A Study on Korea's Evaluation of Teacher-ability-Development Based on CIPP Model and Policy

Seung-hwan Jang¹, Min-chul Yang²

¹ Professor, Chamirisa Liberal Arts College, Duksung Women's University, Korea,
jangh@duksung.ac.kr

² Teacher, Seoul Technical Highschool, Korea, degoa@snu.ac.kr

Corresponding author: Min-chul Yang

Abstract: It has been 10 years since Korea's teacher-ability-development evaluation, which aims to cultivate the expertise of teachers, was fully implemented in 2010, following the test operation in 2005. However, the evaluation on teacher development has caused a lot of controversy since its introduction. The purpose of this research is to provide meaningful information for decision making by studying the teacher-ability-development evaluation system. To this end, the CIPP model was applied to each stage of the policy process and conducted an analysis. First, the evaluation elements were derived for each CIPP phase and determined that they are closely related to the phase of the policy process. Then, the policy process of the teacher-ability-development evaluation system in stages was analyzed (policy formation, policy decision, policy execution, policy evaluation), and conducted context, input, process, and product, respectively, to examine major issues and problems. Ten years have passed since Korea's full implementation declaration of its teacher-ability-development evaluation on March 2010. This study is significant for it aims to determine how the teacher-ability-development evaluation system changed ten years after its implementation. The objective of this research is to evaluate teacher competency development evaluation systems using CIPP models and clarify development measures for the systems to provide practical implications.

Keywords: Teacher-ability-development Evaluation, Korea's Evaluation of Teacher, CIPP Model, Policy

1. Introduction

Ten years have passed since Korea's full implementation declaration of its teacher-ability-development evaluation, in March 2010. In the early stages of implementation, there were many arguments and objections from interest groups, but now it seems to be operating without any major problems. The purpose of this study is to investigate on the teacher-ability-development evaluation system using the CIPP model and to clarify the development measures of the system.

Research on the development of teachers' abilities included a comprehensive study of the results of the pilot operation[1-2] and a study on the policy-making situation or process of teacher evaluation[3][4]. In addition, in 2010, the teacher-ability-development evaluation system was evaluated using CIPP models. Accordingly, the teacher-ability-development evaluation system was systematically analyzed and information on how to improve the system was provided. The significance of research is to determine how the teacher-ability-development evaluation system changed in 2020, 10 years later.

Received: February 23, 2021; 1st Review Result: April 08, 2021; 2nd Review Result: May 27, 2021
Accepted: June 30, 2021

The purpose of this research is to study the teacher-ability-development evaluation system using the CIPP model and to clarify the development measures of the system. First, the relationship between the policy-process stage and the CIPP model is examined. Second, the evaluation of teacher development is analyzed according to the stage of the policy course. Third, the teacher-development evaluation system is evaluated by applying a CIPP model according to the policy process

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Teacher-ability-development Evaluation System

2.1.1 Sub Section 1 Outline of the Teacher-ability-development Evaluation System

The teacher-ability-development evaluation is a system that aims to improve public-education satisfaction and the quality of school education by diagnosing teachers' expertise in educational activities and supporting the development of skills based on the results of the improvement. "Ministers of Education and Superintendent of Education shall clearly assess teachers' abilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Law in order to select trainees under Articles 37 to 42 of the Act," said Article 18(1) of the Regulations on Teachers' Training. The teacher-ability-development evaluation will be conducted by fellow teachers, students, and parents in the areas of life guidance, collective intelligence, and learning guidance. Such a teacher-ability-development evaluation has a different direction from that of the teacher performance evaluation, which is reflected in personnel and individual performance pay.

The main characteristics of the teacher-ability-development evaluation are as follows[5]. First, the purpose of evaluation is to improve teachers' abilities through feedback on their professional activities. Second, teachers, vice principals, and principals will all be evaluated to improve their respective abilities to teach and to manage schools. Third, principals, vice principals, teachers, parents, and students participate in the evaluation through the creation of questionnaires on checklists and survey forms composed of free description expressions. Fourth, for the management of various tasks, a teacher-evaluation-management committee is established at a unit school, a principal and a head teacher-evaluation-management committee are established at the municipal and provincial education offices, and an evaluation manager is established at the officials. Fifth, in order to ensure the anonymity of the evaluator with respect to the survey results, the evaluator will provide individualized summary data, reflecting on areas of lack of expertise and using them as materials for improvement.

