

American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)

e-ISSN :2378-703X

Volume-5, Issue-1, pp-130-137

[www.ajhssr.com](http://www.ajhssr.com)

Research Paper

Open Access

## EVALUATING A PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN GORONTALO

AzisNoho Kasim, Abdul HarisPanai, AstinLukum, Arfan Arsyad

*Postgraduate Program Gorontalo State University*

**ABSTRACT:** This research set aims to evaluate the assessment program of junior high school teacher performances in Gorontalo, which included policy supports, assessment program resources, implementation, and outcomes. This research used an evaluation approach with a descriptive method with the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model. Data were analyzed using a qualitative descriptive method. Findings indicate that (1) Policy supports for the assessment program of junior high school teachers encompassed the distribution of target areas for school supervisors, activation of principals' work deliberation (MKKS), school supervisors' work deliberation (MKPS), subject teachers' work deliberation (MGMP), and application of online teacher performance assessment, (2) Teachers, principals, assessors, and school supervisors had poor ideas of what a teacher performance assessment concept was, (3) The implementation of junior high school teacher performance assessment was not aligned with the standard procedures and the supervision did not meet the standard as well, (4) The teacher performance assessment resulted in a mean existing in the criteria **good**. Teachers whose statuses were upgraded in less than five years increased in number but in regard to scientific article writing, their activities were considered low. That situation generates a low level of the performance assessment program objective achievement of junior high school in Gorontalo.

**Keywords:** *Teacher Performances, CIPP Research Model, Teacher Performance Assessment Program*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Performance assessment programs are based on the instruction of the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 16/2009 on Teacher Functional Position and Credit Scores. The programs have several objectives, e.g., improving teacher competencies and performances and promoting teacher professions and careers. The teacher performance assessment program was enacted in January 2013 at each educational level. The program demanded teachers be regularly assessed, in regard to their performance, once a year. By the regulation enactment, all educational institution levels, both primary and secondary, are obliged to conduct teacher performance assessments. The program is not intended to burden teachers, rather, it develops professionalism in teachers as the dignity of professions is determined by the quality service delivered by the interested professions.

In more elaborative detail, the teacher performance assessment designated in the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 16/2009 includes the assessment of each of the primary tasks of teachers in relation to their career development, rank, and position. The performance assessment is focused on four competencies, i.e., pedagogical competency, personality competency, professional competency, and social competency. A performance assessment is implemented to manifest professionalism in teachers as educators and hence allows them to deliver educational services to students through quality learning/teaching activities.

In Gorontalo, teacher performance assessments had been implemented since 2013. However, in accordance with our preliminary research, the implementation of performance assessments in junior high school teachers was poor. Evidently, several educational institutions had not arranged any plan corresponding to the assessment implementation. Additionally, some others did implement the assessments but overlooked standard procedures. We also found that teachers' and principals' apprehension of teacher performance assessments was not uniform, and the assessment outcomes were left aside in making sustainable profession development programs. As such, evaluations of the implementation of teacher performance assessments in the respective junior high education units are strongly required. Program evaluations are intended to understand, analyze, review, and correct the process of teacher performance assessment implementation. From evaluations, the outcomes expected are unqualified aspects which obviously need rectification and complementation and an assessment implementation which complies with applicable regulations. Besides, evaluations aim to elevate

teacher competencies and professionalism, allowing them to be professional workers with standard profession principles.

Based on the explanation aforementioned, we were interested in studying the issues and writing research titled “**Evaluating the Assessment Program of Junior High School Teacher Performances in Gorontalo**”. This research aims to evaluate the assessment program of junior high school teacher performances in Gorontalo, including the program policy supports, resources, implementation, and outcomes.

## II. METHODS

This research used a descriptive method with the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product) model. The schools researched were 20 junior high schools in 19 subdistricts. Research subjects were selected using a purposive sampling method. Individuals regarded as informants were those who understood the issues of a performance assessment program for junior high school teachers in Gorontalo. Data collection techniques were interviews, observation, and documentation.

## III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Findings

#### 1. The Results of Context Evaluation

##### a. Policy Supports for the Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers in Gorontalo

To the teacher performance assessment program, the Department of Education and Culture in Gorontalo gave some supports, such as dividing target schools for school supervisors to monitor, assist, guide, and help school principals in terms of the implementation of the teacher performance assessment program, activating school supervisors’ work deliberation (MKPS), school principals’ work deliberation (MKKS), and subject teachers’ work deliberation (MGMP), implementing online teacher performance assessments, and making the outcomes of the teacher performance assessment as references to promote teachers. Responsible policymakers had adequately comprehended the teacher performance assessment program and its underpinning regulations. Nevertheless, the program was still poorly implemented, so was the program evaluation.

