

Some aspects to consider to build teachers' job satisfaction: A comparative study of Uzbek and Hungarian teacher appraisals

Szűcs Ida¹ – Gulmira Avezova²

¹ Eszterhazy Karoly Catholic University Associate professor,
ORCID: 0000-0003-3806-263X, zagyvane.szucs.ida@uni-eszterhazy.hu

² Doctoral School of Eszterhazy Karoly Catholic University PhD student,
ORCID: 0009-0000-5576-4161, avezovagulmira8@gmail.com

The initiative of the Hungarian government to introduce a new teacher appraisal system within the whole-scale teacher assessment made us review the operational teacher career models and teacher appraisal frameworks linked to salary schemes in the world and compare the planned Hungarian model with the Uzbek teacher career model and teacher appraisal framework. The comparison includes the evolution of appraisals, their procedures, criteria, and methodology. Our study proposes some ideas for decision-makers to consider when introducing or modifying teacher assessment frameworks so that they can better contribute to teachers' well-being and to improving the quality of work in education.

Kulcsszavak: teacher career models, teacher assessment, salary schemes

DOI: 10.37205/TEL-hun.2024.2.02

Introduction

Working conditions, including career prospects and a good salary, deeply impact the quality of a job and influence employees' well-being, skills development and productivity (Bascia & Rottmann, 2011; Gomendio, 2017; Viac & Fraser, 2020.) Good working conditions are essential not only for individuals, but also for companies and societies. This is especially true for professionals, teachers, doctors, lawyers, who require opportunities to fulfil their ambitions, the recognition of their contribution to the community, constant feedback, and opportunities for professional development (Cazes, Hijzen & Saint Martin, 2015).

Current changes in the Hungarian educational system have made us reflect on working conditions, focusing on teacher appraisals within teacher assessment systems. Teacher performance assessment is a crucial part of teacher career models and is linked to salary schemes. This study aims to compare two teacher appraisal systems (Uzbek and Hungarian), highlighting similarities and differences

and pointing out the challenges faced by both systems. We hope our research results will support decision-makers in fine-tuning the existing systems. The main aspects of our analysis are the evolution of the teacher appraisal systems, the proportion of data sources (external and internal) used in teacher's appraisals in Uzbekistan and Hungary. In this study, we will review the existing teacher career models and teacher's appraisal frameworks in the world, present the main principles of the Hungarian and Uzbek teacher career models and make comparisons based on the above-mentioned aspects. In our study, we rely on international research results and existing legal documents (Mourshed, Mona, Barber & Chijioke, 2010).

Literature review

The evolution of teacher appraisal: professionalism and managerialism

Professionalism and managerialism can be identified as two prevailing trends in the evolution of existing teacher's appraisal systems worldwide. According to professionalism, a modern professional constantly questions and reflects upon their practice (Schön, 1983). This approach aims to understand all aspects of the teaching-learning process, resulting in a deeper professional insight. The whole procedure, involving evaluation, criticism and ultimately self-development, requires openness and trust between those involved. Developing reflectivity on personal and organisational levels also requires flexibility in working procedures to allow for individual experimentation. Reflective practice may lead to a lack of satisfaction with the existing organizational structure and may result in a more dynamic organisation. Schön emphasises the importance of self-criticism as a part of professional development.

In recent years, the term of managerialism has appeared in education. An increasing market pressure on education (Bottery, 1996) led to emphasising management concerns and increasing competition. Competition created a need among school management for a more intensive use of target setting and monitoring performance (Gewirtz, 1997). The growth of management teams and functions connected to supervision have extended professionalism (Ozga, 1995), increased managers' concerns about external quality control and internal cost control (Ball, 1994), and teaching and learning have been defined by customers' needs rather than professional judgements.

The co-existence of these two trends presents both challenges and opportunities for educational systems globally. Managerialism promotes a culture of accountability and performance-driven outcomes, ensuring that educational institutions meet the demands of a rapidly evolving society. However, the overemphasis on these principles may risk eroding professional autonomy, stifling creativity, and undermining the intrinsic motivation of educators. Conversely, professionalism encourages educators to engage in critical reflection, collaborative inquiry, and ongoing professional development, fostering a culture of innovation and excellence in teaching and learning. By prioritising the holistic development of educators and recognising the complexity of classroom practice, professionalism can enhance teacher morale, job satisfaction, and overall effectiveness.

Ultimately, the evolution of teacher appraisal systems must strike a delicate balance between professionalism and managerialism, recognising the unique contributions of each paradigm while mitigating their potential drawbacks.

Single-Generation and Second-Generation Career Structures

Historically, single-generation career structures in teaching have been characterised by linear progression, hierarchical advancement, and long-term commitments to single educational institutions (Hargreaves, 2000). In such structures, educators follow pre-defined career paths, starting as classroom teachers and gradually advancing to administrative roles based on seniority and academic credentials. While single-generation structures provide stability, they often lack opportunities for professional growth, innovation, and collaboration.

Within single-generation career structures, teacher assessments primarily focus on measuring adherence to predetermined standards and benchmarks. These standards often revolve around tenure, seniority (years of service and hierarchical position, and academic qualifications (degrees, certifications, and specialised training). As far asr classroom performance is concerned, assessment focuses on classroom management and curriculum adherence, with less consideration of innovative teaching methods and learning outcomes. Single-generation career structures face inherent challenges in fostering adaptability, innovation, and collaboration among educators. The rigid assessment frameworks may hinder professional growth and limit opportunities for career advancement based on merit and performance.

