

Teacher Effectiveness Evaluation and not Existing Evaluation in Greek Public Schools

Anna Debrenlieva-Koutsouki

South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Faculty of Pedagogy, Blagoevgrad

Received 22 February 2018 ▪ Revised 30 May 2018 ▪ Accepted 10 June 2018

Abstract

In the Greek public schools, the teachers' performance evaluation in any form was terminated in 1982, as the inspection carried out up to that point led to a number of negative consequences. Over the last 30 years, this issue has been discussed at the scientific, political and labor union level. Obviously, the situation is inconsistent with the recommendations of the European Institutions, pedagogical science, practice in most countries in Europe, North and South America and Australia, as well as public expectations of state education in the country. In conclusion, it should be stressed that it is necessary to provide answers to a number of questions as to which changes need to be made, which models, methods, criteria and procedures are best suited to the application of specific conditions, how the teacher assessment tool will be linked to the high expectations of such an activity and the mandatory objectivity at all levels and by all participants.

Keywords: teachers' performance, teachers' performance evaluation, teachers' performance assessment, educational system, school law.

1. Introduction

In today's society as a whole, but in a number of more sensitive areas, evaluation has become an integral part of their existence and social function. Indeed, given the current complicated economic conditions on a national and global scale, and hence the difficulties in allocating funds to individual sectors, the evaluation and assessment of each situation is expected to play an increasingly important role. In addition, the need to increase productivity and achieve world-class quality necessitates the continuous development and implementation of more adequate tools to achieve real and objective assessments across the board, materials, resources, institutions, citizens, etc.

“Man has always sought self-improvement. It is the thirst for knowledge that is the characteristic trait that drives us to develop” (Debrenlieva-Koutsouki, 2017: 2). In this context, evaluating the effectiveness of organizations, teachers and students in many countries is considered to be particularly important as a country's economic progress is directly related to the quality of the education offered.

Every student deserves a good teacher. Most educators agree that great teachers are crucial to the success of students (Кутюкис, 2015). However, the question of whether the school is doing enough to evaluate teachers objectively and accurately and how to use this information to

improve the quality of education is constantly relevant, both in theory and in practice in any self-respecting educational system.

The need of teachers' performance evaluation can be seen at three levels: economic, psycho-pedagogical and practical:

(A) At the financial and economic level, the problem stems mainly from the limitation of resources and commodities in modern societies, which puts its mark in all areas of public life. In the economic sphere, the assessment of the processes of production, distribution and consumption of goods is one of the approaches to a reasonable cost allocation and ensuring the efficiency of both production and consumption. "And since in practice the opportunities for conducting any experiments are minimized, maximum effort is needed to achieve the desired performance. As far as education is concerned, spending on the average per pupil is considered to be high, it is also necessary to optimize the costs, keep it at a reasonable level and always be in line with the expected outcome" (Δημητρόπουλος, 2010: 34).

(B) At the psycho-pedagogical level, the need for assessment is associated with the assumption that teachers and school are expected to understand and facilitate the learning process. This dimension of evaluation is directly related to the use of effective didactic teaching methods and the implementation of policies and measures that, on the one hand, facilitate learning and, on the other hand, reduce the waste of time, effort and financial resources, while achieving sustained improvement in the effectiveness of educational efforts.

(C) At the management-practical level, the evaluation is related to the solution of practical, administrative-management, educational or other similar issues such as selection and career development of staff, promotion and success of students, planning in the school organization, etc.

Although in practice it has been done for millennia, the organization and systematization of the accumulated knowledge in this area, especially in terms of human behavior, has been developing only in the last century. Founded at the end of the second decade of the 21st century, more and more countries are seeking to assess and modernize their education systems in general, as part of this process is also the teachers' performance assessment.

All of this is reflected in a number of European Union documents and policies. Following the signing of Lisbon Strategy in 2000 and the formulated educational objectives education and training policies became central to the creation and transmission of knowledge and are a determining factor in each society's potential for innovation (Council, 2004: 2). In 2002 the Education and Training 2010 work program was adopted, which outlines the way of achieving the objectives. To the first strategic objective "Improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training in the European Union" objective 1.1 is defined of the program "Improving the education and training of teachers and trainers". It emphasizes the key role of the teacher in enhancing the quality of education and hence in the development of society and the economy. As major issues to Goal 1.1 of the work program: identifying the skills that teachers must possess in order to respond to the changing needs of society; providing conditions for teachers to be supported during their initial training and on-the-job training; making the profession of a teacher a desired and attracting choice, retaining highly qualified and motivated staff in it (Μιχόβα, 2014: 159). This is the direction in which the decisions of the Education and Training 2020 framework are headed. The framework sets four common EU objectives to address challenges in education and training systems by 2020 (European Commission, 2018):

- Making lifelong learning and mobility a reality;
- Improving the quality and efficiency of education and training;
- Promoting equity, social cohesion, and active citizenship;

- Enhancing creativity and innovation, including entrepreneurship, at all levels of education and training.

In this respect, it is particularly impressive to find that it is impossible to find a solution to this question for more than a quarter of a century in the Greek education system, after the rejection of the long-standing evaluation by the inspectors. This, on the one hand, creates tension because society, and in particular taxpayers, expect an assessment of the work of teachers – how they teach their children, and on the other hand generates heated discussions about the democracy, objectivity, harm or benefit of introducing such procedures in the education system also involved are political and trade union factors, and ultimately school as an institution becomes a battleground of various interests. The effect of all this is one – assessing the teachers' performance does not exist.

2. Abolition of the assessment and inspector in Greece (80's of the 20th century)

According to Greek legislation, teacher's performance assessment is understood as the procedure of evaluating the provided education quality and the degree to which its goals and objectives have been achieved (Νόμος 2525, Art. 8, 1997). Its aim is to improve and quality upgrade all the factors in the educational process and to continuously improve pedagogical communication and relationship with students (Νόμος 2986, Art. 4, 2002) and more specifically:

- The enhancement of their self-knowledge in terms of their scientific composition, their pedagogical training and their teaching capacity;
- The formation an established image of their performance in work;
- The effort to improve their offer to the student by making use of the assessors' findings and guidance;
- The identification of their weaknesses in the provision of their teaching work and the effort to eliminate them;
- The satisfaction of teachers from recognizing their work and motivating those wishing to evolve and serve in positions of education staff;
- The identification of their training needs and their training's content determination;
- The cultivating of a climate inspiring mutual respect and trust (Νόμος 2986, Art. 5, 2002).

Following the course of the European Union after 1982 where everyone agreed with the evaluation in education but disagreed with the way and methods of evaluation "*in Greece, the education system is given higher priority in issues such as "democratic school", emergence of innovative and research actions, the cultivation of critical and creative thinking as well as the formation of a new way of regulating the relations between the factors of the educational system*" (Ζιάκα, 2006: 64). In the context of the above priorities, the inspector institution is abolished and the school counselor is institutionalized, who is now responsible for pedagogical guidance and participation in the evaluation and training of teachers and for encouraging any effort for scientific research in the field education (Νόμος 1304, Art. 1, 1982). From this point on, practically ending the teachers' performance assessment in state schools in the country.

The Greek education system can not be excluded from the generally negative context of reception and treatment of official forms of educational assessment. Even at the start of a dialogue to introduce an evaluation model, the reactions that are being caused all the time are striking (Τσιουπλή, 2016). The reasons for this, almost automatic, rejection of the assessment should be sought in the deeply traumatic experience of "inspections" in the country over the past decade. The situation was further exacerbated by the teacher evaluation system that prevailed. In any case, evaluation is by nature a delicate matter that often causes disagreements, frictions or even conflicts. In particular, however, the evaluation system in force at that particular time was particularly useful for creating friction and conflict. There was a system of numerical evaluation

of teachers with five points. The score at these five points was given the overall rating, which was of great importance for his career development. Once the score is in place, the teacher's questions, weaknesses, and gaps that may be present can not come to light and can not be questions for the inspector. *"The teacher is obliged to conceal all of this in order to avoid the negative impact on his rating, which played a decisive role in service changes at all levels. Transfers, postings, placements in schools of the teacher's preference, but also career developments (promotional wage scales, etc.) depended largely on the general rating of the teacher's marks"* (Παπαβασιλείου, 2008: 153).

