

The Views of Greek Educators on Evaluation Techniques: The Case of Model Experimental Schools

Anastasia Papadopoulou 

General Secretary of the Hellenic Society for Educational Evaluation, Secondary Education of Western Attica, Greece

Article Info

Keywords:

Evaluation
Evaluation Techniques
Interview
Portfolio
School Director
School Counselor

ABSTRACT

The term "evaluation of the educational work" and, respectively, of the teachers was established in our country during the post-colonial period. The following questions particularly concerned both the educational community and the state in general: "How are or should the results of the evaluation be used?", "Can all aspects of the work produced at the school unit level and the effects of teachers on their students be objectively measured and evaluated?", "How can the subjective element be reduced in the procedure of teacher evaluation?", "Is it possible to apply uniform evaluation criteria to schools that operate in heterogeneous socio-economic, cultural, or geographical environments?", "What is the role of the teachers and the Management of each school and school counselor as well as other actors of the school community (students, parents, other staff)?"

The answer to the above questions comes through the research carried out on 405 teachers in Greece and highlights various philosophical, political, and pedagogical dimensions concerning the purpose of Evaluation, the bodies, forms, techniques, and evaluation criteria.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Anastasia Papadopoulou
General Secretary of the Hellenic Society for Educational Evaluation, Secondary Education of Western Attica, Greece
Email: anastpapad@yahoo.gr

1. CLARIFICATION OF THE CONCEPT OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

The concept of educational Evaluation and work is intertwined with the teacher's Evaluation and his work, as many common elements run through these concepts. Mainly in the perception of the educational community, the concepts of teacher evaluation and Evaluation of the teacher's work are intertwined and inextricably linked. In the international arena, the term "evaluation of the work of teachers" is identified with the Evaluation of teachers [1]. Nevertheless, what is the Evaluation of teachers looking for? The answer stems from four data sources: a) the first source is the official position of the

state for the institution or school unit, b) the second source is the general duties of teachers, c) the third source is the job description and d) the last source is the particular needs of each school unit [2] in which the teacher serves.

The necessity of teacher evaluation is confirmed by the opinion of Stronge, who argues that the improvement of the school unit goes through teacher evaluation [3]. Completing the drawing sources, the OECD findings on teacher evaluation focused on five axes: the social work, the pedagogic-teaching work, the administrative-service work, the work of communication and collaboration with other teachers and with the broader community, with the aim of the promotion of the School as a community of learning and development and finally, the work of personal and professional development of the teacher [4], [5].

The whole discussion of teacher evaluation needs a more specific context [6], [7]. In teacher evaluation, Greece presents significant discrepancies compared to other developed countries. While at a theoretical level, there are works that emphasize the need to apply Evaluation in education, in practice, since the late 1970s, no systematic evaluation of the educational work has been carried out. The emphasis on Evaluation observed in other countries does not apply in the case of Greece. Mutually negating attempts have been made at the legislative level several times in recent years, some of which have also contained innovative features. None, however, was successful [8] as a fundamental principle of informing teachers about procedures and the criteria of their Evaluation and their consent to them was not respected [7].

2. TEACHER EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

2.1. File of Teacher's Achievements File (portfolio)

In education, the use of the personal file for the teacher began to be implemented during the 80s. Although the use of the teacher's file in the Anglo-Saxon world has a long tradition, in Greece, it is an innovative tool for professional development. The teacher's file (portfolio) is an evaluation tool as it allows the teacher to capture the complexity and uniqueness of the details of his teaching [9]. In many scientific fields, portfolios are used as tools for personal development. This tool is considered particularly important for self-feedback. In our case, this method plays a significant role in professional development through feedback and self-feedback. Portfolios are used in fields such as job search, professional development, education, etc. [10], [11].