##### b. Policymakers’ Understanding of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers in Gorontalo

We could safely argue that policymakers in the Department of Education in Gorontalo had adequately understood the teacher performance assessment program and the objectives. They also had understood what tasks and responsibilities they had to finish were regarding the implementation of the teacher performance assessment program. However, several tasks and responsibilities, e.g., stepwise evaluations of teacher performance assessment program implemented in schools, had not been finished yet so we could not identify the degree or the quality of the implementation of performance assessment for junior high school teachers.

#### 2. The Result of Input Evaluation

##### a. Teachers’ Understanding of the Concept of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers

Junior high school teachers built the concept of a performance assessment program upon what they experienced after principals assessed their performances. Furthermore, regarding the performance assessment procedures, they made a relevant conception based on procedures implemented by assessors. They set more focuses on some aspects to be assessed, including attributes needed in a performance assessment. However, teachers did not have a chance to participate in a sustainable profession development (PKB) program because their schools did not arrange it.

##### b. Principals’ Understanding of the Concept of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers

Principals did not apprehend teacher performance assessments, with respect to either concept, theories, or technical layers. In regard to concepts and theories, they did not comprehend the correlation between teacher performance assessments and sustainable profession development, which consequently, they only implemented the first but abandoned the latter. Additionally, in terms of technical layers, some teacher performance assessment procedures were not implemented. Principals were identified as careless in collating the plan of teacher performance assessment program implementation, including the program to the school activity plan and budget (RKAS), and making a decree of principal to corroborate the determination of the team, comprising partners, representatives of student parents, and representatives of students, engaged in teacher performance assessments.

**c. Assessors' Understanding of the Concept of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers**

Assessors had not comprehended teacher performance assessments, regarding either the concept, theories, or technical layers. With respect to the concept and theories, assessors did not understand the procedures and rules of teacher performance assessments. Meanwhile, in regard to technical layers, they never had necessary meetings with other assessors to make deliberations in relation to assessment techniques applied. At the observation level, assessors did not keep track of observation and monitoring, instead, they only focused on pedagogic and professional competencies. As a result, personality and social competencies were not attested and thus the essence of teacher performance assessments as a professional attempt made to promote professionalism, achievements, and performances in teachers was still obscured.

**d. School Supervisors' Understanding of the Concept of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers**

Junior high school supervisors had understood teacher performance assessments in terms of technical layers, e.g., visiting schools to verify the outcomes of teacher performance assessments school principals or appointed teachers implemented, making coordination and monitoring of the implementation of teacher performance assessments, and monitoring and evaluating the implementation of teacher performance assessments. However, they did not understand the concept and theories. Unfortunately, their understanding of teacher performance assessments was limited in rules and procedures mentioned in the guidelines, making them neglect the improvement of the quality of teacher performance assessments implemented in each target school. We identified the latter issue in target school citizens who did not share the same concept of teacher performance assessments.

**e. The Profile of Junior High School Teachers in Gorontalo**

Regarding the qualification aspect, the majority of junior high school teachers had passed the National Education Standards (SNP). 605 or 94% of teachers had completed either bachelor's, master's, or doctor's degree, whereas the rest, 42 in number or 94% did not fulfill the standards for not passing even the bachelor's degree. Furthermore, regarding the rank aspect, five teachers (1) had the rank/group II, while 326 (50%) and 316 (49%) teachers had the group III and the group IV, respectively. Also, 562 junior high school teachers (87%) were certified, while 85 (13) were not. As such, the teachers, in regard to their performances, could still be developed through teacher performance assessments.

**f. Supporting Facilities and Infrastructures for Teacher Performance Assessments**

Facilities and infrastructures provided at schools, such as principals' rooms, teachers' rooms, study rooms, laboratories, libraries, tables and chairs, the Internet, textbooks, and reference books, had fulfilled the Minimum Service Standards (SPM) for Primary Education. On the other hand, science practicum instruments, textbooks, learning media, and plans of teacher performance assessment program implementation had not. However, those facilities and infrastructures had been able to adequately support the enhancement of junior high school teacher performances in teaching.