The main functions of the school counselor are expanded without being particularly specific in 2 years, such as collaborating with the directors, teachers and pupils in their area (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 214, Art. 2, 1984), help teachers to realize the deeper meaning of their mission (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 214, Art. 3, 1984), visit the schools of their jurisdiction at regular intervals and are informed by the directors and instructors about the educational project (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 214, Art. 4, 1984), while for the evaluation it is only mentioned that they participate in the teacher evaluation process, according to the provisions of the relevant provisions. Corresponding provisions are not issued for the next 8 years, when the interest is directed to other serious problems and especially to the modernization and democratization of the school.

3. Suspension of evaluation (1990s of the 20th Century)

At the beginning of the 1990s, Law 2043/92 on "Supervision and Administration of Primary and Secondary Education and Other Provisions" was adopted, according to which *"responsible for the evaluation of teachers are school counselors and school principals"* (Νόμος 2043, Art. 6, 6th subpar., 1992), as well as the Presidential Decree 320/1993 on "Evaluation of the work of teachers and educational staff in primary and secondary education", which defines a very simple process of self-evaluation of the school unit with an evaluation report and personal evaluation of each teacher at the end of each school year (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 320, Art. 2, 1993). Two evaluation reports are drawn up in accordance with the procedure, which, in addition to the descriptive part, also contains a numerical designation and is kept on the corresponding address (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 320, Art. 5, 1993), without any other consequences for the teacher. The school counselor evaluates the teacher's educational training and pedagogical-teaching capacity, while the school principal's assessment is formulated through their day-to-day collaboration and takes into account the service consistency, accountability and the development of initiatives by the teacher, as well as collaboration-communication with teachers, students and parents (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 320, Art. 4, 1993). Although the process is in fact really formal and no implications for teachers and school units are foreseen, the implementation of this proposal is suspended because of the trade unions' reactions.

Five years later, a further proposal by the Ministry of Education, which provides for the institutionalization of a series of new evaluation procedures and instruments, is being followed in order to examine the competence of teachers, the performance of school units and, more generally, the effectiveness of the system (Νόμος 2525, Art. 8, 3th subpar., 1997). The heads of the school units, the heads of offices, the school counselors and the newly established Bodies of Permanent Assessors are assigned various responsibilities, such as:

- The school principal prepares an evaluation report for the school unit, which he also runs for the school's teachers;
- The Head of the regional office of education and the Head of Office compose a report on how schools in their jurisdiction operate;
- The school counselor supports the scientific and educational work of the

teachers in his area of responsibility and draws up a valuable report on subjects related to the teacher's academic and didactic competence;

- The evaluation is carried out by the Body of Permanent Assessors, which undertakes the preparation of the evaluation questionnaires for each school unit, the evaluation of the education staff and the centers, units and services supporting the education and the elaboration of a relevant report, the checking of the accuracy upon completion of the questionnaires by students as well as the preparation of a general evaluation report.

This proposal is expanded in 1998 with the introduction of an annual school self-evaluation report drawn up by a five-member committee selected by the club, the evaluation of the school heads and the school headmasters by the school counselors (Υπουργείο Παιδείας, Art. 2, 1998), and the evaluation by the body of permanent assessors of school units, education staff and teachers (Υπουργείο Παιδείας, Art. 3, 1998).

The concept of evaluation of the educational work and the specific solutions to some issues in these two attempts have different content, with greater or lesser divergences, in the various legislative texts, but their common element is that for teachers the pay and administrative development is not directly related to the evaluation processes, not punishing, but more emphasis is put on the attempt to capture the overall picture of the education system. These models are very similar to each other and mainly because they have never been applied in practice.

4. Pilot self-assessment (first decade of the 21st century)

After two decades of efforts to implement a democratic and fair evaluation that satisfies all stakeholders, the interest of the Ministry of Education is more focused on the self-assessment of schools and attempts are made to test experimentally before its final implementation in practice.

4.1 *Pilot self-evaluation programs of the school unit*

Along with its legislative proposals, in 1997 the Ministry of Education started through its consultative structure, the Department of Evaluation of the Pedagogical Institute, at a research level a specific model of evaluation of the educational project, focusing on the collective internal evaluation or self-evaluation of the school unit. *“According to this, an evaluation system tailored to the country's educational data was set up. At the initiative of the European Commission and the supervision of a European consultative group, five Greek schools, in cooperation with 96 other European schools, are participating in a pilot self-evaluation program”* (Αντωνίου, 2017: 29).

Taking advantage of the experience above, there is a second experimental three-year internal evaluation program. The idea is mainly based on collective the self-evaluation processes of the school and, in a selective way, borrows and incorporates certain elements from other evaluation models and practices in order to:

- Ensure the scientific support of school-level factors performing self-assessment practices (Training – Indicative Procedures – Observatory);
- Enhance the systematicity of self-assessment procedures (Indicative Procedures – Quality Indicators);
- Ensure the acquisition of quantitative educational data (School Element Recording Software);
- Ensure the flow of information (both quantitative and qualitative) both between school units and to and from higher levels of educational research,

- educational administration and reception;
- Achieve “cross-checking” of the results of self-evaluation;
- Linking with the production of knowledge from wider assessment studies (Σολομών, 1999).

This project is an innovative step for Greece for its time but its realization remains only at a pilot level and ultimately leaves the impression that it is made more as a European project than to try out an idea that will lead to the creation of a workable model which takes into account the specificities of the country’s education system.

4.2 Assessment for the establishment of teachers

Efforts to adopt a workable and extensively viable evaluation system continued in 2002, but still a strictly hierarchical structure controlled by the central authority, since the regional education directors who assemble the competencies of the regional schools are appointed and dismissed by the Minister of Education. At the same time, the debate on self-evaluation begins, but under the supervision of school counselors and teacher evaluation is linked to the establishment, of a salary and grading improvement and it is mandatory and applies as a priority in the following cases (Νόμος 2986, Art. 5, 2002):

- the establishment of teachers and grading development;
- of the teachers concerned to be judged to fill positions of educational staff;
- of education staff;
- of teachers wishing to be evaluated; and
- any other case he/she deemed necessary.

In this case, a familiar scenario is again applied – the Ministry of Education creates once again a new law with a similar sound, which is not applied in practice again, except for formal post-graduation assessments for all teachers 2 years after their distribution as permanent teachers.

4.3 School self-evaluation – First-time evaluation

And we come up with the latest legislation of the beginning of the last decade, when self-evaluation of school units is being implemented. The procedure provides for (Νόμος 3848, Art. 32, 2010):

- Each school unit, by the end of September, to draw up an action plan with the educational objectives for the school year that is starting;
- At the end of each school year, the school unit prepares a report evaluating the performance of the school as a whole, the achievement of the educational objectives set out in the action plan and the successes, weaknesses and problems encountered during the school year;
- The same report sets out proposals for improvement for the next school year;
- The action plan and the evaluation report are communicated to the pupils and the parents’ club, published on the web pages of the school and the relevant education directorate and submitted to the Center for Educational Research.

It should be stressed that this self-assessment is a complementary form of the institutionalized teacher evaluation by the headmaster and the relevant school counselor, which has not been abolished. The intention of the Ministry of Education is to evaluate schools on the basis of specific sectoral indicators and criteria (quantitative and qualitative). These indicators were identified on the basis of the 16 indicators for the evaluation of school education proposed by the European Commission (Αντωνίου, 2017: 32).

This self-assessment is piloted in the school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 and is accompanied by strong reactions from the trade unions. The project is being implemented in 500 school units, which participate voluntarily despite the opposition of many factors.

In practice, the only evaluation carried out in Greek public schools is the self-assessment of school units during the year 2013-2014, which has ongoing support from the web service *Observatory of Self-Assessment of Educational Project* with educational material, application procedures, production of self- , dissemination of good practices, bibliography, and others (Εγκύκλιος 157723/Γ1/23-10-2013, 2013).

This self-assessment was based on the production and use of educational evidence by the teachers themselves. In the process of self-evaluation, evidence is taken of the teacher's portfolio and of the school unit's evidence (quantitative and qualitative data on the educational work provided). This assessment enables members of the school community to get an overall picture of the school situation. During the first stage of the implementation of the institution, emphasis is placed on issues directly related to the improvement of the quality of the educational project such as (Εγκύκλιος 190089/Γ1/10-12-2013, 2013):

- Creating, improving and updating the school's website;
- Forming or modernizing the school's internal regulations;
- Organizing the operation of the Teachers' Association and improving relations with the parent club and the student organizations.

