Evaluating Teacher Performance in Higher Education: Between Mentoring and Monitoring

Évaluation des Performances des Enseignants dans L'enseignement Supérieur: Entre Mentorat et Surveillance

Nassira Harizi*

University Mohamed Boudiaf, M'sila (Algeria)

nassira.harizi@univ-msila.dz

Abstract	Article info

Teachers' evaluation has emerged as one of the most debatable topics in research and in higher education institutions. Evaluators' roles range according to their hierarchy from mentors to monitors. This paper examines the two broad functions of evaluation, mentoring and monitoring, and their impact on teachers being the subject of evaluation. It also makes a clear distinction between evaluation criteria and procedures that are meant for mentoring and those oriented towards monitoring. A conceptual approach is employed to analyse systematically existing literature and to synthesise diverse perspectives in order to propose a coherent framework for teacher evaluation. The analysis suggests that evaluation is best grounded in a mentoring- based model that promotes professional growth. The study stresses the need for transparent evaluation by a committee that considers experts report, students' views and teacher's self- evaluation according to relevant criteria. The paper makes some practical suggestions to undertake evaluation adequately.

Résumé	Informations sur l'article

L'évaluation des enseignants est un sujet central et controversé dans la recherche et l'enseignement supérieur, où le rôle des évaluateurs oscille entre mentorat et contrôle. Cet article propose une analyse conceptuelle de la littérature existante afin de distinguer clairement les critères et procédures destinés à ces deux fonctions et d'examiner leur impact sur le corps professoral. L'analyse soutient que l'évaluation doit privilégier un modèle axé sur le mentorat pour promouvoir la croissance professionnelle. L'étude insiste sur la nécessité d'une évaluation transparente menée par un comité qui intègre les rapports d'experts, les avis des étudiants et l'auto-évaluation de l'enseignant, tout en offrant des suggestions pratiques pour garantir une mise en œuvre adéquate du processus.

1. Introduction

The usefulness and effectiveness of teacher's evaluation in promoting teaching and learning strategies and outcomes is well documented in literature and research. In all educational and academic contexts, the act of evaluating and rewarding teachers has been matched with teaching quality improvement. Within this perspective, two broad functions appeared as dominating trends in teacher's evaluation: Mentoring and monitoring. Therefore, the role of an evaluator ranges from mentor and supporter to monitor and supervisor according to thehierarchical structures, rules, and purposes of the institution in which evaluation takes place. Indeed, the two types are distinguished as the most debating ones.

The first type is evaluation for judging the quality of current performance for mentoring purposes, while the second one is controlling teaching practice for monitoring purposes. Indeed, the ongoing debate about teacher's evaluation generates further discrepancies among teachers, evaluators and researchers about evaluators' qualifications and roles, evaluation standards, and appropriate methods that embody those standards. Different views about these issues result in different potentially "successful evaluation" models that stress the need for meticulous monitoring and regular supervision of instructional inputs, processes and outputs.

Although teacher evaluation has been widely examined in the literature, limited attention has been paid to the conceptual tension between mentoring-oriented and monitoring-oriented evaluation in higher education contexts, particularly from a developmental perspective. Therefore, this paper seeks to bridge this gap by adapting a conceptual and analytical approach to examine the notion of teacher evaluation in relation to its two dimensions- mentoring and monitoring-, with particular focus on perspectives about evaluation methods, stakes, and measures. The aim is to develop a conceptual framework for a practical evaluation model thatcan ensure high-quality teaching and engageteachers in a meaningful experience for professional development. To fulfil this aim, the study addresses the following research questions:

- Who are qualified to evaluate teachers and on what basis?

- Should teacher evaluation in higher education be primarily mentoring-oriented or monitoring-oriented?

2. The need for evaluating teachers' performance in higher education

The importance and value of high quality learning and teaching arerecognised and acknowledged by all involved in higher education institutions. Teachers are one of the key elements in transferring knowledge and skills and raising educational standards. It is essential to know teachers' strengths and weaknesses in practice in order to enhance efficiency and work on deficiency in teaching for better outcomes. Evaluating teachers'

performance, therefore, is one of the main propellers in the drive to improve teaching quality. In fact, higher education policies and reforms increasingly focus on areas of teaching quality improvement and assurance to achieve academic excellence. Berk (2005, p. 48) explains that the evidence retrieved from teachers' evaluation is useful in making "formative decisions" on how to shape and improve our teaching quality. It can also be employed to make "summative decisions" about annual merit pay, promotion, and tenure.