**g. Funds and School Budget Availability**

All financing activities in junior high schools in Gorontalo were funded by school operational assistance (BOS) funds. The use of BOS funds should refer to technical guidance and follow RKAS. Nevertheless, schools did not include the teacher performance assessment program in school activity plans and budget due to principals' limited understanding of BOS fund management.

**3. The Result of Process Evaluation****a. The Implementation of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers by Principals**

Performance assessments for junior high school teachers by principals, based on our evaluation, had not been properly performed in accordance with the applicable procedures and rules since some aspects were still poorly even not implemented. Those aspects were (1) principals' coordination with assessors engaged in teacher performance assessments was still poor, (2) fact recording and data collection based on observation and monitoring did not include all teacher competencies, rather, they were focused on pedagogic and professional aspects. In consequence, teacher personality and social aspects were not recorded, (3) facts collected from observing and monitoring each of the competencies were only recorded for the sake of administrative aspects in teacher performance assessments, (4) principals relied on Microsoft Excel to perform teacher performance assessments without concerning the procedures and rules written on guidance for the teacher performance assessment implementation, and (5) the result of teacher performance assessments was never followed up

through the sustainable profession development. Consequently, the essential value of teacher performance assessments and sustainable profession development, as two professional attempts made to promote professionalism, achievement, and performances in teachers, had not been as expected.

#### **b. The Implementation of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers by Assessors**

Performance assessments for junior high school teachers by assessors, according to the result of our evaluation, did not meet the standard teacher performance assessment stipulated. In other words, several stages had been impartially conducted, whereas others were partially and even not conducted. Some stages which had been performed are (1) Coordination between teachers was assessed, including delivering schedules and media teachers had to prepare, (2) teacher performance assessments had been implemented in accordance with the time in the guidance for teacher performance assessments, (3) the outcome of teacher performance assessments was used to calculate credit numbers, and (4) the outcome was reported to the Department of Culture and Education in Gorontalo. Additionally, stages partially fulfilled were (1) in the data collection stage, recorded fact and data resulted from teacher performance observation and monitoring did not cover four teacher competencies. Rather, they were only focused on pedagogic and professional aspects, (2) in the scoring stage, there was no fact and data classification by competency indicators. Instead, scores, in the form of numbers, were directly given without reporting factual evidence and supporting data on the assessment form provided. Finally, teacher performance assessment stages which were not implemented by assessors were (1) there was no meeting between assessors where they could uniform insights relevant to the implementation of teacher performance assessments and fairly divide tasks and responsibilities, (2) assessors did not give additional assessments to teachers when we all knew that teachers usually had sedentary jobs, such as vice principals, heads of laboratory, and heads of library, and (3) no follow-ups responding to the outcome of teacher performance assessments, e.g., teacher profession assistance and development through the sustainable performance development, were identified.

#### **c. The Implementation of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers by School Supervisors**

We had evaluated that supervisors had implemented their tasks related to teacher performance assessments well. They had verified the outcome of teacher performance assessments implemented by principals and assessors, partners, parents, and students. Also, they had regularly monitored and evaluated the implementation of teacher performance assessments and guided and assisted engaged principals, assessors, and teachers in teacher performance assessments. However, those activities were not adequate to work out serious issues in the implementation of teacher performance assessments as we also identified some overlapping and dissimilar opinions regarding teacher performance assessments between supervisors. In response to the latter situation, one of the best solutions to manifest a quality implementation of teacher performance assessments which was in accordance with the procedures and rules was giving training to all engaged components in teacher performance assessments, i.e., principals, teachers, and school supervisors.

### **4. The Result of Product Evaluation**

#### **a. The Outcome of the Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers in Gorontalo**

Based on the teacher performance assessments conducted to 239 teachers, 130 teachers, or 54.39%, had a performance score categorized as “**excellent (A)**”, while 108, or 45.19%, and 1, or 0.42%, had a performance score categorized as “**good (B)**” and “**fairly good (C)**”, respectively. Accordingly, teachers who had achieved the standards or acquired scores categorized as **A** and **B** were 238, or 99.58%, and the rest, which was one teacher, or 0.42%, was categorized as **C**.

#### **b. Teacher Rank and Functional Status Promotion**

Evidently, of 239 teachers, 177, or 74.06%, were promoted in less than five years. The number consisted of 13 teachers promoted from the rank/group III/a to III/b, 37 from III/b to III/c, 53 from III/c to III/d, 40 from III/d to IV/a, and 34 from IV/a to IV/b. Meanwhile, teachers who got promoted after five years were 62, or 25.94%.