The teacher's process of collecting information and data is characterized as selective, reflective, and collaborative [9], [12], [13]. The primary purpose of the personal file is to describe through the personal selection of elements by the teacher himself the degree of his effectiveness in demonstrating his achievements over time and in specific contexts [14]. Objectively, the portfolio should be structured around the teacher's professional and School goals [9]. Thus the school director, the school counselor, or both, as in the Evaluation of the teachers in the Model Experimental Schools, can have as accurate a picture as possible of the teacher's actions and participation in active school life. The teacher's file can be used in two ways, either as a technique of authentic Evaluation of the teacher's efficiency to be promoted or appointed, as in the case of teachers in Model

Experimental Schoolseither, and as a means of professional improvement and reflection process. In Greece, the term teacher's material file was adopted by the Center for Educational Research, chaired by M. Kassotakis, during the drafting guidelines for evaluating students [15].

The personal file as an alternative form of Evaluation of the teacher can differ from person to person depending on his personality and what he considers essential to include in his material. The portfolio composition may include lesson plans and student tests, observations from colleagues, and class photographs [12]. The file's content is never static, as it is a dynamic tool constantly changing. The primary purpose of the file is to describe through the personal selection of elements the development and improvement of the teacher. In general, we could distinguish two dominant perspectives regarding the conceptualization of the teacher's portfolio, the perspective that emphasizes formative Evaluation and the process and the perspective that emphasizes the results of the teacher's work [16], [17]. However, most researchers [13], [18] agree that a complete file of the teacher's achievements, with the most accurate descriptions, including his professional profile, the participation in examinations for his appointment, such as at the Supreme Council for Civil Personnel Selection, his report on aims and objectives, lesson plans, notes, tests given to students, certificates, diplomas that demonstrate the continuous effort to update knowledge, evaluations either by the School Director and school counselor or by colleagues, reflective essays in which they expose the problems they faced and how they can overcome them.

The Personal file is distinguished into two types: the file of teacher accountability and the file of teacher development. The first type of file is used as an evaluation tool for the promotion or appointment of a teacher, as in the case of the Evaluation of teachers in Model Experimental Schools, while the second type is used for the teacher's professional development [19]. Depending on the purpose of the Evaluation, evaluators should use the corresponding type of file [20].

Research by Deveci et al. [21] showed that potential teachers who were asked to create their files felt panic and lack of time but expressed that it was a significant experience for their professional development and educational profile. Darling's research [22] moves in the same direction and refers to the formative development of the file. Especially for potential teachers, it is preferred that it is an integral part of their evaluation process. The students of the pedagogic schools who were able to narrate their teaching experience produced excellent portfolios.

2.2. Observation Key

The most effective way to evaluate teaching is through observation. Observation of the teacher while teaching and the resulting learning outcome are usually the most objective evidence of a teacher's teaching [5]. Observation is an essential research tool. It is distinguished into three forms: self-observation, hetero-observation, and participatory observation. In self-observation, the subject that is being observed is also the observer. In hetero-observation, there is the observation of situations by an independent observer, and in participant observation, the researcher is involved with the subjects under investigation.

Hetero-observation is distinguished into random and systematic. In random/unstructured, the subject does not realize that he is being observed. In systematic/structured, the observation is controlled with tools (observation sheets, keys, and narrative reports for less structured observations). The teaching observation is usually done by school directors, school counselors, and fellow teachers (peer evaluation).

The observation sheet should include categories corresponding to the survey or evaluation purpose. Before formulating the observation key, it is necessary to determine issues such as the purpose and object of the research. There are teaching observation keys that are weighted and can be adapted to the needs of each research. Before each observation, conducting a pilot application of the key is considered appropriate to ensure validity. Ensure that observational categories are appropriate, adequately cover the topic, are distinctive, precise, and work effectively for research [23].

As already mentioned, there are weighted observation keys by Ben Harris, Borich's teaching observation lenses [24], Danielson's observation key [4], the teaching observation key which was developed for the training program of the potential teachers of Cyprus, teacher observation key which was proposed in the context of the Evaluation of the Educational Project. Examples of these can be found in the Evaluation of the Educational Project observatory.

There is a convergence in the essence of the categories that exist as axes in observation keys. The characteristics of effective teaching tend to be the learning climate, the classroom management, the course's clarity, teaching variety, project orientation, active student participation, evaluation-feedback, differentiation of teaching according to the needs of the students, and the cultivation of high mental functions. In the same context are included by Danielson the elements in the Evaluation of the teacher's teaching [4], [5] from which four axes derive: a. The lesson's planning and preparation include didactic and psycho-pedagogical knowledge (planning and preparation), b. The classroom climate includes classroom management by the teacher, the student's behavior, and the physical space in the classroom (the classroom environment), c. The guidance, which includes techniques of the teacher who gives feedback to the students, pushes the students to learn (instruction), d. Professional responsibility is reflected in the teaching and communication with the students and their families whenever there is a problem (professional responsibilities).

To record the findings from the observation keys, which can be done either during the observation or after it, techniques such as notes, documents in drawings and observation lists, recording and video recording, coding systems such as measurement systems, signals, events, graded scales, rubrics which provide the opportunity to record observed not only behaviors but also the degree to which these behaviors are manifested, can be used [19], [23], [25].

2.3. Interview

It is found that the interview as an evaluation technique is utilized as an "exchange of views between two or more people on a matter of common interest" [26]. The objectives for obtaining information through the interview are varied. The interview will be used by

the employer for the selection or promotion of the employee and will be used to evaluate a person, as in the case of the Evaluation of teachers in the Model Experimental Schools, to gather evidence or develop hypotheses or for opinion sampling [23].

Employee evaluation interviews vary from the standard interview. The interviewee has a particular context in which to operate and respond, up to the utterly informal interview where the interviewee can act freely. In Patton's typology [27], interviews are distinguished into informal interviews, interviews in which the interviewee has a guide/pilot, standardized open interviews, and closed interviews. In most countries, the teachers' interview is also carried out by a person in the School's management [5].

The guided discussion was the teachers' interview in the Model Experimental Schools for their Evaluation. There was a pilot with questions known to the teachers in advance. The advantage of these interviews is the creation of a good climate between the interviewee and the interviewer [23]. The disadvantage is that important issues can be overlooked through carelessness. The wording of the questions can result in significantly different responses, thereby reducing the comparability of responses [23].

Therefore the validity of interviews of all types seems to be a perennial problem. The reason for invalidity is a bias which they define as "a systematic or persistent tendency to make mistakes in the same direction, that is, to overstate or understate the true value of an attribute or person" [28]. The most practical way to increase the validity of interviews is to reduce bias. Bias can come from the interviewer's expectations and personality and misunderstandings between the interviewer and the interviewee. Both sides carry a "burden" of cultural, social, philosophical, and age, which increases bias.

One way to enhance the reliability of an interview is for the researcher to have a structured interview with the same structure, sequence of questions, and exact phrasing for each interviewee [29]. Each interviewer needs to understand the question in the same way because error and bias can often come from wording, typing, sequencing, and lack of training in how the interview works [29].

The lack of training in conducting a valid and reliable interview is an important issue, especially when this is one of the most critical areas in the Evaluation (in the case of the Evaluation of the teachers in the Model Experimental Schools, the interview constituted 1/4 of the total score). Therefore, the effective interviewer [26] must be knowledgeable about the subject he is requested to ask, be organized with a clear purpose and procedure, be evident in the use of questions formulation techniques, and be polite so that the interviewees who are evaluated not to receive an adverse climate, to be sensitive in order to actively empathize with what the respondents said, to be critical by formulating questions about the credibility of those he listens, to remember to refer to the interviewee's previous statements and point out possible contradictions and finally to be able to interpret.

Interpreting results and conclusions are also a problem in interviewing or, as it is called, "transcriber's selectivity" [26]. However detailed, the manuscripts of the interviews remain selective as they are interpretations of social events [23], [30].