Teacher's evaluation is broadly defined as the formal process of collecting evidence from relevant sources that inform on teacher performance and using this to provide feedback to teachers, guide their professional development and support improvements in practice (Sawchuk, 2015; Bichi, 2017). It creates tangible benefits for students, teachers and teaching quality ensuring that the outcomes of the teaching learning process are meaningful and sustainable. It is sometimes referred to as assessment, appraisal, mentoring or monitoring. Each of these terms implies different roles and criteria for evaluation.

Ideally, a meaningful teacher evaluation involves an accurate appraisal of the effectiveness of teaching, its strengths and areas for development, followed by feedback, coaching, support and opportunities for professional development (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 'OECD', 2009). The findings from the evaluation process are used to better understand and accurately diagnose problems in teachers' performance and students' outcomes. It can be half way to achieve teaching practice reinforcement and continuous professional improvement.

The principles underpinning the evaluation of teacher's performance differ from one context to another. Common criteria that constitute evaluation in higher education generally include teacher's self-evaluation, scientific publication, media and digital materials use, students' views, peer review, and direct managers' reports about instructors' attendance and cooperation. From this perspective, evaluation is characterized as a process of gathering data about teachers' practice from different sources.

Research findings suggest a number of quality stakes that characterize effective teaching and are worth for teacher's evaluation. James Ko and his colleagues (2016, p. 53) in their review about effective teaching argue that "there is a growing knowledge base from research evidence that can provide relevant guidance to promote effective practice and support improvement". Among the guidelines research provides are the ones recommended by Jacob et al. (2015). They stress the need to "encourage monitoring and observation using appropriate research-based protocols" (p. 52) in order to support the development of effective teaching.

University teachers, however, who indulge in research field and therefore are expected to play a crucial role in inspiring reflective and innovative learning and teaching, may negatively perceive this suggestion. Monitoring and observation can be considered inadequate if meant for interfering in teachers' decisions and prescribing norms of perfectness by evaluators who are not necessarily practitioners themselves. Another miss-conception is that teachers' evaluation entails controlling and judging their practice. Such

belief makes evaluation a matter of inspection and judgement and may encourage evaluators to act as having a legitimate power over teachers. This is likely to generate negative attitudes towards the process of evaluation and lead to reluctance on the part of teachers. It is rather a worthwhile constructive developmental exercise not to make definitive judgments or to cause tensions and pressure on instructors.

Hammond (2006) reveals that European universities experience in evaluation makes a significant improvement shifting from traditional criteria like performance indicators and questionnaires on students' opinions to teaching profiles, portfolios and peer evaluations. World- class universities rely on their faculty professional development centres that have already undergone the process for an array of evaluation programs, which are evidence based, to support learning, teaching and professional improvement (Jacob et al., 2015). This model of assessment has the potential to shape a culture of lifelong learning that supplies effective student learning, professional improvement and quality assurance.

3. Teacher's Evaluation: A Means for Reflection and Professional Improvement

One of the most beneficial aspects of teachers' evaluation is personal reflection. Teachers working at university particularly have to demonstrate a commitment to their own practice and improvement. They are the primary valid source to get data and insights about the teaching learning situation including classroom context, study program, students' progress, and teacher's performance. Self-evaluation and portfolios are one of the means teachers use to reflect on their teaching. They provide a chance for teachers to document their activities, monitor and adjust plans, and assess performance and professional growth.

The teacher as an evaluator for his own practice expands knowledge and skills about implementing and assessing instructional tools and strategies, and constructs new perspectives and finds out pragmatic solutions suitable to the instructional challenges and problems. By doing evaluation or being a subject for evaluation, the instructor continually reflects on his own teaching practice or on others experiences. Interestingly, the reflections instructors gain in practicing evaluation when teaching or observing colleagues' performance is feeding back into the teaching quality improvement and teacher's engagement.