#### **c. Scientific Research Made by Junior High School Teachers**

Based on our observation, of 239 teachers, 47 or 19.67% were active in making research, whereas the rest, 192 or 80.33% were not.

#### **d. The Degree of the Accomplishment of the Objectives of Performance Assessment Program for Junior High School Teachers in Gorontalo**

The degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high teachers in Gorontalo was obviously seen in activities implemented in each school to achieve the objectives of the performance assessment program, i.e., escalating teacher competencies and performances and improving teacher professions, careers, and ranks. Escalating teacher competencies and performances was possible to be conducted using the performance assessment program, but improving teacher professions should be conducted through sustainable profession development and career development by these particular methods, namely assignments, rank promotion, and promotion. Referring to our evaluation, the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high school teachers in Gorontalo, in respect to escalating teacher competencies and performances, was 56.88%, whereas that, in respect to promoting teacher career and ranks, was 54.92%. On average, the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of a performance assessment program for junior high school teachers was then 55.90%.

## Discussion

### 1. Context Evaluation Stages

The discussion of context encompassed the discussion of the policy supports targeted to the performance assessment program for junior high school teachers in Gorontalo and policymakers' understanding of the teacher performance assessment concept. We found that the implementation of performances assessment for junior high teachers in Gorontalo had been following the laws, minister regulations, the decree of the head of relevant department, and circular letters. These kinds of regulations also underpinned the policy made by the relevant department to manage teacher performance assessments. Nevertheless, several government regulations, such as the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 16/2018 on Assigning Teachers as School Principals Article 12 on Periodization System of School Principal Position remained abandoned.

Some policies made by the relevant department regarding the implementation of manage teacher performance assessments were the division of target areas for supervisions, the establishment of MKKS, MKPS, and MGMP forums, and implementation of *e-kinerja* for all teachers to reinforce and support the implementation of manage teacher performance assessments. The Department of Education and Culture in Gorontalo used the outcome of manage teacher performance assessments to promote teacher positions and conduct sustainable profession development (PKB). However, the policy implementation could be partial as all education components did not gain a full understanding of it. The Department of Education as the policymaker, supervisors, and principals as the implementors, and teachers as the subject whose performances were accessed did not share the same perception of the teacher performance assessment program. teacher performance assessment activities were only regarded as routine activities. After the activity outcomes were reported, there were no follow-ups. As such, the outcomes of teacher performance assessments should be followed up, analyzed, and evaluated by policymakers. The Department of Education and Culture in Gorontalo should optimize the tasks given by principals to assist their target schools in planning and implementing teacher performance assessments and optimize the activities MKKS, MKPS, and MGMP should conduct to increase the quality of teacher performance assessment implementation.

Policymakers had apprehended the teacher performance assessment program and regulations which underpinned the implementation of teacher performance assessment. However, field implementation was still poor. Besides, the evaluation of teacher performance assessment program implementation remained untreated, rendering no accurate data to policymakers which would likely use the data to make other policies, especially those pertinent to the rectification and improvement of the quality of teacher performance assessment program implementation in each of the education units.

### 2. Input Evaluation Stages

Inputs discussed in this research were the resources to the performance assessment program for junior high school teachers in Gorontalo, i.e., teacher understandings, principal understandings, assessor understanding, and institution understandings of teacher performance assessment concept, junior high school teacher profiles, supporting facilities and infrastructures, and school funds and budget.

In fact, we found that with respect to the teacher performance assessment concept, junior high school teachers only knew the definition, implementation time, aspects assessed, underpinning regulations, and methods. Meanwhile, in regard to the procedures and principles, their ideas of those only rested on their experiences when being assessed by principals or assessors because most of them conceded that they had never participated in either training or workshops regarding teacher performance assessments. Due to these factors, teacher understandings of teacher performance assessment concept varied, even we identified several of whom who had an insight that teacher performance assessment procedures were no other than class supervision. The various concepts were reasonable as in implementing teacher performance assessment, principals used the same procedures as that they used when supervising classes. Often, supervision scores were converted into teacher performance assessment scores. These would likely attenuate the teacher performance assessment concept.

Additionally, principals' understandings of the teacher performance assessment concept did not completely understand the procedures. Also, in terms of technical layers, some stages, such as planning the teacher performance assessment program, including the teacher performance assessment program into the school activity plan and budget (RKAS), determining assessor teams comprising partners, parent representatives, and student representatives in accordance with the principal decree, were skipped. However, principals had actually attempted to implement teacher performance assessments following PermenegPAN and RB Number 16/2009. Several undesired situations during the implementation of teacher performance assessments were impacts of many factors, e.g., teacher performance assessment socialization to principals was little, not all principals had participated in teacher performance assessment training or workshops, principals had little time to learn guidelines for teacher performance assessments, guidance and assistance principals should have to implement teacher performance assessments were poor, and principals did not understand the procedure of teacher performance assessment implementation.