In the light of the evolving demands of contemporary learning environments, there is a pressing need for a shift towards more dynamic and inclusive assess-

ment practices that prioritise continuous learning, collaboration, and student-centred teaching approaches. Second-generation frameworks underscore adaptability, innovation, and collaboration (Fullan, 2001). These structures prioritise the continuous development and ambition of educators to meet the evolving needs of students and educational systems. Performance assessment constitutes a crucial aspect of second-generation career structures, serving as a cornerstone for evaluating teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and contributions to collaborative endeavours.

Considering the axis of the single- and second-generation career structures, Crehan (2016) describes four career models, trying to simplify variations among complex systems. The first model is the single salary schedule, a first-generation career model where differentiation and promotion are based on seniority and experience, not performance. The other three models are second-generation career structures, where differentiation is made between teachers based on their performance. The three models are: bonus pay, salary progression based on performance appraisal, and career ladder. These three models rely on summative appraisals to differentiate between teachers.

Bonus pay programmes award teachers for a specific achievement. The best teachers receive a bonus or a salary supplement for a finite period. *Salary progression based on appraisal* is a model where teacher salaries increase at key points and are dependent on their successfully passing an appraisal. The salary spine can consist of different levels or grades, and teachers move to higher salary levels on the pay spine. Moving up the salary levels does not mean taking up additional responsibilities or a new status. *The career ladder model* means that teachers' pay progresses up to a point, beyond which they must pass an appraisal and take on an enhanced role with additional responsibilities. Career ladder models may be horizontal (teachers are promoted to more advanced levels, but teaching in the classroom remains key to their work) or vertical (teachers are promoted to administrative or leadership positions and often stop teaching).

The evolution of career structures in teaching has significant implications for educators, educational leaders, and policymakers (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). To support the transition to second-generation frameworks, educational institutions must invest in professional development, mentorship programs, and leadership opportunities for educators.

Bottery (1996) describes the process of how single-generation career structures are transforming into second-generation career structures. The stages involve recognising the limitations of traditional models, implementing ongoing professional development initiatives, and integrating performance assessments to improve teaching quality and educational outcomes. The evolution of teacher career structures reflects a global trend towards a more dynamic competency-based framework. This shift involves moving away from traditional tenure-oriented models towards second-generation career structures prioritising ongoing professional development and performance assessment. The critical aspects of this evolution include balancing professionalism and managerialism, transitioning from a single-pay or bonus system to more comprehensive salary progression models, and adopting mixed evaluation approaches such as career progression.

International trends in teacher appraisal

In OECD countries, teacher appraisal means the formal evaluation of teachers “to make a judgement and/or provide feedback about their competencies and performance” (OECD, 2013, p. 272). It is done in many forms. One of the differentiating factors is whether *the appraisal is centralised or done by schools*. Then there is a difference between *appraisals conducted after completing the probationary period*, when *registering as a qualified teacher (national exam)*, *appraisals used as a performance management tool* including registration processes, *regular appraisals*, *appraisals for promotion*, and *reward schemes based on the identification of high-performing teachers* (OECD, 2013; TALIS, 2018).

In this study, we are focusing on regular performance appraisals, promotion appraisals, and reward schemes. The *regular performance appraisal* is typically an internal process regulated by general labour-law provisions. Such appraisals can range from strictly regulated ones – regulated regarding how to implement them – to ones which provide full autonomy even regarding how to design them. The appraisal may be connected to an interview and include elements such as discussing the teacher's professional development, responsibilities, working conditions, career progression or salary advancement (OECD, 2013, p. 275). *Appraisals for promotion* can be separate from regular teacher appraisals in some countries. It is often voluntary and occurs in relation to employment status decisions. *Reward schemes* involve teacher appraisals aiming to identify a select number of high-performing teachers to acknowledge and reward their teaching competence and performance through rewards or one-off salary increases (OECD, 2013, p. 275).

Appraisals can be formal or informal, subjective or objective, and summative or formative. Appraisal and feedback systems can be viewed as an integrated element of the school culture or an “add-on” to existing systems (Marshall, 2005; Santiago & Benavides, 2009). The appraisal and feedback system can be perceived as fair and accurate or the opposite. Thus, developing the best instruments to be used in the evaluation process is vital.

Developing an instrument for evaluation needs to consider the *goals of the evaluation*, which is generally improving teaching quality by developing teacher capacity (OECD, 2005). Furthermore, it may contribute to the continuous improvement of schooling (Santiago & Benavides, 2009) and increase the focus on teaching quality and continuous professional learning for teachers (OECD, 2013, p. 276). Moreover, effective teacher appraisal may make the organisation of schools sensitive to individual talent and performance, enhancing teachers' motivation to take up new roles and responsibilities (Mead et al., 2012). Therefore, it can boost the attractiveness of teaching as a career choice and increase the status of teachers. Finally, it provides a tool for schools to hold teachers accountable for the quality of education.

The *functions of teacher appraisal* can be varied: it can be a tool for quality assurance (summative appraisal); it can provide opportunities for teachers to identify their strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement; it can provide helpful information to support schools, teachers and educational authorities in making decisions regarding career advancement and professional development (Isoré, 2009; Papay, 2012). Furthermore, it can build the efficacy of education systems (Hattie, 2009). Finally, teacher appraisal is a way to build a salary scheme different from a single salary structure (Crehan, 2016; Hanushek, 2007).