2.1.2 Process and Main Content of the Teacher-ability-development Evaluation System

It was the 1995 Education Reform Committee's "Education Reform Plan for the Establishment of a New Education System" that officially proposed the teacher-ability-development evaluation. Korea's Education, Science, and Technology Ministry announced in November 2005 that it would select and operate 48 teacher evaluation schools for the 1998 "Education Vision 2002" and 1999 "Five-Year Plan for Education Development" and 2001 "Comprehensive Plan for Teaching Development." In addition, in October 2006, the name of the teacher-evaluation system was changed to the teacher-ability-development evaluation system, and in March 2009, the number of model schools was expanded by 30% nationwide. In 2012, the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology expanded the area of self-reliance to avoid confusion in conducting teacher-ability-development evaluation. Subsequently, the Instruction on the Implementation of the Teacher Development Assessment was enacted in 2016 and revised in 2016. The improved teacher-ability-development evaluation system is currently in effect.

2.2 CIPP Model

2.2.1 System Features

CIPP evaluation models are models designed by Stufflebeam[6] that correspond to decision models in the curriculum-evaluation models. This model defines educational evaluations as providing useful information for educational decision makers to make accurate decisions. The CIPP evaluation model consists of four areas of evaluation: context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation, each of which is conducted in a series of steps. This model implicitly shows that planning and execution of the program is a continuous activity, so the situation, input, process, and calculation evaluation progresses cyclically, and the calculation evaluation is re-entered as an object of the situation[7]. When the CIPP evaluation model is divided into four areas, first, context evaluation is the most basic evaluation stage performed to provide evidence for program objectives. Assessment of appropriate environment and desired conditions, potential requirements and opportunities, problems and obstacle factors, etc.[8]. Context evaluation identifies development areas required by consumers and removes them from educational programs. Secondly, input evaluation is an evaluation of what materials and strategies should be used to achieve the desired goals through the program. Details such as when and when educational materials should be utilized, when the program location and time are most appropriate, and sufficient materials and examples should be used for education. In the input evaluation, specific analysis of input factors and strategies can be suggested[9]. The reason for the input evaluation is to help review alternative strategies to meet the needs of evaluators, calculate a plan that can be implemented, and obtain an appropriate budget. Thirdly, the process evaluation is to provide the information necessary to modify, supplement, and improve the way a program is implemented. If there are any problems, the process searches for a solution. The evaluation method focuses mainly on understanding the program improvement procedures through interviews and observations[8] and focuses on program design and procedure improvement in order to effectively control the implementation process by using methods such as contact with program operators[10]. Process evaluation plays an important role in interpreting situational assessment and input evaluation by describing problems applied by comparing action plans and practices and evaluating how well the problems have been solved. The final stage, namely product evaluation, is an evaluation that measures and analyzes the calculation and acquisition results in the middle of the program end stage and implementation. This is the stage in which calculated information is related to the target, situation, input, and process, and the number and quality of the results calculated when the program is operated according to the target is checked, and information necessary to finally judge the effectiveness of the program is provided. A methodology that compares the measurement results with predetermined criteria or compliance and analyzes the results in relation to context-input-process information is used. Product evaluation is a cyclical stage of decision making that compares the actual results with the expected results to determine whether the program should continue to perform in its current state, be modified, or be abolished.

2.2.2 Contents

Using the CIPP evaluation model, one can ask questions and set criteria for evaluation at each stage[11]. That is, considering all aspects of context, input, process, and product, one can apply it to the program and evaluate it from a decision-making perspective. Unlike other evaluation models, the CIPP evaluation model can select a wide range of subjects, understand the direct or indirect impact on the program, and coordinate decision making and evaluation effectively[12]. The CIPP evaluation model improves the program provided to the user through these evaluation stages and formats and attempts to effectively use the human and physical resources, time, and technology intended for the program

operation. In order to correctly apply these evaluation models, four basic principles that must be preceded together are highlighted as follows[13]. First, the CIPP evaluation model emphasizes the principle of fairness. In other words, all program members were included in the evaluation, and key persons who took into account the internal and external components of the program were to be considered as evaluation factors. Secondly, the CIPP evaluation model is improvement oriented. I would like to understand the potential for program improvement and determine if there is a possibility for improvement. Third, we aim for objective epistemology. Objective epistemology can be justified from various data to present conclusions that can give credibility to all evaluators. Fourth, the CIPP evaluation model requires the evaluator to perform a constructive and comprehensive meta-evaluation that matches the professional criteria of the evaluation. To improve the reliability and validity of the evaluation by professionally re-evaluating the evaluation scale to determine whether the key compliance contained in the CIPP evaluation model is useful, practicable, and accurate, the evaluation is aimed at external components. Overall, the CIPP evaluation model is a decision-making model consisting of specific evaluation content and questions depending on the context, input, process, and product stage. It can be defined as an objective, comprehensive, and valid model depending on the cyclical structure of various evaluators and four areas.