Although it was applied for a school year with strong reactions and in many places with amateur behavior of the responsible ministry and the teachers, it is an innovative improvement project for Greek education and it leads to the effective start of the change of structures, processes and culture in the school unit, in recognizing the relative autonomy of schools, in increasing the degree of freedom of teachers in the implementation of their work, and in respecting the parents and students who are still far cut off from the educational process in public education in the country.

According to school reports, the implementation of school self-evaluation has had several positive results, including improving the pedagogical climate, awareness and active participation of pupils and teachers in the design and implementation of educational programs and innovative actions and enhancing in-school training. However, negative points such as increased workload have been noted, as some procedures in implementing the Action Plans had been particularly bureaucratic and time-consuming, as well as the lack of financial resources, equipment and tools to implement the Action Plans. Also, the schools reported that the negative intervention of the trade unionists resulted in the cautious attitude of many teachers towards the work of self-evaluation and their non-participation in the program (Αντωνίου, 2017: 33).

5. "Teacher's performance assessment unfinished" (2014-2015)

Then, in 2014, the application of the personal assessment of all teachers began according to 5 categories of criteria, see Table 1.

Table 1. Criteria for teacher assessment (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 14, 2013)

Category	Criteria
1. Educational environment	1.1. Dissociative relationships and expectations
	1.2. Pedagogical climate in the classroom
	1.3. Organization of the classroom

2. Design, programming and preparation of teaching	2.1. Degree of perception of the pupils' potential and needs for shaping the design of teaching
	2.2 Goals and content
	2.3. Teaching and educational tools
3. Executing teaching and student assessment	3.1. Preparing students for teaching
	3.2. Teaching and educational tools
	3.3. Student actions during the learning process
	3.4. Introducing new knowledge and student assessment
4. Service consistency and sufficiency	4.1. Formal obligations
	4.2. Participation in the operation of the school unit and its self-assessment
	4.3. Communication and collaboration with the parents and institutions
5. Scientific and professional development of the teacher	5.1. Typical qualifications and scientific development
	5.2. Professional development

School class teachers are assessed on the criteria of the administrative evaluation by the directors of their respective school units and the criteria of the educational assessment by their respective school counselors (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 4, 12th subpar., 2013).

A four-point descriptive scale is used for the evaluation. The inclusion of the evaluator at a scale of the descriptive scale implies his qualitative characterization as follows: “incomplete”, “sufficient”, “very good” or “excellent” (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 5, 1st subpar., 2013). Teachers classified as incomplete in more than one of the criteria in one of the categories are totally incomplete, irrespective of their overall grade (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 16, 4th subpar., 2013). Also, in each training course, a table of inadequacies is created, where they are marked as being totally incomplete and have no right to promotion for 2 years (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 16, 5th subpar., 2013).

The whole process provides pre-evaluation and post-evaluation meetings with the school counselor to prepare and give feedback to the teacher. The teacher is evaluated in four categories by the school counselor: educational environment, planning programming and preparation of teaching, conducting teaching and assessment of students and scientific and professional development of the teacher (see Table 1). The headmaster of the respective school unit is assessed in the category of service consistency and competence (see Table 1). It makes a particularly striking impression that teachers are limited in their opinion in the evaluation process, as far as they are concerned the self-assessment report and the individual dossier are intended to inform the evaluator more fully and do not bind him/her to his/her valuation judgment (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 17, 2013). Teacher evaluation is completed with evaluation reports. The evaluation report of each teacher is part of the staff of the register (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 19, 1st subpar., 2013). Once the evaluation has been determined and announced, a cumbersome bureaucratic procedure of protests is envisaged, which resembles many situations where the law reminds of dogmatic understandings of past times and regimes. Formally there is an opportunity evaluation of heads of staff by the existing ones, which is written, branded and optional. It is submitted to the immediate supervisor of the evaluator, who evaluates and uses evaluations at his discretion (Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152, Art. 24, 2013).

In general, this idea is a very serious change, in the opposite direction to the proposals of the past 20 years, mainly focused on postponing and delaying any teacher evaluation. In it, the evaluation is performed hierarchically from the highest levels of management in the education system to the regular teacher, following the famous cascade model and its short-term implementation over a large group of people. For the first time there is also a sense of the existence of school counselors who once again assume the role of inspectors with all the proven negative aspects of this position, as mentioned in paragraph 2, although the original idea of their functions is completely opposite. This return to discarded practices makes it possible for the relevant legal acts to be regarded as a kind of restoration. It should also be stressed that the measures are too strict, rather they fear the rated ones and give unlimited rights to the assessors, and at times create even the impression of revanchism. It seems somewhat arbitrary or dilettante to be taught for a few hours by directors and consultants, and then to delegate such great rights, with almost no responsibility, to solve such serious issues as the professional status and prospects for the development of their colleagues. Given the politicized and highly subjective selection of people for these posts, it can even be assumed that the law was designed to empower these teachers even more than the Minister of Education. It is also noteworthy that many activities are being redrawn in unnecessary detail, which can be expected to sharply increase the responsibilities of those employed in education in a very short period of time without the possibility of adaptation. The fact that every tradition of teacher assessment in the country at this stage is interrupted should not be forgotten so that it can be expected that its implementation would lead to a number of serious and justified objections, endless conflicts in all directions, serious manifestations of subjectivism mainly expressed in encouraging reckless teachers and underestimation and punishment of serious people in the personal preference of the evaluators and any kind of influence of various informal groups in the teaching environment or in society at large. In this sense, it is very important to consider what assessment such teacher assessment should receive.

As a guarantor of the quality of pedagogical work as well as the application of this method to the teacher's performance assessment, an independent and subordinate to the Ministry of Education institution is established under the name Authority for Quality Assurance in Primary and Secondary Education, which is expected to monitor, study and evaluate the implementation of the education policy in primary and secondary education as planned, evaluate the quality of the educational work of the school units and other decentralized departments of the Ministry of Education, supervise the evaluation processes of teachers, evaluate the evaluation systems of the teachers and identify weaknesses and ways to address them (Νόμος 4141, Art. 1, 2013).

The application of this model begins in the school year 2013-2014 with the training of education officers (Regional Managers, Education Directors, School Advisors, School Managers) on the Valuation Procedures to be implemented. In the summer of 2014 the evaluation for education executives, i.e. regional directors, heads of education, education managers and school counselors, was completed. This is followed by the evaluation of the head masters of secondary and primary schools, heads of nursery schools and multidisciplinary municipalities, as well as the heads of administrative departments, which never end and the results are not used anywhere. In practice, it can be said that once again, the evaluation has been proposed and not implemented, but this is in favor of education in the country this time.

6. “Self-assessment of school units on hold” (after 2015)

Currently, a two-year self-assessment of school organizations is expected to be implemented (I.E.Π., ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΤΗΡΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΕΕ), at the suggestion of the authorized Institute of Educational Policy according to the internal evaluation or self-assessment is the emergence of the school as the main body of planning and evaluating its educational project. In particular, the implementation of self-evaluation at school:

- It does not aim to control, but to improve the quality of the educational project;
- Identifies weaknesses, clarifies problems, creates conditions for initiatives and undertaking innovative actions, creates conditions for improvement of educational practices;
- Provides teachers with the opportunity to realize in a specific way the particular operating conditions of the school;
- It mobilizes all the factors in the educational community, strengthens the relationship of trust and reciprocity among them, promotes the change of school culture;
- Promotes cooperative attitudes, highlights positive educational activities, dissemination practices, disseminates good practices and points to areas for self-education and training;
- It cultivates co-responsibility and self-commitment as it involves teachers in jointly decided actions and binds them to their own plans;
- Supports the upgrading of teaching and pedagogical practices, the promotion of innovation and the development of supportive and offsetting practices;
- It enhances the better management and operation of school units as well as the effective utilization of human resources;
- Contributes to continuous feedback on the design of educational policy and the definition of training and other interventions.

In the first year, the assessment passes through 4 stages:

1. Determine the composition of the working groups, the indices on which they will work, see Table 2, and the chronograph for the remaining stages of the year;
2. The evidence available in the school for the formation of the overall image of each index (files, printed and electronic, correspondence, minutes, opinions – judgments of teachers, pupils, parents) is investigated. Each Working Group prepares a proposal for a General Assessment of each Indicator, submitted as a suggestion to the Plenary of the Teachers’ Association for the final evaluation of the image of the, and a quantitative score is made on a scale of 1 to 4;
3. The plenary session for the final evaluation of the indicators and the overall picture of the school. The needs of the school are hierarchy and the action plan to be implemented from the next school year is selected. The title of the action plan and the corresponding indicator are recorded in the school's annual report. The plenary session completes the general assessment process by defining the group that will be responsible for planning the action;
4. A General School Assessment Report is drawn up.

Table 2. Groups of indexes for evaluation of the school organization on the basis of the thematic framework for self-evaluation by the Institute for Educational Policy (I.E.Π., ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΤΗΡΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΕΕ)

Axis	Sectors
1. Means and resources	1.1: School space, logistical infrastructure and financial resources
	1.2: Staffing of the school
	2.1: Organizing and coordinating school life

2. Leadership and School Administration	2.2: Managing and exploiting means and resources
	2.3: Exploitation, support and development of human resources
3. Teaching and Learning	3.1: Development and implementation of teaching practices
	3.2: Development and implementation of pedagogical practices and student assessment practices
4. Climate and Relationship of the School	4.1: Relations between teacher-pupils and students
	4.2: Relations of the school with parents and collaborations with educational-social institutions
5. Improvement Actions	5.1: Educational programs and innovations, supportive and compensatory interventions
	5.2: Develop and implement action plans to improve educational work
6. Educational Outcomes	6.1: Studying and learning students
	6.2: Achievements and progress of students
	6.3: Individual and social development of pupils
7. School results	7.1: Achieving the objectives of the school

In the second year implementation of the action plans.

Although this model is the last one and should have taken into account the weaknesses of previous proposals, there are a number of serious weaknesses such as:

- When the Pedagogical Council is self-assessing and decides the future development of the school organization, prerequisites for creativity and autonomy are created within the fully centralized educational system of the country, which does not allow for such phenomena;
- It is noticeable that no intervention by any other institution or authority in any form such as monitoring, control, consultation, inspection, reporting, etc. is envisaged and this creates the feeling that this is a rather superficial and improvised procedure;
- The concept of quality is almost unclear, which would seriously hamper the work of a pedagogical council without giving specific guidance;
- At the end of each period produces as many reports as the number of schools in the country and the very handling of such a large amount of texts is more of a problem than it is useful to serve as a basis for feedback on planning central education policy and choosing the most appropriate changes accordingly.

As good countries can be noted the following:

- The two-year period also seems to be adequately chosen because it makes it often for the members of the Pedagogical Council to officially ask at the sessions the question of the direction the school is developing;
- The constant task of carrying out various activities could play a unifying role for the individual efforts in the working groups and the collective as a whole, thus further contributing to improving cooperation and communication between teachers, and so also to increase the sense of responsibility, empathy and personal commitment to improving the quality of the educational service offered.

7. Conclusions

Obviously, the situation is inconsistent with the recommendations of the European Institutions, pedagogical science, practice in most countries in Europe, North and South America and Australia, as well as public expectations of state education in the country. In conclusion, it should be stressed that it is necessary to provide answers to a number of questions as to which changes need to be made, which models, methods, criteria and procedures are best suited to the application of specific conditions, how the teacher assessment tool will be linked to the high expectations of such an activity and the mandatory objectivity at all levels and by all participants.

In our opinion, the mentality of the Greek society and, in particular, teachers is not ready to be subjected to a personal evaluation that will lead to an objective assessment, especially where several people individually or in a committee will decide in which direction each teacher will develop. It will be subjective, pre-planned and calculated according to the considerations and plans of individual people or groups, will be politicized, will cause a lot of damage and its benefits will be questionable. We recommend that the self-assessment of 2013-14, in which formalism is to a large extent overcome in contrast to the targeting model, has been improved and supplemented, and has proven in practice that the potential of Greek teachers can work to identify the weaknesses and improve the quality of the educational, a service offered by public schools in the country.

References

- Council (2004). “Education & training 2010”: The success of the Lisbon strategy hinges on urgent reforms. *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 104: 1-19.
- Debrenlieva-Koutsouki, A. (2017). Management problems in the alternative school in Greece. *Knowledge International Journal*, 20(2), 1059-1065.
- European Commission. (2018). *European Commission – Education and Training*. Retrived 18 March 2018, from Strategic framework – Education & Training 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework_en
- Αντωνίου, Μ. (2017). *Συγκριτική προσέγγιση και ανάλυση των συστημάτων αξιολόγησης του εκπαιδευτικού έργου και του εκπαιδευτικού προσωπικού της Ελλάδας και χωρών του εξωτερικού – Οι σύγχρονες τάσεις στον τομέα της εκπαιδευτικής αξιολόγησης*. Αιγάλεω: Ανώτατο Τεχνολογικό Εκπαιδευτικό Ίδρυμα Πειραιά.
- Δημητρόπουλος, Ε. (2010). *Εκπαιδευτική αξιολόγηση, μέρος πρώτο*. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη.
- Εγκύκλιος 157723/Γ1/23-10-2013. (2013). Αθήνα: Υπουργείο Παιδείας και Θρησκευμάτων.
- Εγκύκλιος 190089/Γ1/10-12-2013. (2013). Αθήνα: Υπουργείο Παιδείας και Θρησκευμάτων.
- Ζιάκα, Β. (2006). *Η αξιολόγηση του εκπαιδευτικού έργου και η συμβούλη της στη σχολική αποτελεσματικότητα*. Ρόδος: Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου – Διπλωματική Εργασία.
- Ι.Ε.Π., Ι. Ε. (n.d.). *ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΤΗΡΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΕΕ*. Retrieved 19 March 2018, from <http://aee.iep.edu.gr/>
- Ι.Ε.Π., Ι. Ε. (n.d.). *ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΤΗΡΙΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΕΕ*. Retrieved 21 March 2018, from ΤΟ ΠΛΑΙΣΙΟ ΑΞΙΟΛΟΓΗΣΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΤΙΚΟΥ ΕΡΓΟΥ: <http://aee.iep.edu.gr/about>
- Νόμος 1304 (1982). Αρ. Φύλλου Τεύχος Πρώτο 7 Δεκεμβρίου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 1227-1238.
- Νόμος 2043 (1992). Αρ. Φύλλου 79, Τεύχος Πρώτο 19 Μαΐου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 1581-1588.

- Νόμος 2525 (1997). Αρ. Φύλλου 188, Τεύχος Πρώτο 23 Σεπτεμβρίου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 6671-6677.
- Νόμος 2986 (2002). Αρ. Φύλλου 24, Τεύχος Πρώτο 13 Φεβρουαρίου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 231-242.
- Νόμος 3848 (2010). Αρ. Φύλλου 71, Τεύχος Πρώτο 19 Μαΐου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 1439-1470.
- Νόμος 4141 (2013). Αρ. Φύλλου 83, Τεύχος Πρώτο 9 Απριλίου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 1085-1096.
- Παπαβασιλείου, Χ. (2008). *Από τον επιθεωρητή στο σχολικό σύμβουλο – Ιστορικό-κοινωνική αναδρομή και η σημερινή πραγματικότητα*. Ρόδος: Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου – Διδακτορική Διατριβή.
- Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 152 (2013). Αρ. Φύλλου 240, Τεύχος Πρώτο 5 Νοεμβρίου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 4107-4132.
- Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 214 (1984). Αρ. Φύλλου 77, Τεύχος Πρώτο 29 Μαΐου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 839-840.
- Προεδρικό Διάταγμα 320 (1993). Αρ. Φύλλου 138, Τεύχος Πρώτο 25 Αυγούστου. *ΕΦΗΜΕΡΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ*, 3990-3994.
- Σολομών, Ι. Α. (1999). *Εσωτερική αξιολόγηση και προγραμματισμός του εκπαιδευτικού έργου στη σχολική μονάδα*. Αθήνα: Τμήμα Αξιολόγησης του Παιδαγωγικού Ινστιτούτου.
- Τσιουπλή, Ε. (2016). *Διερεύνηση απόψεων στελεχών της δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης σχετικά με την αξιολόγηση των εκπαιδευτικών σύμφωνα με το Π.Δ. 152/2013*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Πανεπιστήμιο Μακεδονίας – Διπλωματική Εργασία.
- Υπουργείο Παιδείας (1998). *Υ.Α. Δ2/1938/26-2-1998*. Αθήνα.
- Куцукис, Г. Т. (2015). *Инновационная школа полного дня в республике Греция*. В: *Сборник трудов конференции: Современные концепции и технологии творческого саморазвития личности в субъектно-ориентированном педагогическом образовании* (с. 99-101). Казань: Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет.
- Μιχοβα, Μ. (2014). *Образователна политика на европейския съюз – приоритети и проблеми*. Пловдив: Астата.