Teacher appraisals may differ *based on who conducts them*. The TALIS report (2018) shows that a small portion (7%) of schoolteachers are never appraised. There are some countries where this percentage is more significant, e.g., Finland (41%), Italy (36%) and Spain (25%). It is mostly school principals or other members of the school management who conduct appraisals. In OECD countries, school principals reported that 64% of teachers were appraised annually as of 2018. Appraisals performed by other sources (mentors, other teachers or external individuals, inspectors, municipal representatives etc.) are less common. There are also countries where the appraisals are conducted by two or three sources.

Methods used in appraisals depend on their functions. Defensible and comparable data are needed to get information about teachers' performance to inform career decisions and to strengthen their accountability. Self-evaluation can be a more effective method if the function is to get information about professional development needs and to promote teacher learning. The most important principle is to gain data from multiple sources of evidence to render appraisals accurate and fair. Classroom observations, students' classroom-based or /and external examination results are commonly used for teacher appraisal. These results make teachers' work measurable and present students' learning outcomes. Teachers' contribution to their students' learning outcomes is difficult to measure, though, as students' results depend on several sensitive statistical assumptions; therefore, some experts (Braun, 2005; OECD, 2013; Papay, 2012) suggest combining the use of students' exam results with other evaluation methods. Student survey responses on teaching, the assessment of teachers' content knowledge and self-assessment of teachers' work are also widely used appraisal methods (OECD, 2018). Results gained with carefully designed student survey instruments can give a unique view of teachers' work, but as students are not trained in rating, their responses may be affected by factors unrelated to students' learning; therefore, again, a combination of evaluation methods is recommended (Kane & Staiger, 2012; Wagner et al., 2013; Wallace, Kelcey & Ruzek, 2016).

The function of the teacher appraisal determines the *consequences* as well. In the case of formative assessment, appointing a mentor to improve teaching or drafting a plan for professional development can be a practical consequence. A wage increase, a bonus or dismissal can be applied when the goal is to ensure good performance and compliance with standards. If the function is providing feedback, post-appraisal discussions can take place where the two parties exchange information about improving the quality of performing work related tasks (Baker, 2013). TALIS countries from 2013 to 2018 show a growing reliance on financial and career advancement incentives and a declining reliance on changes in teachers' work responsibilities or dismissals or non-renewal of contracts.

It is important to clarify at this point what we mean by teacher assessment and teacher appraisal. In our view, teacher assessment includes all the possible forms of teacher evaluation, the criteria of assessment and its procedures as well as the personnel responsible for teacher assessment in the assessment framework. Appraisal is a part of the assessment and refers to a specific school context in a

finite period of time, and it is conducted on a regular basis. Teacher career models are more complex frameworks: they vary depending on whether they include different forms of assessment and appraisal and possible career paths. We see from the literature review that there are assessment frameworks which do not include any forms of appraisal.

Methodology

In our study, the comparison aims to explore similarities and differences between the two appraisal systems to identify the main trends in both countries and some crucial points requiring consideration by decision-makers. The aspects of our exploration are the following:

1. How have the current career structures evolved in Hungary and Uzbekistan respectively?
2. What is the proportion of external and internal data sources for teacher assessment in the two different countries?
3. Based on what criteria are teachers assessed? What is the proportion of the assessment of a teacher's professional competences and institutional appraisal (the achievement of individual goals, school- or class-based practice, the students' results and the students' survey results) in the final results of the teacher's appraisal? To what extent do results from different appraisal data sources determine the teacher's salary?
4. How is the appraisal carried out? What methodology is used? How often is it carried out?

To answer the above research questions, we carried out a document analysis using the aspects mentioned above. The documents are mainly legislative provisions, former research results and national reports. First, we present the two assessment systems separately, and then we highlight their similarities and differences.

Results

The Hungarian Teacher Career Model and Teacher appraisal

In Hungary, a Teachers' Career Model (TCM) was introduced in 2013 (Hungarian Government Edict 326/2013. (VIII. 30.)). It has two aims: (1) to assess teachers' professional work based on professional competencies and (2) to support their professional development (Falus, 2011, Kotschy, 2011). It is a combination of summative and formative assessment. In the Hungarian model, teacher assessment is based on clearly defined levels (standards) of professional competencies (9 competencies). The standards are identified with the help of indicators. The TCM helps teachers to follow a straightforward career path starting from the category of Trainee, entering Teacher I. category after a qualification exam, and then entering Teacher II., Master Teacher or Researcher Teacher status after having successfully passed the respective qualification exams. Initially, the categories of the TCM were linked to the brackets of the teachers' salary scheme, each year adapting to the minimum wage increase in Hungary. The Hungarian government stopped linking the TCM to the annual minimum wage increase right after the first year of its implementation, resulting in the long-term depreciation of teachers' salaries.

Parallel with TCM, schools had their own institutional assessment systems, including teacher self-assessment every second year based on clearly defined criteria and feedback from different sources. The self-assessment was conducted with the help of lesson observations, document analysis, and interviews with the lead teacher of the disciplinary team. The results of the self-assessment were not linked to the salary scheme. The efficacy of the TCM and of institutional self-assessment has not yet been researched and examined.