3. Relationship Between Policy Processes And CIPP Models

3.1 Policy Process

Policy processes are generally divided into policy issue adoption, decision-making, policy implementation, policy evaluation, and policy termination, but there are some differences among scholars[14]. Each prior study defined various stages of policy process; if combined, these stages could be divided into policy formation, policy decision, policy execution, and policy-evaluation stages.

The first stage is the policy formation. The term "agenda" is also used to describe the steps of the policy formation. These agendas can be viewed as the educational agendas or educational-policy-formation stages for evaluating teacher development. Therefore, the educational-policy-formation stage refers to the process or action of the government to adopt as a policy issue a variety of issues that arise outside the school education and the school education sphere[14][15]. The second is the policy decision. Education-policy decision can be defined as the process by the government or public organizations to develop, deliberate, and decide on basic educational policies[14] after gathering information and finding alternatives[16]. The third stage is the policy execution. Scholars discuss policy execution as follows. Pressman and Wildvsky[17] define policies as that which must be executed, achieved, fulfilled, produced, and completed. VanMeter and Van Horn[18] describe the activities carried out by individuals and groups in the government and private sector to achieve policymaking goals. Rein and Rabinovitz[19] maintain that the government preferences considered by many administrators create a cyclical process centered on mutual power relationships and collaboration. Overall, policy execution is the activity of administrators who create a cycle between power relationships and cooperation to express their government's preference to achieve the goals set in policymaking. The fourth stage is policy evaluation, which can be defined as an activity to determine how much the government or a public organization is doing or has achieved in view of the purpose of pre-set policies or projects[14].

3.1 Assessment Elements Based on the CIPP Model

The evaluation items for each phase of the CIPP model are summarized below, and the contents of the CIPP model shown in the research by Lee Jun-hee et al.[20] are summarized.

[Table 1] Evaluation Items in the CIPP Model

Evaluation type	Evaluation item
Context evaluation	Analysis of Evaluator's Needs
	Analyze issues that need to be addressed to meet the assessed needs
	Analysis of opportunities such as property and funds to meet needs
	Assess objectives and priorities based on needs
Input evaluation	Operational strategy evaluation (response to needs, feasibility)
	Assessment of alternative safety strategies (evaluation of advantages through comparison of alternative safety strategies)
	Procedures, budgets, time plans, etc.
Process evaluation	The degree of implementation of a plan (change of plans, deleted details, poor execution, etc.)
	Identifying or predicting interference with running a program
	Modified in the program
	Program Execution Costs
Product evaluation	Intended and unintended effects
	Positive and Negative Effects
	Sustainability and generalizability

3.3 Relationship between CIPP Model and Policy

What is the connection between the policy process and each stage of the CIPP model? The above presentation and policy-process definition are used to confirm if they are relevant to each step of the CIPP model. First, the stage of policy formation is the process and action of adopting a policy. Such a process requires that policymakers understand the needs of the policymakers, analyze the problem, examine the resources to solve the problem, and evaluate priorities based on this analysis. Therefore, it is thought that the context evaluation corresponds to the policy-formation stage. Secondly, the stage of policy decision is the process of developing and determining basic policies. The basic policy can be considered a strategy, but it can be said that it is the stage of evaluating such a strategy and drawing up a budget and time plan so that it can be operated. Therefore, it is thought that input evaluation corresponds to the policy-decision stage. Third, policy execution is an activity carried out by administrators to achieve their goals. The execution stage corresponds to the process. There should have been content related to obstructions, changes, costs, etc., during policy implementation, and these factors correspond to process evaluation. Therefore, it can be seen that the process evaluation corresponds to the policy-execution stage. Fourth, policy evaluation is an activity that determines the degree of achievement of a set objective. The degree of achievement can be said to be the degree of effectiveness of policies. Therefore, it is thought that the product evaluation for evaluating the effect corresponds to the policy evaluation. The above contents are summarized as shown in [Fig.1].

[Fig. 1] Relationship between Policy Process and CIPP Process

The abovementioned presentation and policy-process definition are used to confirm if they are relevant to each step of the CIPP model.

4. Evaluation of The Teacher-Ability-Evaluation Based on The CIPP Model

4.1 System Policy Formation and Context Evaluation

4.1.1 Policy-formation Stage

The policy-formation stage refers to the stage until it is set on the policy agenda on a variety of topics. It is appropriate to consider the period starting in 1995, which was the first official proposal for the formation of an agenda, until the trial implementation in 2005, as a stage of policy formation. During this time, the government's plan was announced, and there was a heated debate involving interest groups.

In 1995, the presidential advisory education reform committee proposed that the government give preferential treatment to talented teachers as well as comprehensive evaluation of teachers[9]. Under the Kim Dae Jung administration, the Presidential Advisory and Human Resources Policy Committee presented measures to improve the teacher promotion and evaluation system in 1998, 1999, and 2001, in a five-year plan for education development[9]. In March 2000, the Ministry of Education considered how to organize and operate a teacher evaluation committee for each school, but this measure was suspended due to opposition from the teachers' association[20]. In February 2003, the participatory government presented the "enhancement of teacher expertise and improvement of promotion system" and "development of teacher expertise" and "ability-centered promotion system" to treat teacher evaluation as a public agenda[20]. In February 2004, Deputy Prime Minister of Education Ahn Byung-young announced the introduction of the teacher-evaluation system, and controversies began[20].

4.1.2 Context Evaluation

Context evaluation consists of an analysis of the needs of evaluators, an analysis of problems to be solved, and an analysis of opportunities such as property and funds. The purpose of this assessment is to analyze these issues and evaluate how the objectives were established by reflecting the requirements.

First of all, evaluators in the analysis of the needs of evaluators will be associated with this policy. They can be divided into parent groups, government groups, and teacher groups. The parent group insisted that students and parents must participate in the evaluation in order to improve teachers' expertise and expel teachers who are not qualified[20]. The government emphasized that education should play a key role in improving national competitiveness, and teachers should play such a role, which has a great influence on teachers' expertise. It was also required that such professionalism be improved in a competitive environment. Teachers are maintaining their basic demands that they should pursue the development of their expertise while guaranteeing their autonomy, considering the special characteristics of teachers[3]. Although I agree with the demand to increase the expertise of teachers, I am opposed to the teacher evaluation because it cannot meet the basic requirements for evaluation due to the peculiarity of teachers. Based on this requirement analysis, we analyzed the extent to which the requirements are reflected in the purpose of the teacher-ability-development evaluation. The Ministry of Education said that since the full introduction of the teacher evaluation in 2010, the evaluation was conducted for the purpose of developing teachers' expertise. Also "Teachers' teaching and student guidance capabilities" is considered to have established a reasonable purpose in consideration of the requirements of parents' organizations and the government of "improvement of professionalism" of teachers. However, it turns out that the requirements of "eliminating qualified teachers" and "creating a competitive environment" are not reflected in the purpose of the evaluation. Secondly, a problem is an obstacle to be solved when meeting a demand. Evaluation is basically acceptable only when fairness is

guaranteed. However, there are difficulties due to the peculiarity of teaching. First of all, teaching is an educational profession, but there are limits to accurately evaluating educational achievements. Also, the structure of the school organization is a loose competitive structure, so there is a limit to creating a competitive environment. Such limitations act as a hindrance to teachers' evaluation. Also, the influence of a strong teachers' association can be seen as a problem that made it difficult to proceed with the evaluation of teachers. Third, opportunities are specifications and support to realize needs. Symptoms such as rapid social change, economic stagnation, COVID-19, job insecurity, and job decline are serving as opportunity factors to realize the evaluation of teacher development. In addition, according to survey results, 83% of the public support the teacher-development evaluation system.

4.2 Policy-decision and Input Evaluation

4.2.1 Policy-decision Stage

In this study, the policy-decision stage is the process of the teacher-evaluation system's being set on the policy agenda and the government's and other concerned parties' formulating policies and implementing them nationwide. Therefore, the policy-decision stage took place from February 17, 2004, which was set as the policy agenda, until March 2010, when the nationwide enforcement started. In November 2005, 48 elementary, middle, and high schools selected by each city and province were tested with models made by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology to improve teachers' expertise. The teacher-ability-development evaluation system was operated on a trial basis at 67 schools in 2006, 506 schools in 2007, and 669 schools in 2008. The system was expanded to 3,160 elementary, middle, and high schools nationwide in 2009. Teacher-ability-development evaluation is based on Presidential Decree No. 28198, "Regulations on Teacher Training," and specific methods and standards are established by the superintendent of education according to the standards and procedures established by the minister of education.

4.2.2 Input Evaluation

The main purpose of the input evaluation is to evaluate and review alternative strategies to help select programs that can achieve the goal, and to carefully examine the implementation of selected strategies[20]. The introduction of the teacher-ability-development evaluation was carried out under the Roh Moo Hyun administration. Despite the controversy over the introduction of the new system, the participation rate has been continuously decreasing over time, showing limitations in many aspects such as the ambiguity and effectiveness of the evaluation, route dependency, formalism, and lack of connection with other policies. As a result, many people are complaining about the system[21]. Though some professors' actions have caused negative public opinions, it is difficult to claim that the teacher-ability-development evaluation system has been applied for a long after the implementation of the teacher-ability-development evaluation system only partially improved. For the majority of teachers, it is also questionable whether the evaluation was used to impart meaningful feedback for improving educational activities[21].

4.3 Policy-decision and Input Evaluation

4.3.1 Policy- execution Stage

As shown in [Table 2], the stage of policy execution is from the start of the operation of model schools, in 2005, to 2020.

[Table 2] Details of the Implementation Stage of the Evaluation System for the Development of Teachers' Abilities

Date	Policy
November 2005	Announcement of a pilot project to improve school education, including teacher evaluation
February 2006	Designation and operation of KEDI as a dedicated research institute for teacher evaluation
October 2006	The purpose of renaming 'teacher evaluation' as 'teacher-ability-development evaluation' and supporting teacher professionalism and ability development is to be clarified
February 2007	Designation of 506 leading schools for the evaluation of teacher-ability-development
March 2009	Pilot operation of 1,570 leading schools
July 2009	Education Minister Announces Full Implementation of teacher-ability-development evaluation in 2010
March 2010	The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology announced the full implementation of the teacher-ability-development evaluation (first year)
July 2011	Development and Distribution of the NEIS teacher-ability-development evaluation Online System
September 2012	Revision of the Presidential Decree for mandatory evaluation, etc.
May 2013	The Supreme Court's ruling on the National Delegation of teacher-ability-development evaluation
Year of 2016	Simplification of the teacher-ability-development evaluation into two
January 2016	Enforcement of the superintendent of education of the city and province under the Decree of No. 157 on the Implementation of the teacher-ability-development evaluation

4.3.2 Process Evaluation

Process evaluation is the evaluation of the process-execution stage of the CIPP model, and the evaluation factor at this stage was the degree of execution of the plan and the obstruction factor. Regarding the subject of evaluation, two proposals were presented in fiscal 2005 to allow the selection of the evaluation of principals and vice principals, which was required from 2006[20]. In fiscal 2009, teachers of comparative courses were evaluated, and from fiscal 2011, all current teachers (including non-teachers and contracted teachers) operated for all teachers included in the school. The evaluation was conducted on all teachers (including contracted teachers) who taught kindergarten classes for more than two months nationwide, including principals, heads of teachers, general teachers, special teachers, health, nutrition, librarians, and special counseling teachers. The types of evaluations were classified and operated in 2010 into peer teacher evaluations, student-satisfaction surveys, and parent-satisfaction surveys.

As of 2019, evaluation items can be added to reflect the characteristics of the city and provincial education offices, and unit schools can select additional evaluation indicators to reflect the characteristics of schools. The evaluation method was introduced in 2007 to improve the efficiency of the evaluation and to ensure the anonymity of the evaluators[20]. Objective teachers' evaluation should be categorized into five-step scale categories. As of 2020, this evaluation method has been installed and operated in the NEIS system. The evaluation cycle was changed from once a year to once every three years (one-year evaluation, two-year proficiency development) in the 2008 draft, but it was changed again in 2009. Regarding the evaluation-result-processing part, a skill development plan based on the evaluation results was prepared and submitted between 2011 and 2019. Measures to utilize the results of the assessment were given priority when teachers were applying for job training based on the results of the assessment in fiscal 2011. Since 2012, training on the evaluation results has been divided into three categories.

Obstacles to the implementation of the teacher-ability-development evaluation system are provided as follows. First, factors of validity of assessment indicators were found to be hindering. The purpose of the teacher-ability-development evaluation is to improve the teaching expertise for good lessons, but

there is no clear and universally acknowledged definition of "good lessons" and problems in the structure of evaluation indicators[22-26]. Secondly, analogy and compassionism of the people to be evaluated hindered. Unlike the teacher-ability-development evaluation plan, there was a high possibility that the evaluated person would infer the evaluator. Especially in the case of characterized high schools, evaluation is conducted in units of departments, with a minimum of five teachers per department. From this situation, it is difficult to fully guess the evaluator and guarantee anonymity. In addition, it is difficult to accurately evaluate one another, as there is a widespread belief that teachers cannot evaluate each other. This kind of compassionism can be estimated because the results of peer teachers' evaluations are much higher than those of students and parents. Also, in order to obtain information for peer evaluation, one has to visit fellow teachers' classes, yet it remains difficult to enter classes other than those of other teachers in the teacher society. Third, the autonomous evaluation method was a hindrance. The details of the teacher development assessment are determined by the school. However, due to the excessive work of the teachers in charge, the program was operated differently from the planning intent of the school[5], which did not lead to a valid evaluation period.

4.4 Policy Evaluation and Product Evaluation

4.4.1 Policy-evaluation Stage

Policy evaluation is a step to measure the social problems that were to be solved through policy implementation and how the effects of the policies affected. Policy evaluation can be conducted not only at the end of the policy process but also during it. Evaluation activities are restarting the policy process in order to continue, revise, or terminate existing policies[20]. In the case of this research, although the teacher-ability-development evaluation system was implemented as a model, it was revised continuously, and the policy did not end. However, it can be regarded as a policy evaluation since it was conducted annually during policy implementation.

4.4.2 Product Evaluation

Product evaluation is to determine the extent to which teacher-ability-development evaluation contributes to the development of teachers' abilities and expertise and to the overall effect of the teacher development system (such as educational administrators, teachers, students, and parents).

First of all, there is a fierce conflict in the evaluation of teacher-ability-development. Most parents agreed, and the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union and the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations were at odds with each other. While the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations supported the teacher-evaluation system, the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union opposed it, as did the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations. There is a lot of controversy over whether the evaluation of teachers' educational capabilities has objectivity and fairness. The biggest problem is that parents evaluate teachers. Few parents see teachers many times in a single school, and most of them can only be seen once, at graduation ceremonies, or twice at graduation of teachers is questionable. In particular, most health teachers graduate without seeing most of the students and their parents. It has been 10 years since the introduction of the teacher-ability-development evaluation, which aims to develop and improve the professionalism of teachers in order to provide high-quality education to students. However, the participation rate of parents and students is continuously decreasing or decreasing. Since the Ministry of Education cannot give up the idea, there is no quiet day at home and abroad. The teacher-evaluation system introduced by the Ministry of Education in March 2010 was revised to make the evaluation mandatory in September 2012. Also, in May 2013, the Korean Supreme Court ruled that the evaluation of teachers was a national delegation. Accordingly, it is not easy to abolish the system because of its coordination with relevant laws and regulations. In 2020, the teacher-

ability-development evaluation was suspended due to COVID-19.

In the end, the evaluation of the teacher-development evaluation system should meet the social needs of "development of ability" and "improvement of expertise and quality of school education," but the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers Union strongly demands the abolition of the evaluation.

5. Conclusions

The CIPP model assessed teacher-ability-development evaluation system and presented the following suggestions. First of all, regarding the context evaluation, the purpose of the teacher-ability-development evaluation is to reflect the opinions of the government, parents, and teachers' organizations, and the main purpose is to be reflected. The competitive environment of teachers and the selection of inappropriate teachers are not reflected. The competitive environment is unlikely to be applied in the teacher-ability-development evaluation, but this can be solved by giving students the right to choose their subjects and teachers. Also, the withdrawal of inappropriate teachers requires clear scope and agreement of inappropriate teachers. It is problematic to classify teachers as inappropriate just because they have a low teaching ability. Everyone agrees that teachers who examine other teachers from the same perspective, as civil servants, are punished enough for illegal activities. Fairness is the core of evaluation, but due to the speciality of teaching, it was necessary to present measures to overcome such limitations.

With regard to the input evaluation, the evaluation that the operation is not suitable for the purpose has increased over time, and some people are complaining about and seeking to abolish the system itself. The Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union (KTU) has not accepted the "Teacher-ability-development evaluation system improvement plan" drawn up by Professor Lee Young-hee and his team at the request of the Ministry of Education in December 2019. There is need for a system that allows all members to judge the details of the current skill development evaluation in a reasonable way.

According to the process evaluation, the teacher-ability-development evaluation system has been operated in a stable manner with no significant change since the test operation. In fact, there were difficulties before the teacher-ability-development evaluation system was implemented due to clashes between teachers' groups, government, and parents' groups, but the system was implemented after much discussion. However, some problems and solutions are presented during this process. First of all, this study discovered that other compatibility issues in evaluation indicators through literature review and attributed them to ambiguity about "good lessons," lack of reflection of the multifaceted characteristics of lessons, and linkages between learning activities and lessons. It is difficult to define a "good lesson," but it is necessary to select the core elements after reaching an agreement. Also, the definition of "good class" can change from generation to generation, so a process to reflect the generation through the regular discussion process will be necessary. The fact that the multilateral aspects of classes are not reflected in the evaluation means that elements of sufficient value are not reflected in the evaluation. Evaluation items should be organized not only in traditional classes but also in various teaching methods, focusing on the core elements that should be emphasized in common. Evaluating whether learning activities are properly linked to learning content can evaluate the efficiency of learning activities. Items related to whether knowledge transfer is efficient and whether the learning situation has been properly prepared to create opportunities for self-discovery should be added. Second, there were obstacles such as analogy and paternalism of the people to be evaluated. In order to solve this kind of compassionism, serious advance education on teacher evaluation is necessary. The purpose and effect of the evaluation should be explained, and it should be agreed that it will be an opportunity to reflect on others through accurate evaluation. Rather than pointing out the problem, the evaluation should be conducted to reflect the intention of solving the problem. The analogy of an evaluator is limited by a small evaluation tool. However, in order to solve this problem, it is possible to propose a method for presenting the student

evaluation and the peer evaluation together. It is possible to use the same evaluation items as students for parts related to teaching. Of course, in so doing, the advantage of being a co-worker teacher may be lost. Therefore, I think it would be better if teachers could directly choose whether or not to evaluate students and add themselves. Third, the manual was followed by the use of an autonomous-item-selection and evaluation system. Such a reason cannot be said to be excessive work of teachers; rather, it is a matter of expertise in teacher evaluation. To that end, the person in charge of operations has to work for a long period of time and expand their expertise. However, if the job is avoided in the teaching society, it can be done for many years, but if the job is not too heavy, it is not easy to do it continuously. In the end, the improvement of expertise in the work in charge must be prevented from being biased in the division of duties of teachers, and it is only possible to have the person in charge continue to take charge of the work in the last fiscal year. If the amount of work in charge is similar, the burden on the work teachers have been doing will be less than taking on the new work, so many years of work will be created, which will help them improve their expertise. Parents, the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers' Union, and the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations all have different positions on the product evaluation. Therefore, it should be noted that negative results are produced in terms of effectiveness and satisfaction, occasionally producing unintended results, unlike those in accordance with the original system. In order to improve them, it is judged necessary to organize negative results, establish gradual management methods, understand the degree of acceptance of the evaluation of policy makers, and make a decision on whether to maintain or abolish the system.

The introduction of the teacher-ability-development evaluation was carried out under the Roh Moo Hyun administration. Despite the controversy over the introduction of the new system, the participation rate has been continuously decreasing over time, showing limitations in many regards such as the ambiguity and effectiveness of the evaluation, route dependency, formalism, and lack of connection with other policies. As a result, many people are complaining about the system. Though some professors' actions have caused negative public opinion, it is difficult to claim that the teacher-ability-development evaluation system has been applied for a long after the implementation of the teacher-ability-development evaluation system[21] only partially improved. For the majority of teachers, it is also questionable whether the evaluation was used to impart meaningful feedback for improving educational activities. Although many parts of the teacher-ability-development evaluation system[21] have been revised and improved through test management, problems and issues remain. Further research and extensive field-opinion collection will require in-depth exploration of institutional improvements and measures to utilize the results. This research is meaningful in providing significant information on decision making in implementing this scheme and developing related policies by evaluating the teacher-ability-development evaluation by applying the CIPP model.

References

- [1] G. S. Kim, Status and results of pilot school operation for teacher evaluation, Korea Educational Development Institute, (2006)
- [2] D. G. Kim, Policy Adventures for the Evaluation of Teacher's Competency Development, Korean Educational Development Institute, (2007), November 30
- [3] H. J. Cho, A Study on Dilemma in Policy Making of Teacher Evaluation System and Performance-based Pay System for Teachers, The Journal of Educational Administration, (2007), Vol.25, No.1, pp.183-206, UCI : G704-000511.2007.25.1.006
- [4] J. H. Lee, A Study on the Policy Direction of the Teacher Evaluation System, The 6th Annual Winter Seminar of the Institute of Education and Public Administration, (2009)

- [5] J. S. Jeon, H. K. Kim, Step-by-step strategy for on-site employment of the teacher evaluation system, The Korean Society For The Study of Teacher Education Academic Conference Material Book, (2009), pp.54-55.
- [6] D. L. Stufflebeam, The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability, Journal of Research and Development in Education, (1971), Vol.5, pp.19-25.
- [7] J. H. Kim, The theory of lifelong education program development, kyoyookbook, (2001)
- [8] Y. M. Lee, Y. S. Choi, S. M. Hong, The Diagnostic Analysis of Consortium Training Programs for Small and Middle-Sized Corporations, Using CIPP Evaluation Model, The Korean Journal of Human Resource Development Quarterly, (2009), Vol.11, No.2, pp.91-113, DOI : 10.18211/kjhrdq.2009.11.2.005
- [9] K. H. Lee, A Study on the Improvement of Teacher Evaluation System for Professional Development, The Journal of Korean Teacher Education, (2010), Vol.27, No.3, pp.43-68, <http://dx.doi.org/10.24211/tjkte.2010.27.3.43>
- [10] J. G. Jeong, A Study on the Development Direction of University Evaluation Recognition System by CIPP Evaluation Model, Daegu Catholic University, Doctoral Dissertation, (2010)
- [11] D. L. Stufflebeam, A. J. Shinkfield, Evaluation theory, Models & applications, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, (2007), <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214007308902>
- [12] H. S. Bae, The theory of evaluation of educational programs, Wonmisa Publishing, (2008)
- [13] K. H. Koo, S. M. Nam, The Development of Evaluation Scale for Middle School Free Semester Activity Program Based on CIPP Evaluation Model, The Korean Youth Activity Association, (2019), Vol.5, No.2, pp.31-55.
- [14] I. H. Jung, C. A. Joo, J. W. Kim, Theories and examples of educational policy, Seoul: Dongmoonsa Publishing, (2016)
- [15] J. G. Jeong, The theory of policy institutes, Seoul: Daemyung Publishing, (1998)
- [16] H. S. Choi, The exploratory logic of educational policy, kyoyookbook, (2006)
- [17] J. L. Pressman, A. B. Wildavsky, Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, University of California Press, (1973)
- [18] Donald S. Van Meter, Carl E. Van Horn, The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework, Administration and Society, (1975), Vol.6, No.4, pp.445-488, <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404>
- [19] M. Rein, Implementation: A theoretical perspective, (1st Edition), Policy to Practice, (1983)
- [20] J. H. Lee, S. H. Kim, J. M. Kim, Evaluation Study on Policy of Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development Using CIPP Evaluation Model, The Korea Educational Review, (2010), Vol.16, No.1, pp.183-213.
- [21] Y. H. Lee, S. H. Kim, S. C. Kim, W. J. Lee, J. H. Yoon, Y. S. Kim, E. B. Lee, A Study on the Improvement of the System for teacher-ability-development evaluation, The Department of Education in KOREA, (2019)
- [22] K. J. Cho, Critical Study for Teacher Appraisal for Professional Development Index, Korean Journal of Teacher Education, (2013), Vol.29, No.1, pp.53-70, DOI:10.14333/KJTE.2013.29.1.53
- [23] E. J. Kim, Feasibility Analysis of University Education Satisfaction Survey Tools - Focused on SSI Scale in the U.S, Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Management Research, (2020), Vol.5, No.1, pp.29-38.
- [24] M. Hazel Ramos, C. Y. Park, Motivational Factors and Learning Styles in Acquisition of Global Language and Business Skills in Multicultural Education, Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Management Research, (2020), Vol.5, No.1, pp.9-16.
- [25] M. Lim, J. S. Kim, The Learning Styles of Middle School Student for Solving Technological Problems, Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Management Research, (2019), Vol.4, No.3, pp.21-28.
- [26] P. H. Kim, Formative Assessment Methods to Resolve Curriculum and Summative Assessment-related Issues, Asia-Pacific Journal of Educational Management Research, (2019), Vol.4, No.2, pp.1-6.