What assessors perceived on teacher performance assessment concepts was majorly based on what they experienced after observing teacher performance assessments principals conducted. They apparently lacked a full understanding of procedures and rules to perform teacher performance assessments, could not differentiate facts and assumptions when recording observations, did not understand how to classify facts, data, and other supporting evidence records by the indicators of each competency. This situation might be a result of that assessors had never partaken specific training to teacher performance assessment assessors and that either principals or school supervisors gave poor assistance regarding teacher performance assessment techniques to them. This was truly regretted when assessor understandings had a great impact on the stages of teacher performance assessment implementation.

In regard to school supervisors' understanding of the teacher performance assessment concept, we found that they did not thoroughly understand the concept, especially that related to the procedures of teacher performance assessment implementation. However, their roles in the implementation of teacher performance assessments should be appreciated. They had verified the outcomes of teacher performance assessments which had been conducted by principals and/or teachers appointed, made coordination related to and supervised the implementation of teacher performance assessments, and monitored as well as evaluated the implementation of teacher performance assessments. Nevertheless, due to their understandings of teacher performance assessment diverse, several aspects, such as elevating quality assurance by the system through planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating, and fixing the quality of teacher performance assessment implementation remained untreated.

Additionally, in relation to junior high school teachers in Gorontalo, most junior high schools, in respect to the qualification aspect, 94% of whom had met national education standards and 87% had been certified. Enhancing quality of teachers, the Gorontalo Government had issued some policies, e.g., scholarships granted for teachers who had not graduated from a bachelor's degree to continue their tertiary education, instructions for certified teachers to be able to operate computers and practice IT, and hence enabling them to access needed information relevant to their expertise, and instructions for all teachers to make self-development through MGMP activities, workshops, or other relevant training.

Regarding facilities and infrastructures, the majority of schools had met the standards stipulated in Permendiknas No. 24/2007 on Standard Facilities and Infrastructure for primary schools/Islamic primary schools, junior high schools/Islamic junior high schools, and senior high schools/Islamic senior high schools. Most schools had been equipped with adequate infrastructures comprising the principal's room, teachers' room, classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. Contrastively, other facilities, such as reference books, enrichment books, and learning media should be escalated. We observed that learning media were not adequate in each of the schools. They only had learning media for natural sciences, e.g., science kit, torso, animal and plant charts, learning media for social sciences, e.g., maps, globes, photos, and learning media for math, e.g., math kits. Moreover, the BOS fund was still not used to fund the implementation of the teacher performance assessment program, and hence the program was excluded from the school activity plan and budget (RKAS).

### 3. Process Evaluation Process

Both principals and assessors in Gorontalo did not meet the procedures and rules regarding the implementation of performance assessments for junior high school teachers. They built poor coordination with assessors engaged in the implementation. Data collection and fact recording from the result of observation and monitoring abandoned several teacher competencies. The two activities were more oriented to pedagogic and professional aspects and overlooked teacher personality and social aspects. Additionally, scoring did not follow fact and data recording. Rather, both principals and assessors relied on Excel application to conduct teacher performance assessments without referring to the procedures of teacher performance assessments stipulated. Also, the outcome of teacher performance assessments was not followed up by the sustainable profession development (PKB) program as a professional attempt to develop professionalism in teachers.

However, assessors had verified the outcome of teacher performance assessments performed by principals and assessors, monitored as well as evaluated the implementation of teacher performance assessments, and rendered assistance and guidance to principals, assessors, and teachers in regard to the implementation of teacher performance assessments. Those activities, nevertheless, were not adequate to mitigate diverse issues in the implementation of performance assessments for junior high school teachers.