Professional development in higher education often stems from an increased attention to quality insurance (Jacob etal., 2015), which is largely based on a sound objective evaluation of the learning teaching process. Hence, evaluation strengthens teacher's accountability and commitment to teaching improvement by taking part in professional development activities such as pedagogical meetings, workshops and conferences. Such activities assist teachers as well as evaluators in developing a kind of expertise in sustaining a purposeful positive learning and teaching environment that caters and meets quality teaching stakes and learners' diverse needs and expectations.

To ensure high quality teaching, teachers need to update and upgrade their knowledge and teaching skills through learning in authentic situations, having critical attitudes about

their own practice, and sharing information and experiences with colleagues. Worth noting, evaluators and teachers should work with a view to continuous support and improvement.

4.   Teachers' evaluation process

The process of teacher's evaluation deals with the components, features and procedures involved. A perennial debate in higher education involves questions about who are qualified to evaluate university teachers and according to which criteria. Improving the efficiency and equity of teaching depends, in large measure, on providing appropriate answers for these questions. Interestingly, evaluation at university aims at ensuring that teachers are highly skilled, well resourced, and motivated to perform at their best as the outcomes of their performance will lead to substantial gains in students learning (OECD, 2005; Kaneet al., 2011).

Students, instructors, heads of departments, and accreditation board are the most common figures to undertake the process of evaluation. Their roles as evaluators range according to their hierarchy from advisors and mentors to reviewers and monitors. Evaluators of teachers' performance may vary according to their educational status, administrative rank, and teaching perspective. The most common models of evaluation include self- evaluation, peer review by other colleagues, evaluation by principals' ratings and evaluation by students through questionnaires and online rating systems. That is, teachers, colleagues, administrators, and students participate actively and constructively in the evaluation of teacher's performance.

4.1 Evaluators and Evaluation methods

Evaluation is an opportunity for instructors to draw on multiple sources of feedback to assess their performance and receive developmental input. Feedback may come from the teacher himself, colleagues, and students and can be further used for reconstructive reflection and assessment, responsive pedagogy, and professional development. In fact, these sources of feedback inform evaluation methods. Among the methods discussed in literature, self-evaluation is widely used by teachers who have reflective and critical attitudes about their own practice.

The teacher may evaluate himself through different ways such as preparing a plan before the lecture and measuring his achievements accordingly by the end. The assignments teachers deliver to students are another strategy through which they get informed about learners' state of development and therefore elicit data about their teaching outcomes. Interaction of students with teachers and motivation to attend the session and participate in discussions are another source of feedback to be considered in teacher's self-evaluation meant for personal development.

Peer reviewing is another method of evaluation. Peer reviewers who are most of the time colleagues from the same department and field of speciality can assess the quality of their peers' performance. Given the fact that they are experienced practitioners, peer- evaluators

tend to work as mentors providing assistance for teachers to remove barriers and solve problems related to course design, technology integration, knowledge transfer, feedback quality, and assessment strategy. Furthermore, peer-evaluators are expected to help teachers reconstruct their teaching experience and improve practice. Berk (2005) recommends such type of evaluation for the sake of formative rather than summative decisions.

Similarly, teachers can be evaluated by their line managers or principals who act most of the time as monitors for hierarchy reasons. In evaluating teachers, they depend on subjective principal ratings, which are not based on classroom observation or tied to teaching performance as such (Jacob and Lefgren, 2005; Rockoff and Speroni, 2010). Principals judge a teacher's ability to improve student performance as measured by standardized test scores. In this system, principals maintain substantial informal power over teachers (Jacob and Lefgren, 2005).

It is clear that principal rating method is directed towards identifying teachers who produce the largest and smallest standardized achievement gains and making diagnosis and prediction about learners' results. Both aims, unfortunately, do not match with improving teaching in practice. In the same line, many researchers question the validity and accuracy of this measure in assessing teacher's performance and providing any feedback for progress as principal ratings may easily be biased and misused.

Students' views and perspectives about their teachers' performance, known in literature as "Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI)", are another form of evaluation widely adopted in university system. This kind of evaluation requires students to respond to standardised and anonymised questionnaires in which they evaluate their teachers' performance at the end of every semester course or/and at the end of the academic year. In many countries, developed as well as under-developed ones, instructor's evaluation is an online survey system on university portal where students grade professors according to a given scale on various categories such as availability, attitude, proficiency, knowledge, and supervision. Other forms of students' evaluation of lecturers include written comments that enable them account for the extent to which the teacher appears motivating, well prepared for the lesson, and shows respect and cooperation.

Having students evaluating their teachers seems quite helpful for teachers to understand the learning needs and attitudes of their students in order to improve the method they used to convey knowledge. Kane and Cantrell (2010) maintain that surveys based on students' rating are effective and exact tools to evaluate teachers' performance. Their responses can be valuable feedback about teaching. Students as evaluators are indeed activating their critical reflective thinking in transmitting into details how teachers act inside the classroom. However, some problems may be encountered in having students evaluate their teachers mainly about the following areas:

- Insurance of representative sample of students

- Usefulness of students' evaluations for teaching effectiveness

- Validity and relevance of questionnaire items

- Credibility and reliability of students' responses

- Students' ability to understand and judge teacher's knowledge and proficiency

Taking into account variables like students' honesty, maturity, attitude, attendance, and proficiency, it seems that evaluations done by students are relative, limited (Morales, 2022), and cannot be reliable most of the time (Berk, 2014; Benton and Ryalls, 2016). That is, many factors will affect their evaluation, especially the grades and assignments their teachers offer. Low achievers, for instance, who do not like doing assignment and care more about getting grades to pass with minimal efforts, will not care about the ability of teachers to make them acquire knowledge. Hence, their evaluation may not necessarily reflect teacher's performance.

Unfortunately, there is a fear that students will not honestly evaluate teachers because of test grades that may skew their opinions about their teachers. Thus, students who score well are likely to demonstrate positive attitude while those whose marks are low might give unfavourable evaluation for the instructor to echo a negative attitude. Some universities attempted to solve this problem of bias by affording graduates the opportunity to evaluate teachers believing they will be less- biased, but their evaluation is not informative since they are not representative sample in terms of number and level.

Berk (2005, 2014) goes further and argues that students are not qualified enough to evaluate their teachers on traits and skills that are above their current level of understanding like teacher's field knowledge, proficiency, and course plan and content, and teaching method. For these reasons and others researchers never recommend (SRI) to be used as the sole tool for evaluating teaching performance (Berk, 2005; Berk, 2014; Benton and Ryalls, 2016; Mare, 2021; Morales, 2022). Instead, they recommend to be combined with other evaluation methods.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria and Measures

Evaluation policy in higher education uses multiple approaches and measures involving multiple sources of data to get insights about the strengths of teachers and those aspects of their practice which need further to be developed. Evaluators usually consider teacher's roles and activities inside and outside the classroom. For example, they check teacher's skills in designing instructional activities and course materials, and their ability to stimulate students' interest and communicate clearly with them. For such task the best procedures would be structured classroom observation (Pam et al., 2010; Kane et al., 2011) and teacher's self -evaluation report. Other measures include teacher's supervision and mentoring skills and research publications per year. However, it is not clear how would evaluation account for teacher's performance and instructional efforts that are done outside the classroom such as interactions with students via emails and social media study groups, and provision of references for students in need.

Teachers' evaluation system also depends on statistic data from assessment results of students' performance such as pass rates, dropouts and principal ratings. In many universities including world-class ones, evaluators depend on students' achievements and learning outcomes as parameters for teacher's evaluation (Kaneet al., 2011). Student-test-score-based measures as "value-added" measure are considered as the most direct and objective evidence of teacher's effectiveness (Jacob and Lefgren, 2005; Pam et al., 2010; Mare, 2021). It is based on students' achievement gains. Thisimplies that the teacher is exclusively responsible for students' learning, disregarding their individual differences, efforts, and previous learning experiences.

