

The Role All the Self-Evaluation of School Units in the Development of Autonomous and Revolving School

Karava Zacharoula

(Regional Centre of Educational Planning of Peloponnese, Greece)

Abstract: In this paper we will try to demonstrate the contribution of self-assessment of the school unit in the creation and development of the autonomous and renewed school. Terminology and culture that tend to be integrated into the Greek educational data but at the moment find strong resistance to acceptance in the culture of Greek teachers in order for them to accept the new reality that accompanies the requirements of our time, which needs direct educational modernization.

Key words: self-assessment, autonomous, renewable school, critical friend, participatory-distributed leadership, methods, school leader, school culture

1. Introduction

The self-evaluation of the school unit is the process of gathering information from teachers, students, parents, which is based on partnership and interaction and therefore contributes both to the improvement of the organization and the development of the people who participate in it (Theophilidis, 2014).

Admittedly, in recent years there has been a common trend in the assessment systems of most countries that focuses on unit assessment. That is, while in the past, teachers were evaluated on a non-individual basis, in recent years the evaluation focuses on the educational work produced by each school unit (Karatzia-Stavlioti, Lambropoulos, 2000d). This fact is not accidental, but a result of the change that exists in the philosophy of the modern, autonomous and self-improving school.

2. The Theoretical Basis of School Self-Assessment

The theoretical basis of school self-assessment is provided by Social and Organizational Psychology. Social Psychology is about the process and strategy by which change is sought. Organizational Psychology deals with individual members, developing four Theories, which are an essential part of the theoretical basis of school self-assessment.

The first is Theory Ψ “which interprets the behavior of members, the second is the Theory of the needs of the individual and their hierarchy, the third is the theory of gradual maturation of the individual in his work and, finally, the fourth Theory dealing with the data controlled by the service and the data concerning it” (Argyris, Schön, 1978).

Karava Zacharoula, Ph.D., Educational Coordinator, Regional Centre of Educational Planning of Peloponnese; research areas/interests: educational leadership and administration. E-mail: karavaxara@yahoo.gr.

According to the modern bibliography, a learning organization, such as the school, is one in which people are constantly expanding their ability to create the desired results, where new expanded models of thought enter, where collective ambition is left free and people are constantly learning how to learn together in the work itself and especially in its achievements and the recognition of which individuals receive within the framework of the mortal organism (Bakker, 2012).

3. What Is the Learning Organization

On the basis of this logic, the learning Organization is fundamentally different from the traditional ones where they focused mainly on individual learning and individual projection.

Today and in the future, the organizations that will really stand out are the ones that will discover how to attract people's dedication and their ability to learn at all levels (Cros, 1997).

The professional profile — teachers' skills, leadership models and management systems favor the development of a school-learning organization. Innovation, the collective vision and the cooperation of the members of the organization, the self-evaluation of the educational practices and actions are key characteristics for the learning and development of the organization. The model of transformational, distributed and leadership model for learning are also leadership models that are inextricably linked to the learning organization, while decentralized management systems favor and enhance its operation. In the Greek educational system, some of its characteristics refer to characteristics of the school as a learning organization.

According to the literature, the effectiveness of a school is not judged by the number of innovations it makes, but by the coherence of the program, the selectivity and the integration of the goals of these innovations. An effective school, according to Fullan (2001, pp. 4–5; 1999, p. 11), is not one that pursues the greatest number of innovations, but one that works with coherence and coherence of program and goals.

The Gather-Thurler and Perrenoud (1991), believe that the school can learn:

- a) when it recognizes that the power of a living system arises from its diversity and not from its uniformity. The school should allow and encourage broad-based sharing and evaluation of local experience.
- b) when it adopts procedures for solving its own problems, when it accepts the temporary and incomplete nature of curricula, teaching and structures, when it abandons the spirit of the system and the spirit of final reform, when it moves away from the regulations and “prescriptions” that come from the top of the hierarchy and follow his own needs and quests.
- c) when he accepts the limits of the child's knowledge and learning, when he recognizes the impasses and impossibilities of any pedagogical act, when he denies magical thinking, when he is freed from defense mechanisms and from superficial innovations and showcase works. The school, that is, learns when it is pragmatic and does not set utopian goals.
- d) when it acquires the right (to learn) and the means, when it is organized to formulate problems, to invent assumptions, to recognize alternatives, that is, when it has a method in terms of: communication between teachers, exposure to disagreements, evaluating the implementation of practices.

In order for the organism to learn, or in other words, in order to transform the collective patterns of interaction and function of the organism, it needs an imbalance, internal or external. This imbalance can result from an incompatibility between goals and their level of achievement, between challenges from the external environment and the organization's response. It can also come from transformations of the organization's own

economic or social environment. Or even, arise from internal crises or conflicts that are directly related to.

Moreover, the self-assessment and accountability of learning organizations is a serious point of criticism they have received, as they are related to control by stealth processes in teachers, which place particular emphasis on formal cognitive processes to the detriment of the informal. Relationships and social networks that build a strong sense of “belonging” to a professional community.

4. Objectives of Self-Evaluation and the Autonomous School

The goals preached by the modern, autonomous and self-improving school are briefly summarized and focused on:

- upgrading the school environment as a key learning factor, taking initiatives for areas in need of reform
- strengthening relationships reciprocity and trust between all actors in order to address the problems collectively and students and teachers to scientifically support their views, and claims (YPEPO, 2000)
- Strengthen and commit to joint decisions for promotion and optimal presentation of the educational work of the school units
- To make the teachers, involved in the evaluation, understand their role. In this way they will be able to realize their personal educational Theory (perceptions, beliefs, values that refer to the purposes of education, the way of learning, the roles of student and teacher, the discipline, the orientation of the curriculum, the phase of knowledge, etc.)
- To proceed jointly with all the actors of the school unit in the formulation of an action framework which, in a long-term perspective, will lead to the improvement of the learning achievements (Matthew, 2007).

All in all, as it can be seen from the above, the issue of self-evaluation of the school unit has to do with the participatory process and the direct involvement of all actors in the educational community, as it is commonly accepted by its most ardent critics that contributes to the self-improvement of school units, since as a methodological tool it has no recorded negative reviews (Andreou, Papakonstantinou, 2006).

On the other hand, it should be mentioned the difficulty of evaluating the quality of the educational work, which involves the risk of epidermal outbreak, as well as the issue of the acceptance of the evaluation by the teachers, who seek their evaluators primarily to have their own strictly evaluated.

It is, therefore, obvious that the planning of the program, the setting of goals through processes that stem from a collective effort and concern the whole year can determine the level that we want our educational system to have. At the same time, everyone is given the opportunity to know their potential to overcome their weaknesses but also to better understand their own role in the school unit (Saitis, 2002).

In this way, exploring the effectiveness of the school unit, we do not stop at measuring the parameters of school life and data collection, as we should not ignore the school culture, climate and conditions of the school, but also the professional development of the teacher (Pasiardis, 2004).

Through the evaluation processes, the teacher can change his/her attitude towards the evaluation itself, considering it the most necessary tool for his/her professional development (Darra, 2005). Through this treatment, the evaluation may be stopped in some way, that is, the evaluation creates frightening syndromes, especially for teachers who feel that their authority and professional status and competence are being shaken (Athanasoula-Reppa, 2008).

Mainly for this reason, the institutionalization of an evaluation system has so far met with the reaction of the educational world of our country, since it has been linked to enforcement, quota, availability and finally dismissal. The essential and honest dialogue that will be developed with all the stakeholders involved, the correct information that will be provided, the social and political consensus that will be gained in this project, will give value and emphasis to the desert that is to be implemented. Thus, teachers, principals, students and parents, following a series of systematic planning and implementation processes, will attempt as a final manifestation of their effort, to sketch her portrait (Mac-Beath, 2005), obtaining a clear picture of their daily educational reality.

For this to happen, however, the self-evaluation of the school unit must be based on the three evaluable components of its philosophical existence. More specifically, the first one stems from the need for accountability, the second, which is that of improvement, requires diagnosis, utilization of its results and feedback for improvement purposes, while the third component is that of professional development (Brand, 1998).

Referring especially to it, we can say that it encourages the search and allows tools, use different information and decide on ways to deal with the problems of crisis management that arise within them. "Thus, in combination, they acquire know-how and develop professionally" (Giles, Hargreaves, 2006).

At this point it is worth mentioning and emphasizing the key role that the principal of each school unit will play in the training of its teachers. In particular, the principal must give great importance to the continuous training of the teacher, because as the school curriculum is constantly evolving, a great effort must be made by the principal, so that the teacher acquires modern knowledge.

At school level, it should involve all teachers and develop communication and cooperation between them. In collaboration with the school counselor, to further encourage teachers' activities and strengthen their participation in the development of training programs. Utilize the Positions and opinions of all involved regarding the content and methodology of the training program, remaining the coordinator of the whole effort (O.E.C.D. ,1990).

There are three models of teacher training: the rational, the technical and the reflective. In the rational model, the principal proposes traditional type training, where the teacher is called to attend the programs of the Schools in the past and today private training programs or corresponding training programs of a Public body. In the technical model, he invites the school counselor to provide the education which consists of technical knowledge related to skills and abilities and to contribute to the professional competence of the teacher. Finally, in the reflective model, the principal must organize workshops for feedback, so that the teacher can adjust the lessons during the next school year (Theofilidis, 2012).

Therefore, the school leader with these practices will bring change and improvement to the school unit and the teaching staff and differentiation of the existing culture. School self-assessment is currently gaining increasing international attention. As self-assessment is supported, it seeks the development of the school unit and its emergence as a strong body of speech and action, in order to have a reason for existence and acceptance by the educational community, which treats it with caution and suspicion.

This is because it is closely linked to the individual evaluations of all parameters of the educational system as well as to the evaluation of teachers. It is linked to the training of staff in the way it develops and occupies leadership positions, in the way it recruits staff, in the adequacy of scientific knowledge it possesses and in its maturity (Coppeters, 2005). It is also directly related to the planning of the school unit and contributes to its upgrade. Useful conclusions are drawn, corrections are made, weaknesses and problems are highlighted and solutions are sought for the most rational and efficient operation of the unit.

The result of the evaluation process, apart from the self-control and the correction of the deviations, has the dynamics of defining an evaluation system of the whole educational system as well as a change of the central educational policy.

In effective schools, staff and students have clear goals that they put a lot of effort into achieving. The goals are high level, but achievable. Self-evaluation helps individuals to judge their effectiveness, to take measures that ensure their uniqueness and ultimately leads to self-improvement (Asimaki et al., 2011).

5. Conclusions

Our educational system, having characteristics of a centralism, often ignores the particular characteristics that each educational unit may have individually, ignoring the particularities and the culture that each school develops (Diamantis, 2011).

Acceptance of continuing education is almost universal. Improvement, supported by appropriate means, must be continuous and have a long-term horizon, in order to contribute to the change of teachers' "theories of action". Considering the teacher as a lifelong learner, it is necessary to take into account dimensions such as the importance of teachers' previous teaching experiences and the need to reflect on them, the "framing" of training in specific school environments and the formation of a culture of autonomous learning.

The basic education, the training and finally the professional development of the teacher aims at the upgrade and recognition of his professional identity. Autonomy in the exercise of the educational work and the continuous information and training, are basic elements that determine the profession of the teacher and central characteristics of his professional development (Gather-Thurler, 2000).

The evaluation of the educational project, together with the training of the teachers and the educational research, constitute the three mechanisms of feedback and improvement of the quality of the educational system. It is, therefore, a challenge for all of us who belong to the field of education, the introduction of the Institution of the evaluation of the educational work in the daily educational reality, which we owe in the context of our professionalism to accept and fight for its consolidation, so as its result to compensate the long struggle of tireless efforts of some daring, ideological and visionary persons.

So, through this feedback, teachers invest their energy in self-improvement, as the self-assessment of the school unit, which considers schools as autonomous, autonomous and renewable organizations, enables the school unit to face changes, plan and handle crises and problems (Hargreaves, 2003).

References

- Andreou Ap. And Papakonstantinou G. (1994). *Power and Organization-Administration of the Education System*, Athens: New Borders.
- Apple M. (1986). *Ideology and curricula*, translated by T. Darveris, Thessaloniki: Observer.
- Argyris C. and Schön D. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Reading: MA, Addison-Wesley.
- Athanasoula-Reppa A. (2008). *Educational Management and Organizational Behavior*, Greek. Athens.
- Bakker H. (2012). "Developmental education schools as learning organizations", in: B. van Oers (Ed.), *Developmental Education for Young Children, International Perspectives on Early Childhood Education and Development*, Amsterdam: Springer, p. 7.
- Coppieters P (2005). "Turning schools into learning organizations", *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 129–139.
- Darra M. (2005). "Conceptual views, ideological framework and institutional approaches to quality in education: A comparative study", doctoral thesis, P.T.D.E. National Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Hargreaves A. (2003). *Teaching in the Knowledge Science: Educated in the Insecurity*.

- Theofilidis Ch. (2012). *School Leadership and Administration: From Bureaucracy to Transformational Leadership*, ATHENS: Grigoris, pp. 179–180.
- Theofilidis Ch. (2014). *School Unit Self-Assessment*, ATHENS: Grigoris.
- Karatzia-Stavlioti E. and Lambropoulos Ch. (2006). *Evaluation, Effectiveness and Quality in Education*, Athens: Gutenberg.
- Matthew D. (2007). “Quality in education: Ideological determinants, concepts and policies — A comparative view”, *Review of Educational Streams*, Vol. 13, pp. 10–32.
- MacBeath J. (2005). “Self-assessment: It’s time for a great idea”, in: Bagakis G. (Ed.), *School Unit Evaluation*, ATHENS: Metaichmio.
- Mouzelis N. (June 29, 2003). “Why are reforms failing?”, *To Vima*, p. 7.
- Pasiardis P. (2004). *Educational Leadership*, Athens: Metaichmio.
- Papakonstantinou P. (2006). *Critical Pedagogical and Educational Practice*, Athens: Gutenberg.
- Saitis H. (2002). *Organization and Administration of Education*, Athens: Atrapos.
- ΥΠΕΠ Θ. (2000). *Introduction to the Evaluation of the Quality of the Educational Project: Basic Concepts and Assumptions*, Vol. A, Athens.
- Fullan M. (1995). “The school as a learning organization: Distant dreams”, *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 230–235.
- Gather-Thurler M. (2000). *Innovator au coeur des établissements scolaires*, Paris: ESF.
- Giles C. and Hargreaves A. (2006). “The sustainability of innovative schools as learning organizations and professional learning communities during standardized reform”, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 42, pp. 124–156.
- Asimaki A., Koustourakis G. and Kamarianos I. (2011). “Its concepts modernity and postmodernity and their relation to knowledge: A sociological approach”, *The Step of the Social Sciences*, Vol. IE, No. 60, pp. 99–120, accessed on 9/8/2014, available online at: <http://www.uth.gr/tovima/60/5.pdf>.
- Diamantis K. (2011). “School self-assessment: A critical approach”, *Positions*, Vol. 117, Oct-Dec., accessed on 24.11.2014, available online at: http://www.theseis.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1162&Itemid=29.
- Brand R. (1998). “Powerful learning”, ASCD, accessed on 10/8/2014, available online at: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/198179.aspx>.
- Centre pour la recherche et l’innovation dans l’enseignement - O.E.C.D. (1990). “Des enseignants pour l’école de demain”, accessed on 13/08/2013, available online at: <http://www.oecd.org/fr/edu/scolaire/1840213.pdf>.
- Cros F. (1997). “L’innovation en éducation et en formation”, *Revue française de pédagogie*, Vol. 118, pp. 127–156, accessed on 09/10/2014, available online at: http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/rfp_05567807_1997_num_118_1_1181.
- Gather-Thurler M. and Perrenoud Ph (1991). “L’école apprendisselles’endonne le droit, s’encroit capable et s’organise dans cesens!”, in: *Société Suisse de Recherche en Éducation (SSRE), L’institution scolaire est-elle capable d’apprendre?*, Lucerne, Zentralschweizerischer Beratungsdienst für Schulfragen, pp. 75–92, accessed on 18/8/2014, available online at: <http://www.unige.ch/fapse/SSE/teachers/gather-thurler/Textes/Textes%201991/MGT-1991-02.html>.