#### 4. Product Evaluation Stage

The discussion of product in this research encompassed (a) the outcome of performance assessments for junior high school teachers in Gorontalo, (b) the promotion of teachers' functional rank/position, (c) junior high school teachers' scientific research, and (d) the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high teachers in Gorontalo. Findings indicate that the majority of teachers (54.39%) showed excellent performances, while the rest, which were 45.39% and 0.42% in percentage, showed good and fairly good performances, respectively. However, teacher performances could not describe the real teacher performance as what it was like in the field because the assessment process did not follow the procedures and rules. However, the outcomes had been extensively used to quantify teacher credit numbers, resulting in an increase in the number of junior high school teachers who were promoted with academic tenure of fewer than five years (74.06%), while the rest, 25.94%, were promoted after five years of tenure. However, most teachers had a fixed rank/group at IV/b for teachers who wanted to be promoted to the rank/group of IV/b or above, they had to write scientific articles and get them published in journals. Besides, teachers' motivation and abilities to write scientific research (KTI) were low. Only 19.67% of them were active in writing, whereas the rest, 80.33%, were not. However, scientific research made was only to meet the promotion requirements, but not to develop teacher professionalism. These situations should concern all parties, especially policymakers in the Department of Education in Gorontalo. They should make strategies solution which could increase teachers' motivation and abilities to write scientific research. Some relevant activities could be convened, such as arranging a scientific research competition and facilitating teachers in participating in a research seminar or publication. These two activities were crucial to make teachers apprehend and realize that scientific research played strategic roles in developing teacher professionalism. Abilities to write scientific research should be mastered by teachers. It was prohibited that teachers showed apathy as they perceived inability to write research, developing reluctance and making them give up when demanded to write it.

Some of the findings, which were the outcome of teacher performance assessment, teacher rank promotion, and scientific research were three aspects which could determine the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high teachers in Gorontalo. The degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high teachers in Gorontalo in relation to teacher competency and performance improvement was 61.04%, and that in relation to teacher career and rank promotion was 54.92%. Accordingly, the mean of the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the teacher performance assessment program was 57.98%. Although the degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the teacher performance assessment program had not met the objectives, it had generated a bigger chance for teachers who wanted to develop their competencies and performances and careers and ranks to be promoted. The teacher performance assessment program gave teachers appreciations in the form of promotion. For instance, teachers could be promoted as principals or school supervisors, even they could be promoted to have structural positions in the Gorontalo government office. Those appreciations were based on several factors, two of which were achievements and ranks. As such, the teacher performance assessment program should be sustained and elevated in terms of its implementation to assist and develop teacher professionalism.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The Department of Education and Culture had adequately supported the performance assessment program for junior high teachers. The supports were activating MKKS, MKPS, and MGMP and implementing online teacher performance assessments. However, in regard to resources, other actors of the teacher performance assessment program did not comprehend the concept so some of its stages were not implemented. Furthermore, we also identified poor monitoring. Even though the outcome of teacher performance assessment resulted in teacher performances with a **good** category and having met the standards, the activity of writing scientific research was low. This impacted a low degree of the accomplishment of the objectives of the performance assessment program for junior high teachers in Gorontalo.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Arikunto, Suharsimi, 2013. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [2] Arikunto, Suharsimi, dan Cepi Safruddin Abdul Jabar. 2009. *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoretis Praktis bagi Mahasiswa dan Praktisi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara

- [3] Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2008. *Penilaian Kinerja Guru*. Jakarta
- [4] Elviya, Diana and Desi Nurhikmahyanti, 2014. *Peran Pengawas Sekolah Dalam Penilaian Kinerja Guru Di SDN Sukowati Kecamatan Bungah Kabupaten Gresik*. Jurnal Inspirasi Manajemen Pendidikan, Vol. 4 No. 4, April 2014, Universitas Negeri Surabaya
- [5] Kemdiknas, Direktorat Jenderal Peningkatan Mutu Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan, 2010. *Buku 2. Pedoman Pelaksanaan Penilaian Kinerja Guru*, Jakarta
- [6] Kemdikbud, Direktur Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan 2016. *Pedoman Pengelolaan Penilaian Kinerja Guru*. Jakarta
- [7] Mahsunah, Dian. 2012. *Kebijakan Pengembangan Profesi*. Badan PSDMPK-PMP
- [8] Muryadi, AgustanicoDwi. 2017. *Model Evaluasi Program dalam Penelitian Evaluasi*. Jurnal Ilmiah Penjas ((Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Pengajaran). Vol. 3 No. 1 (2017). <http://ejournal.utp.ac.id/index.php/JIP/article/view/538> (retrieved 20<sup>th</sup> December 2019)
- [9] Muzayanah. 2011. *Evaluasi program pendidikan*. Jakarta: Postgraduate Program UNJ
- [10] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2007 tentang *Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Kompetensi Guru*, Jakarta.
- [11] Sugiyono, 2016. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta