies are expressed in the first and second competency domains of GTCF. People competencies are comprised of communication, leadership and teamwork, which can be found in the fourth and fifth competency domains of GTCF. Personal competencies are related to life-long learning, critical reflection and social responsibility and examples to these competencies can be seen in the first, fourth and fifth competency domains of GTCF.

Similarly, Alqiawi & Ezzeldin (2015) found that teacher competencies centre around three areas; professional, academic, and personal competencies. The GTCF also holds a holistic competency approach, which is the combination of not only the professional knowledge and skills, but also the attitudes and values of teachers regarding teaching profession (Blömeke & Kaiser, 2017; Bouley et al., 2015; Koenen et al., 2015; Sigfried & Wuttke, 2016). Both sub-competencies and their performance indicators at four competency levels address the personal aspects of teacher competencies in an observable manner.

The most significant features of GTCF, which is different from 2006 and 2017 TCFs prepared by the MoNE, are that GTCF is observable, measurable and has new competencies compatible with international CFs. The 2006 TCF consisted of 233 performance indicators making it hard for teacher trainers to evaluate the extent of the competencies gained by teacher candidates. Besides, there were some redundant competencies under different competency domains. But, the GTCF structurally determines whether the competencies have been achieved over solid and observable performance indicators at four competency levels. In this respect, the GTCF is a unique framework developed by individual researchers due to an extensive study in Turkey.

2017 TCF prepared by MoNE was also developed differently from 2006 TCF in terms of scope, content and structure. 2017 TCF consists of three competency domains entitled as professional knowledge, professional skills and attitudes and values, which holds a modern competence approach, but sub-competencies are listed under generic competencies without performance indicators. In addition, this kind of a framework doesn't allow education faculties to determine the course contents following the competencies and the framework doesn't function as a professional guide for teacher candidates. In fact, MoNE recommends using 2017 TCF to determine the course contents of education faculties and thereby accept it as a fundamental document in teaching target competencies (MoNE, 2017a).

The GTCF; however, determined the performance indicators in measurable, observable and tangible expressions. The teacher candidates using this framework as a reference source will realize the competency domains they need to develop and also be aware of the extent of the competency domains they have achieved for their professional development. Another feature of GTCF is that the competency domains can easily be associated with the course contents of teacher education programmes and be used for a consistent accreditation process of these programmes across the country as a reference document. One of the biggest criticisms of field experts to 2006 and 2017 TCFs is that the competencies cannot find application areas and they are not functional and practical. This framework has a significant feature since it can be used as a reference source for improving teacher quality and accountability of teacher education programmes (Öztürk & Kafadar, 2021). In addition, the competencies can be used as a benchmark in programme assessment for bachelor degree level (Strijbos et al., 2015). The GTCF with an observable and measurable quality might form a basis for the national evaluation systems needed as well (Taş & Bıkmaz, 2016).

This study suggests that teacher candidates need a well-structured and well-defined reference document to gain the competencies they are expected to possess. The observable and measurable competencies will enable teacher candidates to self-evaluate and self-reflect on their professional development. In addition, organizing course contents of education faculties around the competencies determined will help teacher candidates gain competencies in a more systematized manner. This will also contribute to the efforts in transforming theory into practice, which is emphasized as the biggest deficiency of the curriculum and help teacher candidates be more experienced by gaining the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes of the profession as far in advance as possible. Hatlevik's (2017) longitudinal study revealed that teaching training programmes play a crucial role in developing teacher competence and increasing the perceived self-efficacy of prospective teachers, which then turns into professional competence. Hence, quality standards or competencies gained through the combination of theory and practice at bachelor degree might help ease the negative effects of reality shocks of teachers at the beginning of their careers.

Based on the findings, some suggestions can be made for further studies. The GTCF yielded as a result of this study should be developed systematically because of the nature of CFs. To do this, various studies including projects and workshops should be carried out with the participation of more teachers, field experts and other stakeholders from different regions and schools. As a matter of fact, the MoNE experts who developed 2017 TCF stated that it was prepared from the MoNE's point of view and they asserted that a different framework would have come out if more and various participants had involved in the process. Therefore, developing competencies with multiple views of participants from different socio-cultural backgrounds will be another factor increasing the validity of the framework. Comparative analysis of competencies across countries through joint-studies can also be beneficial in determining core competencies of teachers. Besides, the proposed framework should be implemented, evaluated and the results to be obtained should be reviewed by experts. In this respect, it would be useful to implement the determined competencies in different schools from various regions. Finally, the potential impact of competencies determined can be assessed on teacher

candidates and teachers through longitudinal studies. Last but not least, the effectiveness of the curricula of teacher education programmes that centre around competencies can be assessed.

6. Acknowledgements

This study was supported by Anadolu University, Commission of Scientific Research and Projects. Eskişehir, Turkey. (Grant number 1802E024). Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

7. References

- Alqawi, D. A., & Ezzeldin, S. M. (2015). A suggested model for developing and assessing competence of prospective teachers in faculties of education. *World Journal of Education*, 5(6), 65-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wje.v5n6p65>
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, (2011). *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia: Standards and procedures*. Education Services Australia. Retrieved from https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/national-policy-framework/accreditation-of-initial-teacher-education-programs-in-australia.pdf?sfvrsn=e87cff3c_28
- Blömeke, S., & Kaiser, G. (2017). Understanding the development of teachers' professional competencies as personally, situationally and socially determined. In Clandinin J. & Husu, J. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research on teacher education*, (pp. 783-802). SAGE publications.
- Bouley, F., Wuttke, E., Schnick-Vollmer, K., Schmitz, B., Berger, S., Fritsch, S., & Seifried, J. (2015). Professional competence of prospective teachers in business and economics education: Evaluation of a competence model using structural equation modeling. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 90(4), 491-502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2015.1068076>
- Braun, E., Woodley, A., Richardson, J. T., & Leidner, B. (2012). Self-rated competences questionnaires from a design perspective. *Educational Research Review*, 7(1), 1-18. <https://doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2011.11.005>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Akgün, Ö. E., Demirel, F., Karadeniz, Ş., & Çakmak, E. K. (2014). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi.
- Caena, F. (2013). *Supporting teacher competence development for better learning outcomes*. Education & Training, European Commission, 5-59. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/education/policy/school/doc/teachercomp_en.pdf
- Call, K. (2018). Professional teaching standards: A comparative analysis of their history, implementation and efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n3.6>
- Charteris, J., & Smardon, D. (2015). Teacher agency and dialogic feedback: Using classroom data for practitioner inquiry. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 50, 114-123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.05.006n>
- Coenen, J. B., Heijke, J. A. M., & Meng, C. M. (2014). *Narrow versus broad vocational education: Labour market position and curriculum characteristics of specialised versus less specialised vocational education programmes in the Netherlands (No. 004)*. Maastricht University, Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market (ROA). <https://doi.org/10.26481/umarot.2014004>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013, April). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0: A Resource for ongoing teacher development*. Washington DC. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage.

- Çiftçi, E., & Karaman, A. (2019). Short-term international experiences in language teacher education: A qualitative meta-synthesis. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 93-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v44n1.6>
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional development: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gian, P. M., & Bao, D. O. (2021). The competences of teaching staff and principals in the context of educational innovation and school development. *International Education Studies*, 14(1), 65-75. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v14n1p65>
- Hatlevik, I. K. R. (2017). The impact of prospective teachers' perceived competence on subsequent perceptions as schoolteachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(7), 810-828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1322056>
- Jobs for the Future, & the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2015). *Educator Competencies for personalized, learner-centered teaching*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED560785.pdf>
- Kaendler, C., Wiedmann, M., Rummel, N., & Spada, H. (2015). Teacher competencies for the implementation of collaborative learning in the classroom: A framework and research review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 27(3), 505-536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9288-9>
- Koene, A. K., Dochy, F., & Berghmans, I. (2015). A phenomenographic analysis of the implementation of competence-based education in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 50, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.04.001>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2006). *Temel eğitime destek projesi "öğretmen eğitimi bileşeni" öğretmenlik mesleği genel yeterlikleri*. Tebliğler Dergisi, 2590, 1491-1540. Retrieved from https://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_12/13161921_YYretmenlik_MesleYi_Genel_YETERL_YKLERi_onaylanan.pdf
- Mulder, M., Weigel, T., & Collins, K. (2007). The concept of competence in the development of vocational education and training in selected EU member states: A critical analysis. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 59(1), 67-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13636820601145630>
- Mulder, M., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Wesselink, R. (2009). The new competence concept in higher education: Error or enrichment? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33 (8/9), 755-770. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590910993616>
- Oyerinde, O. D., Onajite, O. G., & Aina, A. M. (2020). Competency needs of business educators in Osun state secondary schools, Nigeria. *International Education Studies*, 13(2), 80-87. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n2p80>
- Özcan, M. (2013). *Okulda üniversite: Türkiye'de öğretmen eğitimini yeniden yapılandırmak için bir model önerisi*. Retrieved from <https://www.tusiad.org/tr/yayinlar/raporlar/item/7344>
- Öztürk, C., & Kafadar, T. (2021). The first attempt to establish an accreditation system in Turkish teacher training history. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 8(1), 99-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2021.8.1.216>
- Paine, L. (2013). Exploring the interaction of global and local in teacher education: Circulating notions of what preparing a good teacher entails. In X, Zhu and K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for the 21st century* (p. 119-140). Springer.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage.
- Pulham, B. E., Graham, R. C., & Short, R. C. (2018). Generic vs. modality-specific competencies for K-12 online and blended teaching. *Journal of Online Research*, 4(1) 33-52. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/182168/>

- Scheerens, J., & Blömeke, S. (2016). Integrating teacher education effectiveness research into educational effectiveness models. *Educational Research Review*, 18, 70-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.03.002>
- Schleicher, A. (2016), *Teaching excellence through professional learning and policy reform: Lessons from around the world. International summit on the teaching profession*. Paris: OECD Publishing <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264252059-en>
- Siegfried, C., & Wuttke, E. (2016). How can prospective teachers improve their economic competence? *Zeitschrift für ökonomische Bildung*, 4, 65-86. Retrieved from http://www.zfoeb.de/2016_4/2016_4_siegfried_wuttke_economic_competence.pdf
- Strijbos, J., Engels, N., & Struyven, K. (2015). Criteria and standards of generic competences at bachelor degree level: A review study. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 18-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.001>
- Sultana, R. G. (2009). Competence and competence frameworks in career guidance: Complex and contested concepts. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 9(1), 15-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-008-9148-6>
- Taş, İ. D., & Bıkmaz, F. (2020). Bir öğretmene değerlendirme modeli önerisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(3), 575-593.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Sage.
- TEDMEM. (2018). 2017 Eğitim değerlendirme raporu (TEDMEM Değerlendirme Dizisi 4). Ankara: Türk Eğitim. Retrieved from <https://tedmem.org/yayin/2017-egitim-degerlendirme-raporu>
- Turkish Ministry of Education. (2017a). *General Competencies for Teacher Education*. Ankara: Directorate General for Teacher Training and Development. Retrieved from http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_06/29111119_TeachersGeneralCompetencies.pdf
- Turkish Ministry of Education. (2017b). *Teacher strategy paper 2017-2023*. Ankara: Directorate General for Teacher Training and Development. Retrieved from http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_05/25170118_Teacher_Strategy_Paper_2017-2023.pdf
- Winterton, J. (2009). Competence across Europe: Highest common factor or lowest common denominator? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(8/9), 681-700. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590910993571>
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Young, J., & Chapman, E. (2010). Generic competency frameworks: A brief historical overview. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 37(1), 1-24. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/109114/>

Appendix A. Sample performance indicators in draft teacher competency framework evaluated by field experts

1- Commitment to Learning and Teaching (Competency Domain)

Overall View:

1a) Teacher conducts activities supporting individual differences. (Sub-competency)

Competent Performance Indicator		Non-competent Performance Indicator	
The teacher addresses different learning styles (visual, aural, verbal, kinesthetic) during in-class activities. The teacher uses blackboard, coursebooks, various resources and materials, visual and aural media, and authentic materials. The teacher diversifies the examples (school, family, business life, nature, kinship etc.) in subject teaching and addresses various cultural and socio-economic classes.		The teacher uses single type or limited material. The teacher only relies on the coursebook. The teacher usually addresses a single learning type (aural). Their examples are not various or limited to a certain field	
Appropriate	Required	Appropriate	Required
Suggestion:		Suggestion:	

Appendix B. Exemplary analysis of teacher views on the draft competency framework

Sub-competency 1a. Teacher conducts activities supporting individual differences.

Performance indicators	Appropriate		Inappropriate		Appropriate under a different domain		Non-responded	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Teacher addresses different learning styles visual, aural, verbal, kinaesthetic) in classroom activities.	317	79.8	3	0.8	-	-	77	19.4
2. Teacher uses blackboard, coursebooks, various resources, audio-visual aids and authentic materials.	313	78.8	1	0.3	3	0.8	80	20.2
3. Teacher diversifies examples in subject teaching (school, family, business life, nature, kinship etc.) and addresses various cultural and socio-economical classes.	302	76.1	6	1.5	4	1	85	21.4

The exemplary analysis above shows the results related to three performance indicators of the first sub-competency in the draft framework -1a. *The teacher conducts activities supporting individual differences-* under the first generic competency domain, namely “Commitment to Learning and Teaching”. Regarding the first performance indicator, 79.8% of the teachers evaluated the first sub-competency as appropriate, 0.8% as inappropriate, and 19.4% didn’t make any comment about it. The second performance indicator was evaluated as appropriate by 78.8% of the teachers and was evaluated as inappropriate. 0.8% of the teachers thought that it should go under a different sub-competency of another generic competency domain and 20.2% of the teachers didn’t answer it. The third performance indicator was evaluated as appropriate by 76.1% of the teachers and as inappropriate by 1.5% of the teachers. 1% thought that it should go under a different sub-competency and 21.4 didn’t answer it.

Appendix C. Generic Teacher Competency Framework

1- Learning and Teaching Process

1.1. The teacher prepares effective lesson plans and conducts lessons accordingly.

A. Teacher; prepares the lesson plan according to the curriculum; prepares the lesson plan in a particular order and logic; prepares the whole lesson plan addressing to the all elements of curriculum; explains how to incorporate technology in teaching subject-matter and in conducting activities in their lesson plan; considers learning outcomes in planning and implementation process and conducts each activity towards a particular learning outcome; makes students aware of why and what they learn.

- B. Teacher; prepares the lesson plan based on curriculum; prepares the lesson plan in a particular order and logic; prepares the overall lesson plan addressing all curriculum elements. Most of the activities are towards a particular learning outcome in planning and implementation process. Teacher makes students aware of why and what they learn.
 - C. Teacher's lesson plan addresses only one or two elements of the curriculum. There are disconnections between the transitions of the activities. Few activities are towards learning outcomes.
 - D. There are problems with the unity of the lesson plan. The lesson plan has very little to do with content, student level, and resources.
-

1. 2. The teacher selects and uses methods and techniques appropriate to the objective and content.

- A. Teacher; applies expository, discovery, and research-exploration instruction strategies effectively for the lesson to achieve its goal; selects instruction techniques appropriate to the objective, subject, group size, time allocated and physical opportunities; selects appropriate instruction techniques among direct instruction, question and answer, case method, problem-solving and demonstration according to the cognitive, affective and psycho-motor objectives; utilizes instruction techniques based on both individual and cooperative learning-teaching techniques such as brain-storming, acting, drama, simulation, observation, field trip, project work, six thinking hats; provides students with rich clues, reinforcers and feedback.
 - B. Teacher; applies expository, discovery, and research-exploration instruction strategies for the lesson to achieve its goal; applies various methods and techniques; redresses the balance between individual and cooperative learning-teaching techniques; provides students with sufficient clues and reinforcers and feedback.
 - C. Teacher; generally applies a particular type of instruction strategy; has a limited repertoire of instruction methods and techniques; applies mainly individual learning-teaching techniques. The activities through which students learn from each other are limited.
 - D. Teacher; applies only one type or limited instruction strategy; applies mainly expository instruction method. The activities conducted are only for individual learning.
-

1. 3. The teacher utilizes teaching materials effectively.

- A. Teacher; uses instructional resources and materials skillfully; wastes no time in using resources and materials; designs and uses instructional materials consistent with curriculum and student needs; designs and uses materials that provide meaningful learning activities for students; adapts textbooks/resources as needed; and uses a variety of different resources and technologies effectively to achieve learning outcomes.
 - B. Teacher; doesn't have problems using lesson equipment and materials; loses very limited time in using lesson equipment and materials; designs lesson materials in line with the curriculum and students' needs; adapts course books/resources when needed; applies certain resources and technologies appropriate to the learning outcomes.
 - C. Teacher loses time in using lesson equipment and materials. The materials designed according to the needs of students are limited. The resources and materials used provide students with very few meaningful learning experiences.
 - D. Teacher loses a lot of time in using lesson equipment and materials. The equipment and materials used are insufficient to provide students with meaningful learning experiences.
-

1. 4. The teacher enunciates the objective of the subject and lesson.

- A. Teacher; expresses the objective and importance of the lesson or unit subject clearly; associates the subject and lesson with other subjects; attracts the attention of students to the subject; has a well-planned instruction of the subject and associates it with previous knowledge and experiences; engages students in the explanation of the subject and concepts.
 - B. Teacher; expresses the objective of the lesson or unit subject; explains how the subject is related with other subjects. The teacher's instruction is appropriate and associates it with students' previous knowledge and experiences.
 - C. Teacher expresses the objective of the lesson or unit subject. The teacher's instruction is appropriate and associates it with students' previous knowledge and experiences.
 - D. The objective of the lesson and subject is unclear for students. The teacher's instruction is complicated or the teacher uses unintelligible language.
-

1. 5. The teacher gives timely and accurate instructions.

- A. Teacher; gives oral and written instructions in timely and precise language, with instructions including what to do and for what purpose; prepares and uses visual and written instructions using information technology; verifies that instructions are understood; provides alternative explanations in unambiguous terms; provides alternative explanations against possible misunderstandings.

- B.** Teacher's most of the written and oral instructions are timely and intelligible. Students don't spend much time to grasp the written and oral instructions. Teacher checks whether instructions have been understood.
- C.** Teacher's instructions at first seem to be complicated for students. Teacher is often obliged to repeat the instructions. Students have difficulty in following the instructions. Teacher tries to explain the instructions checking in the same manner. Students lose time to grasp the instructions.
- D.** Teacher's instructions cause confusion among students. Since teacher's instruction repetition is always the same, it causes confusion or panic.
-

1.6. The teacher conducts and adapts activities supporting individual differences during teaching process.

- A.** Teacher; effectively uses multimedia devices, various materials and activities towards individual differences such as learning styles, multiple intelligence and learning levels during teaching process; incorporates various resources appropriate to learning outcomes, content, teaching-learning process and evaluation elements of the curriculum.
- B.** Teacher; uses equipment, materials and activities towards individual differences during teaching process; adapts the resources in line with the requirements. The resources used are compatible with the curriculum.
- C.** Teacher presents examples generally addressing to the similar learning styles, multiple intelligence or learning levels. Teachers' use of equipment and materials towards individual differences in the teaching process is limited. Activity variety remains limited to few activities.
- D.** Teacher; presents examples addressing to similar learning styles, multiple intelligence or learning levels since s/he takes no notice of individual differences; lacks knowledge, skills and attitudes about individual differences in learning.
-

1.7. The teacher organizes learning experiences appropriate to students' developmental characteristics and stages during the teaching process.

- A.** Teacher; knows the age group characteristics of the students s/he teaches; conducts classroom activities and gives instruction according to the cognitive, affective, psycho-motor development, interests, requirements and wishes of students; uses a language appropriate to students' developmental stages and levels in subject teaching, example selection and resource use.
- B.** Classroom activities generally support developmental areas. During the teaching process, students' interests and requirements are noticed at a certain level. Most of the subject teaching, example selections, and resources used are appropriate to students' developmental stages.
- C.** Classroom activities support limited developmental areas. Very few of the student interests, wishes and requirements are considered. Subject teaching, example selection and resources used are either above or below the level of students.
- D.** Activities support only one developmental area. Teacher's language, examples and resources used are either above or below the level of students.
-

1.8. The teacher organizes special learning activities for students who need special education.

- A.** Teacher; knows how to help students with special educational needs, makes necessary arrangements for students to participate in the classroom, and organizes instructional practices accordingly; makes necessary physical and instructional accommodations for students with special needs; facilitates these students' access to learning activities and materials; collaborates with experts and families as needed.
- B.** Teacher; organizes education practices by considering the needs of students who need special education to a certain extent; partly makes the necessary physical and instructional adaptations for students with special needs. Those students have some difficulties in accessing learning activities and materials. When needed, teacher cooperates with experts and families to a certain extent.
- C.** Teacher considers and organizes the needs of students who need special education in a limited way. Students with special needs have great difficulties in accessing learning activities and materials. Teacher carries out the practices towards students who need special education on his/her own.
- D.** Teacher; conducts instructional practices without considering the needs of students who need special education; tries to carry out instructional practices towards students with special needs on his/her own; lacks knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding organizing learning activities for students who need special education.
-

1.9. The teacher enables students to actively participate in teaching process.

- A.** Teacher; employs student-centred instructional strategies, methods, and techniques; monitors instruction on an ongoing basis; prepares learning environments with respect to the needs of students who have difficulty learning; makes necessary accommodations for students who resist learning; creates special plans, guides, and monitors students to meet their individual learning needs.

- B.** Teacher; mostly utilizes student-centred instructional strategies, methods and techniques; diagnoses and supports students who need extra support to a great extent; makes special plans to meet the needs of those students.
 - C.** Teacher utilizes teacher-centred instructional strategies, methods and techniques. Teacher gives feedback to whole class rather than individual feedback. Teacher's support to students who have learning difficulties is limited.
 - D.** All the instructional strategies, methods and techniques the teacher utilizes are teacher-centred. Teacher always conducts the lesson with particular students.
-

2- Content Knowledge and Teaching

2. 1. The teacher has the knowledge of related discipline and uses it effectively.

- A.** Teacher; has the command of subject-matter terminology; well knows the prerequisite knowledge and provides students with concept maps; builds the subjects on students' previous knowledge; presents the relationship between the subjects and concepts through specific examples; gives examples from daily life and engages students in this process; provides students with activities allowing the transfer of knowledge across subjects and generalization; gives importance to depth rather than the breadth of knowledge during instruction; doesn't make content errors.
 - B.** Teacher; has the command of basic knowledge of subject-matter terminology; knows the prerequisite knowledge; builds the subjects on students' previous knowledge; demonstrates the relationship between subjects and concepts; gives examples from daily life; asks students to give their examples; doesn't make content errors.
 - C.** Teacher; knows the basic subject-matter concepts, but has some difficulties in showing the relationship between them; conducts activities that indicate s/he has the basic command of prerequisite knowledge of the field.
 - D.** Teacher; makes content errors; conducts limited activities indicating s/he has the basic command of prerequisite knowledge of the field.
-

2. 2. The teacher adapts teaching process according to the requirements in the face of unexpected situations.

- A.** Teacher; prepares flexible lesson plans; possesses advanced decision-making skills; skillfully makes significant changes to lesson plans as needed; continually analyses context and makes appropriate attempts; pursues diverse and alternative instructional methods that may be effective for students with learning difficulties; incorporates deductive and inductive instructional strategies depending on objectives, topic, situation, and individual differences; uses a variety of resources; turns unexpected situations or diverse student interests and questions into opportunities for learning and teaching; helps students question and explore the topic from multiple perspectives.
 - B.** Teacher; continuously analyses the context and makes appropriate attempts; successfully makes little changes in the lesson plan according to the need and situation; successfully replies students' various questions or responds to their interests and continues to the lesson; tries different instruction ways for students who have learning difficulties.
 - C.** Teacher; attempts to make changes in the lesson plan in the face of unexpected situations; however, those attempts partly become successful; loses a lot of time while responding to students' questions or interests. The flow of the lesson breaks down. Teacher has a limited repertory of teaching strategies and decision-making skills.
 - D.** Teacher sticks to the lesson plan strictly even if it needs to be changed. Teacher is indifferent to students' various questions.
-

2. 3. The teacher enables students to use higher-order thinking skills.

- A.** Teacher; utilizes thinking skills such as critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving and decision-making skills; asks questions like "Why?", "What would have happened if...?", "What would you do if you were...?", "Which option would you choose and what would be your justification?", "What approaches would you use in solving this problem and why?" that guide higher-order thinking; encourages students to critique each other by presenting evidence and reasoning in a democratic environment, taking multiple points of view, asking effective questions, and presenting real and alternative answers; guides students to synthesize and analyze; organizes activities to develop their creativity, thinking, and social skills; and becomes a role model for students.
 - B.** Teacher; utilizes higher-order thinking skills; always asks questions guiding to higher-order thinking and usually engages students in this process; supports students to focus not only the surface but also the deeper meaning of the knowledge.
 - C.** Teacher; asks questions both requiring and not requiring higher-order thinking; encourages students to make meaningful arguments instead of direct instruction and repetition even if it isn't regular.
 - D.** Teacher's instruction is at information level. The questions s/he asks have a single right answer rather than requiring higher-order thinking. The interaction between the teacher and students depends only on information transmission.
-

2. 4. The teacher assigns tasks based on research and inquiry.

A. Teacher; guides students to use information technology for research and inquiry; illustrates the use of various resources; uses examples to show how students can access knowledge; helps students use search strategies; shows students how to analyse knowledge; allows students to research various resources in small or larger groups and asks them to compare, classify, and question what they find; assigns homework that promotes students' lifelong learning skills.

B. Teacher; enables students to research from various resources; demonstrates how to access those resources; illustrates how to analyse knowledge; guides students in using various resources; provide students with opportunities to share their findings.

C. The resources s/he uses in the activities and assignments are limited. The teacher partly demonstrates how to access and analyse knowledge. Out of class activities and assignments are limited.

D. Teacher carries out the activities and assignments through a single resource. All the activities and assignments are done in the classroom.

3- Classroom Management**3. 1. The teacher creates a democratic and free classroom environment.**

A. Teacher; takes students' opinions into account in determining code of conduct and classroom rules; applies the rules for all squarely; infuses democracy into students as a culture; creates a secure classroom environment based on rapport, respect and mutual tolerance; makes every student feel valuable and unique; gives students an equal voice; involves students keeping silent or reluctant, instead of giving voice to the same students. Students know why they should or shouldn't do certain things in the classroom.

B. Teacher; has established the code of conduct and classroom rules and applies the rules for all squarely; infuses democracy into students as a culture; creates a secure classroom environment based on rapport, respect and tolerance; tries to give everyone an equal voice. Students know why they should do or shouldn't do certain things in the classroom.

C. Code of conduct and classroom rules have been determined, but students sometimes feel puzzled about what is allowed or not. The teacher can sometimes be inconsistent in applying classroom rules. Most of the students respect each other. Some students are dominant in the classroom.

D. Students feel puzzled about what they are allowed to do or not in the classroom. Some students are dominant in the classroom. Students can treat their peers discourteously.

3. 2. The teacher knows and applies the preventive measures in classroom management.

A. Teacher; skilfully and continuously monitors students in the classroom; detects the problematic situations and students; takes necessary measures; encourages students to become self-disciplined. Students warn their peers with due regard should the case occur.

Teacher; handles interpersonal disputes and conflicts before they come to a head; makes group assignments attentively and according to personal characteristics; knows what to look for in peer matching; does not lose his temper easily because of misbehaviour; does not insult or threaten students; addresses misbehaviour in a timely manner; enables students to behave properly by reminding them of class rules.

B. Teacher; continuously monitors students in the classroom; detects the problematic situations and students; timely deals with misbehaviours; doesn't easily lose temper due to misbehaviours; doesn't insult or threaten students; respects students' dignity.

C. Teacher; can miss some misbehaviours although s/he is aware of students' behaviours; deals with the misbehaviours s/he sees; sometimes gets angry easily due to misbehaviours; spends some of the lesson time by dealing with behavioural problems.

D. Teacher; has difficulty monitoring what students do in the classroom; inconsistently deals with negative situations and behaviours; performs an authoritarian and angry approach; acts and makes statements that are beneath students' dignity.

3. 3. The teacher supports and appreciates students' efforts for learning.

A. Teacher; encourages all students to do their best; praises and recognises appropriate student behaviour and performance; sets challenging goals for students; supports and guides students in developing their skills and performance; knows or seeks to discover students' interests and abilities; motivates students to develop new and creative ideas.

B. Teacher; tries to learn the interest and abilities of all students; praises and appreciates the appropriate behaviours and achievements of students; sets challenging targets for students; encourages students to put more effort for learning.

- C. Teacher; usually praises and appreciates students' appropriate behaviours and achievements; shows interests in students' abilities.
 - D. Teacher; deems success and ability related with his/her discipline; seldomly praises and appreciates the appropriate behaviours and achievements of students.
-

3. 4. The teacher uses the lesson time effectively.

- A. The introduction, development and closure segments of the lesson are clear to students. Students are aware of the segment of the lesson they are engaged in. Teacher associates all of the activities including fun and games and discussions with lesson subject. The pace of the lesson is appropriate for all students. The time allocated for activities is logical. Teacher allocates time for practice, repetition, reflection and wrap-up in the lesson. Transitions between activities are seamless and teacher doesn't lose time.
 - B. Teacher structures the lesson as introduction, development and closure. The beginnings and endings of the activities are clear. Teacher allocates most of the lesson time for instructional purposes. The pace of the lesson is appropriate for students. Teacher associates most of the activities including fun and games with lesson subject. Some activities may last earlier or longer than planned. There is short loss of time between activity transitions. Teacher allocates time for practice and repetition in the lesson.
 - C. There are some inconsistencies with the pace of the lesson. Even though the lesson's introduction, development and closure segments are recognizable, they are sometimes intertwined. Teacher loses time between the transitions of the activities or segments of the lesson. Preparations and arrangements take long time. The activities last either earlier or longer than planned. Some students are either obliged to rush or time elapses very slowly for some students.
 - D. The structure or segments of the lesson are not clear. The time loss between transitions of the activities or lesson segments is significant and preparations and arrangements take long time. The activities last earlier or longer than planned. The lesson pace is either too slow or fast.
-

4- Effective Communication with Stakeholders

4. 1. The teacher uses Turkish effectively in written and oral communication and becomes a role model for students.

- A. Teacher; uses Turkish in an effective, clear and intelligible manner; becomes a role model for students to use Turkish effectively in terms of grammar and pronunciation. Teacher's tone of voice and stresses are appropriate. Teacher; can easily be heard by all students; doesn't use or allow students to use vulgar language in the classroom even for entertainment purposes; corrects students' misuses of the language.
 - B. Teacher; uses standard Turkish; doesn't use or allow students to use vulgar language in the classroom; differentiates class language from daily language; corrects students' language use errors.
 - C. Teacher; sometimes uses daily language in the classroom even though s/he mostly uses class language; makes certain language and pronunciation errors. Students use the class and daily language together.
 - D. Teacher makes Turkish use errors. Students use vulgar language. Teacher is indifferent to students' language use errors.
-

4. 2. The teacher regularly informs parents regarding the development of students.

- A. Teacher; often informs parents regarding the developmental processes of students; makes meetings with parents when needed; applies various communication channels to inform parents; is attentive to parents' sensitivity in doing this and doesn't use a breaking and offending language.
 - B. Teacher; informs parents regarding the developmental processes of students at regular intervals; is attentive to parents' sensitivity in doing this; accepts the meeting wishes of parents about their children.
 - C. Teacher; informs parents about their children at parents' meetings at school; rarely meets with parents.
 - D. Teacher; provides minimal information about students' progress to parents; doesn't respond to parents' request for meetings. Teacher's language and manner in informing parents might be breaking.
-

4. 3. The teacher professionally cooperates with administrators and colleagues.

- A. Teacher; works in tandem with administrators and colleagues; works with the administrators in mutual respect and rapport; fulfils the duties required by laws, regulations and circulars and becomes a role model for his/her colleagues in this respect; gives prominence to professionalism rather than friendship in school-related jobs; is honest and fair in their actions and speeches.
- B. Teacher; works in tandem with administrators and colleagues; acts within the framework of laws, regulations and circulars in their relationships; is honest and fair in their actions and speeches.
- C. Teacher acts within the framework of laws, regulations and circulars in their relationships with administrators and colleagues.

D. Teacher; acts and makes statements opposed to the legislation in their relationships with administrators and colleagues; acts beyond the scope of legal and ethical rules.

4. 4. The teacher cooperates with families.

A. Teacher; guides families to take part in school events and classroom activities; receives families' opinions on how they can contribute to assignments and projects to be conducted; encourages families to engage in school events on important days and special occasions; frequently informs families regarding in and out of classroom practices through various communication channels; shares the justification and expectations of assignments and projects with families.

B. Teacher; guides families to take part in school events and classroom activities; engages families in structuring the assignments and projects; shares their expectations of assignments, projects and other activities with families.

C. Teacher; occasionally makes efforts to engage families in the curriculum; informs families about classroom activities.

D. Teacher makes minimal efforts to engage families in school events and classroom activities.

4. 5. The teacher uses supportive language in announcing the results of assignments, projects and examinations.

A. Teacher; encourages others as well while praising successful students; encourages students to study harder without demotivating them; explains the results of assignments, projects and examinations with justifications and examples; respects students' dignity.

B. Teacher; uses supportive language in announcing the results of assignments, projects and examinations; encourages others as well while praising successful students; respects students' dignity.

C. Teacher; usually uses supportive language in announcing the results of assignments, projects and examinations; doesn't act or make speeches offending students.

D. Teacher's manner in announcing the results of assignments, projects and examinations can be heartbreaking. The teacher doesn't encourage students to study harder and doesn't explain the justification of the results.

5- Professional Development and Responsibilities

5. 1. The teacher seeks ways to improve his/her learning and performance through self-evaluation.

A. Teacher; reflects on the positive and negative impact of their instructional practices on students and families; shares their experiences/knowledge with colleagues and solicits their feedback; conducts or participates in research to determine the effectiveness of instructional practices, resources and materials, and parent satisfaction; uses research findings to improve instruction; follows recent publications in their field and adapts recent developments into their instruction..

B. Teacher; reflects on the positive and negative effects of their instructional practices on students and families; shares experience/knowledge with colleagues and takes feedback from them; follows the recent publications in their field and adapts the current developments into their teaching; plans on how to improve instructional activities and collects systematic information.

C. Teacher; Reflects on the extent to which their instructional practices and lessons were effective; is aware of the extent to which learning outcomes were achieved.

D. Teacher cannot exhibit reflection and evidence regarding professional development or how a lesson could be improved when taught another time and doesn't feel a need for further planning.

5. 2. The teacher participates in continuous professional development events.

A. Teacher; participates in professional development events such as job shadowing, literature reviews, seminars, etc., that are aligned with curriculum, his/her professional development needs, or student needs and reflects/plans how to apply what he/she has learned to practice; sets professional development goals for him/herself; meets regularly with colleagues; establishes or becomes a member of a learning community at school.

B. Teacher; participates in professional development events such as job shadowing, literature reviews, seminars, etc., designed for curriculum, own professional development needs, or student needs, and reflects/plans how to apply what he/she has learned to practice; sets professional development goals.

C. Teacher participates in professional development events that are organized only at his/her school.

D. Teacher resists participating in professional development events or receiving feedback for continuous professional development.

5. 3. The teacher participates in professional development events to improve school.

-
- A. Teacher; voluntarily participates in school events providing support and contribution; takes initiative and encourages his/her colleagues in this respect; cooperates with his/her colleagues in mutual solidarity.
 - B. Teacher; voluntarily participates in school events; works with their colleagues in mutual cooperation; supports their colleagues when needed.
 - C. Teacher; participates in professional development events if obligatory; cooperate with colleagues when the school requires.
 - D. Teacher; avoids participating in school events; avoids sharing their expertise and abilities with the school.
- Teachers' relationships with colleagues are negative or distant.
-

5. 4. The teacher exhibits digital citizenship qualities.

- A. Teacher; knows and uses technology-enhanced instructional opportunities; takes a leadership role for students in accessing these resources; has a critical approach to online resources; is aware of the opportunities and risks of online resources; guides students in the safe, legal, and ethical use of interactive media; is a role model for colleagues in identifying, learning, assessing, explaining, and adapting new digital resources and tools that facilitate learning.
 - B. Teacher; knows and uses technology-enhanced instructional opportunities; provides leadership for students in accessing these resources; has a critical approach to online resources; is aware of the opportunities and risks of online resources; guides students in the safe, legal, and ethical use of interactive media.
 - C. Teacher's use of instructional opportunities supported by technology is minimal.
Teacher; provides students with minimal guidance in using these resources; doesn't demonstrate the opportunities or risks of online resources to students; doesn't have a critical approach for online resources.
 - D. Teacher; doesn't know instructional opportunities supported by technology; isn't aware of opportunities and risks of online resources; doesn't guide students in safe, legal and ethical use of interactive media.
-

6- Assessment and Evaluation

6. 1. The teacher uses various assessment tools congruent with the aim.

- A. Teacher; uses diagnostic, formative and summative assessment tools; uses mainstream and alternative assessment tools to evaluate the process and product; incorporates formal and informal assessment and continuously monitors students.
 - B. Teacher; uses diagnostic, formative and summative assessment tools; uses mainstream and alternative assessment tools to evaluate the process and product.
 - C. Assessment tools are for product evaluation. The teacher carries out an only a formal assessment.
 - D. Teacher carries out an only a formal assessment. The teacher's assessment approach is just grading.
-

6. 2. The teacher designs the instruction according to assessment results.

- A. Teacher; re-designs the activity plans by timely finding out the individual or common errors/mistakes based on the assessment results; writes reports on strengths and weaknesses of students; provides students with individualized learning experiences through interviews or written feedback.
 - B. Teacher; re-designs the activity plans by timely finding out the individual or common errors/mistakes based on the assessment results; gives individualized feedback along with general evaluation and feedback.
 - C. Instead of individualized evaluation, the teacher continuously performs general evaluations addressing the whole class.
 - D. Students are assessed just for grading purposes.
-

6. 3. The teacher designs assessment tools aligned with learning outcomes.

- A. Teacher's assessment-evaluation approach is objective and congruent with learning outcomes. Each question in the assessment tool is for a specific learning outcome.
 - B. Teacher's overall assessment-evaluation approach is aligned with learning outcomes. Some questions are assessed through subjective criteria.
 - C. Some assessment tools and questions are aligned with learning outcomes.
 - D. Minimal assessment tools and questions are aligned with learning outcomes.
-

6. 4. The teacher determines and shares the process evaluation criteria with students.

- A. The process evaluation elements are well-planned. Students have a right to say while structuring the assessment regarding assignments, project/group work and portfolios.

Teacher; demonstrates the assessment tools with specific examples; clearly explains the expectations and criteria to students.

B. Teacher; determines some assessment elements regarding assignments, project/group work and portfolios together with students; expresses the criteria to students clearly.

C. Teacher; decides on the assessment elements regarding assignments, project/group work and portfolios on his own; explains how student work will be evaluated through general expressions.

D. Only the teacher decides on the elements of process evaluation.

6.5. *The teacher incorporates self and peer evaluation techniques.*

A. Teacher; provides students with opportunities in which they can evaluate their own work; becomes a role model and encourages students in self/peer-evaluation, reflection and making individual development plans; guides students in this respect and puts in time.

B. Teacher; provides students with opportunities to evaluate their work; engages students in constructive peer-evaluation experiences and becomes a role model; informs students about self-evaluation.

C. Teacher; provides students with minimal information about self-evaluation; provides students with minimal opportunities to evaluate their work.

D. All assessment approach is teacher-centred.