Teachers' low salaries made the government link TCM and institutional appraisal to the salary scheme and substantially modify the appraisal system in 2023. The Act passed in July 2023 (Act LII of 2023 on Teachers' New Career Paths) introduced a new system of teacher assessment combined with a new salary scheme. One pillar of the system is the TCM providing the same straightforward career path opportunities (97. §, ACT LII of 2023) as the 2013 Government Edict, but shortening the length of experience required of teachers to enter the next category, making only the qualification exam for Teacher I. status compulsory while establishing a defined salary scheme for all TCM categories (98. §, Act LII of

2023). The aims of this component have remained the same: providing summative assessment of a teacher’s professional competencies and providing feedback to inform their continuous professional development.

Another pillar of the teacher assessment system is the annual teacher performance appraisal carried out by the employer, based on a set of criteria partly worked out by the government, partly elaborated and agreed on by the schools, considering all the conditions determined by the school environment, students' needs, aims and goals stated in the national curriculum, and documents regulating the educational system (see institutional quality regulations 402/2023. (VIII. 30.) Government Edict 2023. 19. 46. §.).

The third pillar of the system is the salary scheme, which consists of several pay brackets, and defines the pay range in each bracket, i.e. the minimum and maximum amount of money that can be earned in each category (Trainee, Teacher I., Teacher II., Master teacher, Researcher teacher). The bottoms of each bracket are the base or the minimum sums to be paid to the teacher. The employer can decide to increase the salary within the bracket based on the annual appraisal results. This means that the teacher's salary can change year by year.

The introduction of the new system raises some *dilemmas related to the assessment of professional competencies*. The optional qualification procedure which enables a teacher move from Teacher I. to Teacher II. and the slight difference between the respective salary brackets (Table 1.) may motivate a great number of teachers to stay in Teacher I. category rather than try to qualify as a Teacher II. It is worth entering Teacher II. category only for those who aim to qualify as Master teachers or Researcher teachers later on. There is not much point in earning and then staying in Teacher II. status for one’s whole career.

Categories	Salary strips
Trainee	440.000 HUF (determined in an Edict)
Teacher I.	410.000 HUF – 1.065.000 HUF,
Teacher II.	430.000 HUF – 1.135.000 HUF
Master teacher	520.000 HUF – 1.365.000 HUF
Researcher teacher	640.000 HUF – 1.470.000 HUF

Table 1: The original salary scheme proposed by the Act (98. §, LII of 2023, amended in January 2024)

The government's intention to push more teachers towards the category of Master teacher is highly welcome, but we should not forget about the fact that the government can limit the number of applicants for Master teacher status every year; furthermore, as it has been pointed out above, achieving Teacher II status lacks substantial financial rewards, so teachers may choose just to stick to their Teacher I. status, probably ignoring continuous professional development opportunities.

Besides modifying the TCM, the Hungarian Interior Ministry, currently in charge of public education, issued an Edict (18/2024. (IV.) introducing a new, institutional teacher appraisal, which consists of two parts:

- The achievement of three developmental goals defined by the teacher and fitted to the goals of the educational institution (3X7= 28 scores)
- Assessing the teacher's performance on seven criteria:
 1. Pedagogical work quality and efficiency (28 scores)
 2. Professional tasks assessed based on quantitative indicators (12 scores)
 3. Reliability and keeping to deadlines (8 scores)
 4. Communication and collaboration (6 scores)
 5. Dealing with highly- and badly performing students considering their needs (8 scores)
 6. Motivation, commitment and ethical behaviour (6 scores)
 7. Individual goal assigned by the institution (8 scores)

The maximum score is 104. (See also Annex 1 to the 18/2024. (IV. 4.) Interior Ministry Edict.

Category	Salary scheme stripes	External assessment: professional competences-bottom line calculated	Internal/Institutional appraisal top line calculated	
			Individual outcomes (within the appraisal 26.9%)	School-classroom activities (within the appraisal 73.10%)
Teacher I.	538 000-1 065 000 HUF	50.52%	49.48%	13.31% 36.17%
Teacher II.	555 000-1 135 000 HUF	48.88%	51.12%	13.70% 37.42%
Master teacher	630 000-1 365 000 HUF	46.15%	53.85%	14.48% 39.37%
Researcher teacher	750 000-1 470 000 HUF	51.02%	48.98%	13.17% 35.85%

Table 2: The proportional weight of the components of the Hungarian teacher assessment in the salary scheme according to the 3/2024 Government Edict.

Both external and internal assessments are to be conducted in the Hungarian educational system. A committee of two external and one internal member assesses the teacher's professional competencies. The principal or his /her deputy conducts the institutional appraisal.

The institutional appraisal (Table 2.) has more importance compared to the assessment of professional competencies in the case of Teacher I and Researcher teacher as it can account for more than 50% of their salary. In the case of the Teacher II and Master teacher categories this proportion is lower than 50%. Therefore, Master teachers' school and class related work counts to the biggest extent among the categories. The question is whether the principals will have the amount of money at their disposal to be able to give the maximum within the brackets to the best teachers. Furthermore, giving the maximum rise may generate tensions within the staff and lead to the deterioration of the organisational climate. In the case of Researcher teachers, there is more emphasis on the external assessment than in other teacher categories, but school and classroom activities

still account for a significant proportion of their total institutional appraisal. Comparing the proportion of individual developmental goals and school- or classroom activities, we can see that the latter counts more within the internal appraisal (73%). The teacher's everyday practice as experienced by the principal and the colleagues on every day basis (pedagogical work quality and efficiency, professional tasks, reliability, communication, collaboration, adopting to student's needs, motivation and commitment) gains intensive attention in the assessment structure. Still, there are some questions to be answered regarding the new proposal such as the availability of financial resources, the methodology of institutional assessment, and the consequences of poor results (sanctions or support).

As we pointed out earlier, the teacher assessment system has been transformed within the framework of second-generation structures: it is a special mixture of career ladder and institutional appraisal models. Currently, the criteria of assessment are professional competences (TCM) depending on standards (development stages) and the teacher's school and class activities as experienced by the principal and the colleagues on every day basis (Teacher's institutional appraisal). In the framework of the TCM, there is a measurement tool to assess the teacher's portfolio containing documents produced during their career; furthermore, the teacher's activities are observed in two classes; last but not least, the teacher's presentation on his professional achievements is the final building block of the career ladder assessment. The institutional appraisal is still being elaborated on. It will be based on a combination of a centralised measurement tool and a measurement procedure developed by the school communities. When the Hungarian TCM was introduced, the teacher categories were linked to salary brackets. Now the government is expanding the salary scale by linking teachers' institutional appraisal to the salary itself.

The Uzbek Teacher Career Model and Teacher appraisal

The teacher assessment system in Uzbekistan has evolved through several historical phases. In the pre-Soviet era, assessments were informal, focusing on the teacher's respect for the community and their moral integrity, both deeply rooted in Islamic traditions. During the Soviet era (1924–1991), the system became highly centralised, emphasising ideological conformity, standardised testing, and political loyalty. After gaining independence in 1991, Uzbekistan aimed to reform its educational system so that it could reflect national identity and economic needs. Early reforms focused on de-Sovietization and introducing new evaluation

criteria but faced challenges like insufficient funding and a lack of professional development opportunities. Modernisation efforts from the 2000s onwards introduced continuous professional development, certification processes, performance-based assessments, and significant investments in teacher training and digital integration. Despite progress, challenges such as resource disparities and the need for continuous updates in assessment criteria exist.

In Uzbekistan, teacher appraisal systems lack a centralised Teacher Career Model (TCM). Frequently, teaching staff are graded based on information gained through classroom observations and students' feedback. The decentralised structure contributes to the emergence of different yardsticks, such as category levels, specialisation tracks, and leadership roles and requirements for the professional growth of teachers, which eventually hampers the formulation of a single strategy for teacher development and promotions.

As we cannot talk about one career model in Uzbekistan, the system supports different career advancement pathways for teachers from advancing to teach at a higher level of education to senior management roles but it has a core feature that is mandatory for all educators.

As teachers enter the profession, they are categorised based on their qualifications. There are three teacher categories:

1. Teacher-specialist level: for teachers with a bachelor's degree without a teaching certificate.
2. Category level II: for teachers with a bachelor's degree and a teaching certificate or a master's degree.
3. Advanced category: for teachers with a doctoral degree.

Categories, excluding teacher-specialist, are awarded for five years, subject to periodic teacher appraisals. Exceptions exist for teachers with over 15 years of experience or doctoral degrees, who maintain their category indefinitely. Only Teachers in the advanced category and with extensive experience qualify as teacher-methodologists in teacher education. Starting from 2020, teachers may participate in evaluation processes twice a year, allowing for quicker progression. The State Inspectorate for Supervision of Education Quality (SISEQ) conducts teacher appraisals nationally and assigns teachers to categories depending on the evaluation results. The assessment criteria are essential, but we cannot identify a comprehensive list of professional competencies combining knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the Uzbek system. There are data sources like e.g. institutional

appraisals, students' results, and students' surveys, based on which one can make inferences about the teachers' competencies.

Teacher assessment involves evaluating teachers' abilities in areas such as lesson planning, instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment practices as well as their professional development efforts and the outcome of their institutional appraisals (individual achievements, school- or class-based activities); students' results and student surveys also count (Odilov, 2023).

The appraisal, in which one can score 100 points, emphasises key indicators to assess effectiveness and support professional growth:

- Students' Academic Performance
- Student Participation in Science Olympiads
- Primary School Engagement
- Teacher Recognition and Impact
- Pedagogical Experience
- Class Supervision and Coordination
- Training and Development
- Extracurricular Initiatives
- Pedagogical Effectiveness

Although this comprehensive evaluation identifies strengths and areas for improvement, and thus supports teachers' growth and ensures accountability, in Uzbekistan the focus leans heavily towards evaluating for assessment, or summative assessment rather than evaluation for development, i.e. formative assessment (Odilov,2023). The evaluation system in Uzbekistan encompasses both pedagogical skills and subject matter knowledge, with a weighting of 20% and 80%, respectively. Pedagogical skills encompass various facets of teaching effectiveness, from instructional delivery to the integration of technology in the classroom. Data sources for evaluating a teacher' pedagogical skills are multifaceted:

- Conducting Open Lessons,
- Students' Academic Results
- Use of Pedagogical Tools and IT Technologies,
- Teacher's participation in educational seminars and competitions.

The cumulative evaluation score for pedagogical skills is calculated based on the points earned across all criteria, providing a comprehensive assessment of a teacher's teaching capabilities. In addition to pedagogical skills, psychological readiness is evaluated. The evaluation criteria for psychological readiness include

positive results from psychological analyses of lessons, which indicate effective classroom management and student engagement. However, the presence of complaints from students and parents may indicate areas requiring improvement. The total score for psychological readiness is determined by the results of psychological analyses and feedback, highlighting the teacher's ability to create a supportive and conducive learning environment. These evaluation criteria serve as guidelines for assessing teachers' competences in pedagogical skills and psychological readiness.

The evaluation process takes place in two stages: the school's pedagogical council, consisting of the head and deputy heads, evaluates the teacher's pedagogical skills and psychological readiness, while the SISEQ assesses their subject matter knowledge using diverse methods. The evaluation methodology prescribes how to calculate a total score for all assessment criteria (Odilov, 2023).

Advancement through qualification levels entails salary increases, with specific criteria outlined for each level (Table 3.).

Teacher categories	Salary increase depending on the achievements	Progression
Teacher – specialist	7% ($\geq 60\%$)	Category II
Category II	19.8% ($\geq 70\%$)	Category I
Category I	33.5% ($\geq 80\%$)	Teacher – advanced
Teacher – advanced	47.5% ($\geq 80\%$)	Senior management roles with specific criteria

Table 3: Uzbek teacher categories, salary and professional progression

In the Uzbek system, the absence of clear pathways for teachers' career advancement results in limited diversification of responsibilities over their careers (Odilov, 2023). Recognising this, the government plans to introduce well-designed career structures that offer both vertical progression and horizontal diversification opportunities. This initiative aims to align career structures, professional standards, and remuneration, enhancing teachers' capacities and providing sustained motivation.

In the Uzbek system, the Bonus pay programme (Cheran, 2016) is also a part of the complex evaluation system. The Ministry of Public Education in Uzbekistan conducts annual evaluations to determine teachers' salary bonuses for the upcoming academic year, with past achievements as the basis. Bonuses, ranging from 10% to 40% of the salary, are awarded based on evaluation scores, which consider nine domains, including student achievement, work experience, and professional

development. Notably, student performance heavily influences evaluations, accounting for 65% of the total assessment score.

We can see that the Uzbek teacher's assessment system combines some elements of the career ladder model, focusing on teacher's activities in the classroom and at school rather than on professional development efforts. The career ladder is not based on a standardised measurement of professional competences. The assessment is linked to the salary progression, and bonuses may also expand the teacher's salary scale.

In the Uzbek system, teacher appraisal outcomes predominantly focus on the teacher's active role at the school and ensure accountability for student learning rather than on providing constructive feedback for professional development, addressing weaknesses (Odilov, 2023). Therefore, the need for establishing an appraisal system that fosters professional growth, aids teachers in refining their practices is paramount.

The evaluation system often relies on quantitative data, primarily centred on students' average grades, which may create conflicts of interest. As Odilov (2023) states, appraisal results impact teacher salaries, and educators may feel compelled to conceal shortcomings and manipulate performance metrics like student grades. To mitigate this, the evaluation criteria should encompass qualitative indicators that encourage a culture of quality, self-assessment, collaboration, and peer review. Conflicting indicators should be minimised or cross-referenced with standardised and external assessments of teachers' development to ensure objectivity.

Teacher appraisal currently operates independently of school monitoring and evaluation outcomes. The synergy between internal and external school evaluations and teacher appraisals would enhance overall school performance and instructional quality.

Similarities and differences

The development of teacher assessment systems, especially in the cases of Hungary and Uzbekistan, indicates a paradigm shift at the global level towards more dynamic competence-based assessment frameworks in education.

Aspects	Uzbekistan	Hungary
External sources of the Teacher's appraisal procedures	<p>Assessment of subject matter expertise, teaching practices, lesson planning, and instructional methods. A certificate is provided</p> <p>The committee consists of external experts.</p> <p>The external appraisal occurs nationally and may happen twice a year. (Career ladder).</p>	<p>Assessment of professional competences (9 competences) with 4 levels.</p> <p>A certificate is provided.</p> <p>The committee consists of two external experts and the representative of the school).</p> <p>This part of evaluation comes at certain points of the career. (Career ladder).</p> <p>Individual outcomes (3) and assessing 7 criteria of teacher's work. (centralized but adjusted to the school community).</p> <p>By the principal, the deputy or further professionals might be included once a year.</p>
Internal sources of the Teacher's appraisal procedures	<p>School heads determine the sources</p> <p>By school pedagogical council once a year.</p>	<p>See in table 2. More emphasis is on institutional assessment, and within the institutional assessment more emphasis is put on school and classroom practice.</p>
Proportion of the assessment of different sources and items	<p>More emphasis is on assessment and institutional appraisal. This comes in the form of their own desired goals and effective outcomes as part of what they view.</p>	<p>Appraisal determines salary progression. The emphasis is in portion of the salary structure. Consequences are related to the salary mainly.</p>
The impact on the Teacher's salary	<p>Appraisal determines salary progression of the Teacher as they develop into varied levels of leadership and engrossed engagement over time.</p>	<p>Appraisal determines salary progression. The emphasis is in portion of the salary structure. Consequences are related to the salary mainly.</p>
Methodology	<p>External evaluation: educational authorities or evaluators assess teachers against pre-defined standards, including classroom observations and student feedback, to gauge teaching effectiveness. (Quantitative metrics)</p> <p>Internal evaluation: Teachers reflect on their practices, set goals, and seek feedback from peers and administrators</p>	<p>External evaluation: detailed, large-scale evaluation system, set standards defined centrally, well trained human resources. (Quantitative metrics)</p> <p>Internal evaluation: absence of valid, reliable and objective methodology.</p>

within their professional environment to foster continuous improvement.

More emphasis on quantitative metrics in both external and internal evaluations to ensure a comprehensive assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Table 4: Comparing Uzbek teacher evaluation system to the Hungarian teacher evaluation system

In both countries (Table 4.), the evolution of second-generation career models can be detected: they are moving away from linear tenure-oriented models, focusing on ongoing professional development and performance assessment to improve teaching quality and educational results. Because of the centralised governmental measures, this transition has been more intensive in Hungary concerning the TCM rollout – since the early-2010s. The TCM functions as a career ladder in the Hungarian system with double aims. On the one hand, the TCM attempts to evaluate teachers' performance in the context of standardised competencies, specifying linear career paths from Trainee to Researcher teacher. On the other hand, Hungary highlights professional competencies and outlines its career progression policy to encourage teachers' lifelong professional development through an accountability culture and the pursuit of excellence.

Uzbekistan seems to be transitioning into a second-generation career framework too, although with its distinct characteristics. The assessment system is not as much centralised as in Hungary. Teacher performance evaluation is focusing on assessment rather on professional development. The career ladder is based on such criteria as teacher's qualifications and subject matter knowledge rather than on professional competencies. In the future, in Uzbekistan, one of the aims can be moving towards a competence-based evaluation system and focusing more on professional development in teaching to improve the quality of education. This metamorphosis is seen as venturing away from the retrogressive tenure-based frameworks towards more dynamic models that accentuate the effectiveness of educators and proceed to improve. Countries with a career ladder can set a good example for Uzbekistan, considering one of the most significant advantages of this model: it emphasises continuous professional development. Nevertheless, the amendments must be adapted to suit the nation's conditions and educational culture, which concerns respect for cultural identities and providing resources to meet the student's needs. The transition towards a more managerial type of sys-

tem raises certain dilemmas, e.g. whether it will encourage teachers' professional development or whether the measurement tools to be used will provide a valid assessment of teachers' performance.

Teacher appraisals take place in both countries at least once a year, and they are conducted by internal sources. As for the proportion of external and internal sources of teacher assessment, external sources determine the career paths for teachers in both countries, but the results of internal appraisals play a more decisive role in determining their salaries. The proportion of the items for internal appraisal is different in Uzbekistan and Hungary. Individual developmental goals add much more to the appraisal results in the former, while school- and classroom practice takes priority in the latter.

The teacher's salary scheme is much more dependent on the internal appraisal results in Hungary than in Uzbekistan. The new appraisal will bring about a major shift in the Hungarian system, but the consequences remain unclear at present.

The appraisal procedures in both countries rely on clearly quantitative measures: Uzbekistan focuses on students' average grades. In Hungary, the methodology will be based on scoring teachers' performance based on certain criteria, including students' achievements. This points to the need for qualitative indicators or the mixture of qualitative and quantitative data to avoid manipulating performance metrics like student grades in both countries. Therefore, self-assessment, collaboration, and peer review could be used as measuring tools for appraisal procedures.

There is one more feature that needs consideration. Teacher's appraisal currently operates in Uzbekistan independently of school monitoring and evaluation outcomes. We accept Odilov's view (2023) according to which the emphasis on school leaders' and educators' performance assessment, integrating school evaluation results with teacher appraisals can maximise the impact of both processes. The synergy between internal and external school evaluations and teacher appraisals promises to enhance overall school performance and instructional quality.

Conclusions

Our research compared Uzbek and Hungarian Teacher evaluation and appraisal systems. We aimed to find similarities, differences and challenges for decision-makers at different levels. The aspects of analysis were the evolution, the assessment criteria, the components and the methodology of teacher assessment. We also included the evolution of the salary scheme in both countries. Based on our results, we could identify dilemmas as well as possible future prospects for both systems; moreover, we clarified the basic principles of the further development of existing appraisal systems, which may enhance teacher job satisfaction: *balancing external and internal assessment, alignment with educational goals, incorporating multiple assessment criteria, promoting professional development, ensuring fairness and transparency, and continuous review and adaptation*. We hope that decision-makers will consider these principles when introducing any new measures in teacher assessment systems.

References

- Ball, S. (1994). *Education Reform: a critical and post-structural approach*. Open University Press.
- Bascia, N. & Rottmann, C. (2011). What's so important about teachers' working conditions? The fatal flow in North American educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(6), 787–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.543156>
- Bottery, M. (1996). The challenge to professionals from the new public management: implications for the teaching profession. *Oxford Review of Education*, 22, 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305498960220206>
- Braun, H. (2005). *Using Student Progress to Evaluate Teachers: A Primer on Value-Added Models*. Educational Teaching Service.
- Cazes, S., Hijzen, A. & Saint Martin, S. (2015). *Measuring and Assessing Job Quality: The OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 174*. OECD Publishing.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24(1), 249–305. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X024001249>
- Crehan, L. (2016). *Exploring the impact of career models on teacher motivation*. IIEP-UNESCO.

- Falus, I. (Ed.) (2011). *Tanári pályalkalmasság – kompetenciák – sztenderdek. Nemzetközi áttekintés*. Eszterházy Károly Főiskola.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. Jossey-Bass.
- Gewirtz, S. (1997). Post-welfarism and the reconstruction of teachers' work In the UK. *Journal of Education Policy*, 12, 217–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093970120402>
- Gomendio, M. (2017). *Empowering and Enabling teachers to Improve Equity and Outcomes for All. International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264273238-en>
- Hanushek, E. (2007). The single salary schedule and other issues of teacher pay. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 574–586.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01619560701602975>
- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice*, 6, 151–182.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/713698714>
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Isoré, M. (2009). *Teacher Evaluation: Current Practices in OECD Countries and Literature Review. OECD Education Working papers, No. 23*. OECD Publishing.
- Kane, T. & Staiger, D. (2012). *Gathering feedback for teaching. Combining high-quality observations with students surveys and achievement gains. MET Project Research Paper*. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Kotschy, B. (Ed.) (2011). *A pedagógussá válás és a szakmai fejlődés sztenderdjei*. Eszterházy Károly Főiskola.
- Marshall, K. (2005). “It's Time to Rethink Teacher Supervision and Evaluation”, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(10), 727–735.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508601004>
- Mead, S., Rotherham, A. & Brown, R. (2012). *The Hangover: Thinking About the Unintended Consequences of the Nation's Teacher Evaluation Binge, Teacher Quality 2.0*. American Enterprise Institute, Special Report 2, September.
- Mourshed, M., Barber, M. & Chijioke, C. (2010). *How the World's Most Improved School Systems Keep Getting Better*. McKinsey & Company.
http://iel.immix.ca/storage/6/1304014879/McKinsey_Full_Report_Nov_2010%282%29.pdf

- Odilov, A. (2023). Teacher Career Structure Reforms in Uzbekistan: The current Challenges and Lessons Learned from Top-performing Education Systems. *Science and Innovation*, 2(6), 30–47.
- OECD (2005). *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264018044-en>
- OECD (2009). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264068780-en>
- OECD (2013). *Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment in Education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190658-en>
- OECD (2020). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals*. TALIS. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
- Ozga, J. (1995). Deskilling a profession, In Busher, H. & Saran, R. (Eds.), *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools*. Kogan Page.
- Papay, J. (2012). Refocusing the debate: Assessing the purposes and tools of teacher evaluation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 2(1), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.1.v40p0833345w6384>
- Santiago, P. & Benavides, F. (2009). *Teacher Evaluation: A Conceptual Framework and Examples of Country Practices*. OECD. www.oecd.org/edu/evaluationpolicy
- Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: how professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Vandervoort, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A. & Berliner, D. (2004). “National Board certified teachers and their students' achievement”. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(46). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v12n46.2004>
- Viac, C. & Fraser, P. (2020). *Teachers' well-being: A framework for data collection and analysis*. OECD Education Working Papers. OECD Publishing.
- Wagner, W., Göllner, R., Helmke, A. & Trutwien, U. (2013). Construct validity of students' perceptions of instructional quality is high, but not perfect: Dimensionality and Generalizability of domain independent assessments. *Learning and Instruction*, 28, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.03.003>
- Wallace, T., Kelcey, B. & Ruzek, E. (2016). What can student perception surveys tell us about teaching? Empirically testing the underlying structure of the Tripod student perception survey. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(6), 1834–1868. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216671864>

Legislative documents

Hatályos Jogszabályok Gyűjteménye (2023). 2023. évi LII. törvény a pedagógusok új életpályájáról. Retrieved from <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a2300052.tv> (2024. 05. 07.)

Kormány (2023). 402/2023. (VIII. 30.) Kormányrendelet a pedagógusok új életpályájáról szóló törvény szerinti felzárkózó és kedvezményezett települések listájáról, valamint egyes közneveléssel összefüggő kormányrendeletek módosításáról. Retrieved from https://jogkodex.hu/jsz/statusz_tv_2023_52_torveny_5005914?ts=2023-07-16#ss3201 (2024. 05. 07.)

Kormány (2024). 3/2024. (I.18.) Kormányrendelet a tanárbéremeléshez szükséges egyes kormányrendeleti szabályokról (p. 77). Retrieved from <https://magyarkozlony.hu/dokumentumok/3cbaed189365674eb11f73447fa9c852375d6e47/megtekintes> (2024. 05. 07.)

Belügyminiszter (2024). 18/2024. (IV. 4.) Belügyminiszteri rendelet a pedagógusok teljesítményértékeléséről. Retrieved from <https://magyarkozlony.hu/dokumentumok/1e954e2d1ca922ab555dc33cae0febb2d6d38ff6/megtekintes> (2024. 05. 07.)

Néhány megfontolandó szempont a pedagógusok munkahelyi elégedettségének javításához: az üzbég és a magyar pedagógus teljesítmény-értékelési rendszerek összehasonlító elemzése

A magyar kormány által bevezetett teljesítményértékelés a pedagógus értékelés rendszerén belül arra sarkallt bennünket, hogy nemzetközi viszonylatban feltérképezzük a létező pedagóguséletpálya-modelleket, azon belül a fizetéshez kötött egyéni értékelési formákat, valamint elvégezzük a magyar és üzbég életpályamodell, valamint pedagógus teljesítményértékelés összehasonlítását. Az elemzés szempontjai az értékelési rendszer fejlődése, az értékelési eljárás és az értékelés kritériumai és módszerei. Célunk, hogy rávilágítsunk néhány fontos szempontra a döntéshozók számára akkor, amikor bevezetnek vagy megváltoztatnak egy értékelési rendszert. Reméljük, e szempontok mérlegelése támogatja a pedagógusok jóllétét és minőségi szakmai munkáját.

Kulcsszavak: pedagóguséletpálya-modell, pedagógusértékelés, fizetési kategóriák