Evaluating teachers' performance on the basis of their learners' outcomes is like assessing teachers according to the grades they give when assessing students. In other word, if students' scores are low the teacher is poorly evaluated regardless to his teaching performance. As a result, teachers' evaluation becomes just the washback effect of the tests they give to students. This seems inappropriate simply because teachers assume responsibility for their teaching and not for whether learners are seriously learning and preparing for their tests. In line with this view, Glazerman et al. (2010) question the feasibility and objectivity of the measure and count for the controversy this type of measures can create in research as well as in politics.

Indeed, linking teachers' evaluation to students' achievements as examination scores seems invalid given that students' performance and results in tests are related to other factors like learning intake, readiness, psychological status, questions level of complexity, and assessment criteria. On the contrary, Jacob and Lefgren (2005) find out that both systems, value-added rating and subjective principal-based assessment are effective in predicting students' future achievement and "identifying the best and worst teachers" according to students' achievement scores. However, they encourage the use of approaches that go beyond students' results and account for teacher's ability to help learners improve in future.

4.3 Understanding Teachers as Subjects for Evaluation

Nowadays, with the new trend of students' centred learning, teachers are no more the dominating power or the centre of learning in the classroom. Instead, their role appeared to be facilitators and motivating agents for students. We need to understand that evaluating the performance of teachers is as important as assessing the students. Evaluation appeared as a necessary routine in the context of university to improve teaching performance and quality. It is vital for both teachers and their students. In most cases, holding a PhD degree is not a parameter to ensure that teachers' performance does not need mentoring because it is the ultimate required standard that other teachers should appreciate. However, evaluationdoes have "washback effect" on teachers just as tests have on students. Gómez, et al. (2025) carried out a comparative study in two public universities in Portugal and Spain using 28 semi-structured interviews to investigate teachers' perceptions about their evaluation model and policy. They found out that teachers perceived it as 'an external imposition' that affects their identity as university educators and their professional development (Gómezet al., 2025)

Evaluation can positively affect teacher's competence, attitude and performance if it is undertaken far from narrow subjective considerations and negative judgement (Jacob and Lefgren, 2005). Within this climate, teachers are motivated to be self-reflective and co-operative. Evaluation then can increase teacher's positive attitudes towards the process and integrity by encouraging ongoing individual and collective reflection. In addition, the opportunities the evaluation process creates for conversation and negotiation among teachers, evaluators, and administrators are believed to foster teacher's professional traits and interpersonal skills.

Evaluation, however, may have a negative impact on teachers if not done appropriately. Indeed, being the subject of evaluation may generate anxiety among teachers who have the impression that others do not trust their ability to convey the required knowledge and skills needed for teaching. To be under evaluation is frustrating by nature causing embarrassment to the teacher regardless to his professional teaching capacities. When diligent teacher's efforts are judged by students, administrators or evaluators who know little about the day to day hard teaching activity, the situation is really threatening.

Unfortunately, instead of receiving constructive feedback and assistance, teachers who demonstrate unsatisfactory performance in some evaluation criteria like attendance and supervision are threatened by salary and performance bonus discount. In fact, being aware of what teaching mission implies and updating one's knowledge and proficiency help teachers build positive attitudes towards their evaluation looking for improvement directions for them and their students.

The relationship between evaluators and teachers as subjects for evaluation is hierarchical. Accordingly, teachers understand classroom realities and needs, transfer knowledge, assess students' performance and constructively collaborate with other teachers who are responsible for assuring teaching quality to foster more creative, high-quality instruction. It is essential to understand evaluation within the mentorship frame of having both teachers and mentors reporting teaching performance limitations, giving suggestions for constructive feedback and improvement. Moreover, they can request university managers to guarantee equal opportunities for all teachers to be evaluators in order to exchange professional experiences. Similarly, exchanging information and sharing teaching experiences through academic training, workshops and conferences with teachers from other universities at national and international levels is quite helpful for teaching quality improvement.

5. Teacher's Evaluation: Mentoring vs. Monitoring

Ideally, teacher's evaluation aims at diagnosing teaching performance difficulties and strengths to provide assistance for teachers in their professional pedagogical improvement. This target is shared by the two main types of teacher's evaluation: Mentoring and monitoring. Mentoring as a system of evaluation encourages accountability for learner progress and can offer opportunities for teachers to maintain strong relationships and reformulate and enrich their teaching experience (Schwille, 2008). Usually, the term

"mentoring" is associated with coaching and training pre-service and junior new teachers (Liu, 2014).

In this paper, mentoring means providing assistance and evaluative feedback by experienced and qualified practitioners on teacher's performance. In ideal situations like world-class universities, mentors must undertake an approved mentorship preparation programme organized by the academic institution where they work before evaluating other teachers. They are supposed to be familiar with the teaching learning situation including the syllabus, input, objectives, classroom assessment as well as evaluation aims and principles. Mentors usually are those teachers who have a large experience in teaching, who employ an advanced range of strategies and methods, and most importantly, they are ready to provide assistance to colleagues (Koki, 1997).

Research indicates that teachers may feel more comfortable with evaluation that depends on mentoring partnerships where mentors (evaluators) and mentees (teachers) interactively demonstrate a number of specific skills and relations that contribute to the teaching quality improvement in free-stress working environment. Mentoring- based evaluation is non-judgmental by nature targeting teaching practice improvement as such (Koki, 1997; Schwille, 2008) depending on strategies like teacher's self- evaluation reports, teaching practice portfolios, peer rating, and evaluators' conferences with the teacher.

The activity can be a team- work to balance views, infer accurate information about teacher's practice, and create opportunities for sharing and cooperation. Mentors' role, however, is to assist teachers and use manageable flexible procedures to evaluate their performance in order to identify professional development needs, and provide formative feedback for future improvement. Furthermore, some would expect mentors to behave as models of professional behaviour for other teachers (Liu, 2014).

The second type of evaluation is monitoring-oriented. It entails implementing a number of tools to collect data about teacher's performance. The most common ones as listed by OECD (2009, p. 29) include:

• Classroom observations made by managers, other teachers or external evaluators.

• Value-added models that try to measure learning gains in student achievement.

• Student evaluations and ratings of their teachers.

• Judgement made by the teacher's line manager or principal

• Teacher self-evaluation

Some university teachers may perceive this kind of evaluation as a different model of inspection that belongs to middle and secondary schools' educational system. Monitoring heavily relies on observation procedures to make definite judgement about teacher's performance and competency (Jacob et al., 2015). Individualized, specific information about one's performance seems especially scarce in the teaching profession (Weisberg et al., 2009). Teacher performance evaluation models that are monitoring- based seem to create tensions

as evidenced in the studies conducted by Mare (2021) and Gómez et al. (2025). It is no wonder then that such procedure leads to stressful experiences where teachers feel frustrated, inhibited, and in need to adjust and frame their performance into a particular model of "good teacher".

It is clear that mentoring tends to give teachers precious opportunities to build professional relations, share experiences and construct their own learning experiences through cooperation and negotiation with the teachers. Within this frame, evaluators can function as facilitators and co-constructors of pedagogical knowledge (Morales, 2022). Monitoring, however, makes teacher's performance more susceptible to evaluation procedures. Monitors, who are conceptualized as prescribing rules of perfect performance, can unintentionally create a climate of frustration and resistance among teachers. Nevertheless, Effective evaluation whether mentoring or monitoring-oriented has to encompass the principal features and strategies of effective evaluation as illustrated in the figure below. The process would first familiarize teachers as evaluators or subjects for evaluation with what is expected of them for purposes of assessment or knowledge transfer and delivery. After collecting relevant information from valid sources, evaluators will identify strengths and weaknesses in teaching practice with the potential to make practical suggestions for performance improvement.

6. Suggestions and recommendations

Drawing from the conceptual analysis developed in this paper, the following suggestions are made to guide policy makers, faculty members and academic staff responsible for quality assurance in higher education to design efficient evaluation models that serve teaching and learning sustainable development. This paper suggests thatto ensure transparency and objectivity in teacher's evaluation process, the selection of the academic committee in charge of the task whether teachers, students, administrators, or evaluators from inside or outside the university in question should be subjected to adequate and rigorous moral, psychological, scientific and professional criteria. That is, evaluators themselves should be first evaluated on these criteria to guarantee transparency and effectiveness. Most importantly, experts in higher education quality stakes, evaluators and teachers should work within their context to provide a framework for teacherevaluation. The team efforts should focus on designing a clear conventional analytic rubric and setting practical evaluation procedures that use appropriate mechanisms to respond to the target need of improving effective teaching performance.

The study recommends that teacher evaluation at university should bementoring- oriented and carried out in more collaborative and less threatening environment. In this respect, it is suggested that a committee of qualified teachers in charge of teaching improvement can make use of an online system that considers teacher's self- evaluation, mentors' reports, and students' surveys. This board of mentors should use valid and reliable assessment rubric articulating professional standards like teacher's knowledge, attitude, materials, performance, availability, and scientific research contribution. The evaluation grid, however,

should be developed in consultation with a range of practitioners and faculty who are staff already familiar with the local teaching learning situation and the academic quality requirements.

Higher education policy makers, university managers and evaluators have to understand that all teachers need, as subjects for evaluation, is a meaningful professional and objective feedback in a non-threatening environment. The desired evaluation would offer the following:

- Accurate fair appraisal of the effectiveness of teacher's performance
- Beneficial and constructive feedback for unsatisfactory performance
- Reward and motivation to the work of good teachers.
- Opportunities for negotiation and cooperation between teachers and evaluators

Researchers maintain that the well-designed and targeted evaluation system is not limited to the excellence qualities of teaching performance, learning outcome and scientific achievement. It rather exceeds to create a culture in which quality teaching is greatly valued and evaluation is meant for teacher's progress and performance improvement.

7. Conclusion

This paper examines teachers' evaluation in higher education in terms of need, role, methods, and criteria. It discusses the notion of evaluation and its two main purposes: As a means for mentoring and monitoring. Evaluation is an invaluable tool for professional improvement, from which instructors can identify the strategies and skills required for them and their students to reach the targeted goals and standards. As for the first research question regarding who is supposed to evaluate teachers and on what basis, the study stresses that the evaluation of teachers' performancecannot be isolated from the social-cultural context of university where evaluators can be perceived as mentors or monitors. If evaluators are not practitioners they are likely to be perceived as outsiders and administrators who need first develop a kind of familiarity with the teaching principles, process and focus. Therefore, we suggest a board of mentors that considers teacher's self-evaluation, students' surveys, and mentors' report based of clear relevant criteria for teaching excellence at higher education.

Concerning the second research question about whether teacher evaluation should be mentoring-oriented or monitoring- oriented, the current study indicates that evaluators are neither monitors nor supervisors since those they evaluate are neither company employees nor students or pre-service teachers. Instead, they are required to be practically involved in teaching at university, to have some expertise in the subject field, and to be qualified in problem solving, negotiating and teaching methods. The evaluators' role indeed needs not to be changed or reduced but rather rethought and redefined as a mentor, facilitator and co-operator.

Teachers, in their turn, do not need prescribed frame to learn how to teach just as they do not need a typical model of how to be "good teachers" in order to reconstruct themselves

accordingly. However, teachers cannot operate solely and consider themselves as being the sole power source at university. To avoid tensions, both teachers and mentors should work in a joint activity to establish academic excellence qualities and stakes, provide necessary resources and tools, and make the required remedies and improvements for an effective teaching.

While the present study is not based on empirical evidence, it provides a theoretical synthesis and a structured basis for policy makers and evaluation committees to develop efficient models for teacher evaluation. In addition, it offers a conceptual foundation for understanding who is supposed to evaluate university teachers and on what basis. However, further research is needed to test the suggested evaluation criteria and to examine how mentoring-based evaluation models can be implemented in universities and how they affect teachers' performance and professional development. Such empirical studies can validate the conceptual work of this paper and lend support to the accumulated efforts to develop an efficient evaluation system in higher education.

References

Benton, S. L., & Ryalls, K. R. (2016). *Challenging Misconceptions About Student Ratings of Instruction. IDEA Paper #58.* Manhattan, KS: The IDEA Center. Retrieved from: https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/PaperIDEA_58.pdf

Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), pp. 48-62.

Berk, R.A. (2014). Should student outcomes be used to evaluate teaching? *Journal of Faculty Development*, 28 (2),pp. 87-96

Bichi, A. A. (2017). Evaluation of Teacher Performance in Schools: Implication for Sustainable Development Goals.*Northwest Journal of Educational Studies.* Vol. 2 (1), pp. 103-113.

Hammond, L. D. (2006). Assessing Teacher Education: The Usefulness of Multiple Measures for Assessing Program Outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education*; 57 (2), pp. 120–138.DOI: 10.1177/0022487105283796

Glazerman, S., Loeb, S., Goldhaber, D., Staiger, D., Raudenbush, S. and Whitehurst, G. (2010). *Evaluating Teachers: The Important Role of Value-Added*. Washington, DC.: Brookings Institution. Retrieved from: http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2010/1117_evaluating_teachers.aspx

Gómez Sánchez , T. F., Moreira, M. A. and RumboArcas, B. (2025). Contradictions and Challenges: University Teachers' Views on Performance Evaluation Models in Portugal and Spain. *Centre of Education Policy Studies Journal.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1785

Jacob, B.A., & Lefgren, L. (2005). Principals as agents: Subjective performance measurement in education. Working Paper #11463. *National Bureau of Economic Research*. https://www.nber.org/papers/w11463

Jacob, w. J., Xiong, W. and Ye, H. (2015). Professional Development Programmes at World-Class Universities. *Palgrave Communications:* pp.1-27DOI: 10.1057/palcomms.2015.2

Kane, T. J. and Cantrell, S. (2010). *Learning about Teaching: Initial Findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching Project*. MET Project Research Paper. Seattle, WA: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Preliminary_Findings-Research_Paper.pdf

Kane, T. J., S. Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H. and Wooten, A. L. (2011). Identifying Effective Classroom Practice Using Student Achievement Data. *Journal of Human Resources* 43 (3), pp. 587-613.

Ko, J., Sammons, P. and Bakkum, L. (2016). *Effective Teaching*. Education Development Trust.

Koki, S. (1997). The Role of Teacher Mentoring in Educational Reform. PREL Briefing Paper, *Pacific Resources for Education and Learning*, pp 1-6, Retrieved from https://www.nmu.edu/Webb/ArchivedHTML/UPCED/mentoring/docs/Role- mentor.pdf

Liu, S. H. (2014). Excellent Mentor Teachers' Skills in Mentoring for Pre-Service Teachers. *International Journal of Education*. Vol. 6 (3), pp. 29-42. DOI: 10.5296/ije.v6i3.5855

Mare, A. Z. (2021). Evaluating the performance of teaching staff members, a step towards teaching performance development of higher education in Sebha University. *Sebha University Journal of Pure & Applied Sciences*. Vol. 20 (3), pp. 21-26. DOI: 10.51984/jopas.v20i3.1080

Morales, J. 2022. The Evaluation of Teacher Performance in Higher Education. *International Journal of Science and Society*. Vol. 4(3), pp. 140-150 https://doi.org/10.54783/ijsoc.v4i3.507

OECD (2005), *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. OECD, Paris

OECD (2009), *OECD review on evaluation and assessment for improving school outcomes: design and implementation plan for the review*. OECD, Paris [OLIS Document EDU/EDPC (2009)3/REV1].

Pam, G., Loeb, S., Cohen, J., Hammerness, K., Wyckoff, J., Boyd, D. and Lankford, H. (2010). "Measure for Measure: The Relationships between Measures of Instructional Practice in Middle School English Language Arts and Teachers' Value-Added Scores." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper.

Rockoff, J. E., and Speroni, C. (2010). Subjective and Objective Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness. *American Economic Review* Vol. 100 (2), pp. 261-266.

Sawchuk, S. (2015). Issues A-Z: Teacher Evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-overview.html/

Schwille, S.A. (2008). The professional practice of mentoring. *American Journal of Educatio.,* Vol.115(1), pp. 139–167. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/590678

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J. and Keeling, D. (2009). *The Widget Effect: Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Teacher Effectiveness.* New York City: The New Teacher Project.