2.4. Experimental Model Schools

On the 24th of May in 2011, Law 3966 (Government Gazette 118 A, 24-05-2011) was published in the Government Gazette with the title: "Institutional framework of the Model Experimental Schools, Establishment of the Institute of Educational Policy, Organization of the Institute of Computer Technology and Publications "DIOFANTOS" and other provisions." For the first time through law 3966/2011 with A. Diamantopoulou, as the Minister of Education, the terms "model" and "experimental" characterize a school unit. It is a new formation in the educational reality, the concept of the experimental model, which includes all the procedures and processes that existed both in the previous experimental and the older model. Law 3966/11 concerning the Model Experimental Schools, etc., was passed by an increased majority in the Parliament in the spring of 2011 and its implementation began immediately. The law was based on the following axes: educational excellence and creativity, experimentation, innovation, educational research and dissemination of good practices to the rest of the system, systematic evaluation of people (teachers and students), functions and structures, and innovations in the management of school units. This law regulates all issues related to the function of model experimental schools.

While until now, the Ministry of Education had the primary responsibility for the function of the experimental and model schools, through Law 3966 of 2011, the administrative bodies that will now have the responsibility are defined. At the national level, the management will be done by the Administrative Committee of Model Experimental Schools. At the school unit level, it will be done by the Scientific Supervisory Council, the director, the deputy director, and the teachers' association (law 3966/2011, article 39).

Law 3966/2011 (Government Gazette A 118) brings to Standard Experimental Schools four sections that were attempted through its implementation. The first section is about educational excellence and creativity. The second is experimentation, innovation, educational research, and the dissemination of good practices; the third is the systematic Evaluation of people-teachers and students-functions and structures. Furthermore, the fourth is innovations in the administration of school units. The structures, administration, and functions of Model Experimental Schools are described in articles 36-50 of Law 3966/2011.

3. THE RESEARCH

3.1. Research tool – questionnaire

The present research was based on primary data collected through a questionnaire. For the research, a structured questionnaire was exclusively created with a combination of closed- and open-ended questions through a literature review. According to several researchers, formulating the research's purpose determines the research type and the tools used [31]. Using a questionnaire as a means of collecting information was considered more effective for recording the perceptions of the teachers of the Model Experimental Schools concerning other data collection methods.

The questionnaire was mainly based on the literature review since the researcher made the relevant necessary changes so that it is suitable to respond to the purposes of the research. An attempt was made to design an increased number of closed-ended questions, which meet the needs of the research and could be answered quickly and easily without taking more than 15-20 minutes. Expressly, on the first page of the questionnaire, information is provided to the teacher who is asked to complete it and related to the necessity of the research, the type and number of questions, ensuring the confidentiality of the answers and other filling instructions. Apart from this introductory part of the questionnaire, the questionnaire consists of four parts:

Part I concerns elements that form the individual/demographic profile of the respondent, such as gender, qualifications, specialization, school level, years of service in Secondary education, years of service in Model Experimental Schools, and the evaluation period (questions A1 to A7). Part II includes questions asking teachers to express their views on the purpose and necessity of Evaluation and is entitled "Teachers' views on evaluation" (questions B1 to B2).

In Part III of the questionnaire, the questions that detect the views of the teachers of Model Experimental Schools on the applied process of their Evaluation are noticed (questions C1 to C14). Finally, Part IV, which we will capture in the present publication, includes open-ended questions that examine the teachers' proposals in Model Experimental Schools to improve the process (DA to DD questions).

The questionnaire is fully structured, with open-ended and closed-ended questions using mainly the five-point Likert scale and the ranking scale to express the extent of agreement or disagreement with a specific statement. For recording the questions, we tried to formulate them as clearly as possible to avoid difficulties in their content and to provide short questions.

3.2. Content analysis

The processing of the questions was carried out by content analysis. Content analysis is defined as "the multi-purpose research method specifically developed to investigate a wide range of problems, in the investigation of which the content of communication serves as a basis for concluding" [23]. In particular, qualitative content analysis is appropriate for analyzing qualitative data [32]. Content Analysis is, therefore, a standardized method that leads to the systematic coding of written and spoken discourse and therefore corresponds to the quantification of the answers to the open-ended questions of the research questionnaire.

First, the material under investigation was defined. In this particular case, the material is the answers which were obtained from the following four open-ended questions:

- a. Proposals for the Evaluation by the director,
 - b. Proposals for the Evaluation by the school counselor,
 - c. Proposals for the Evaluation through Interviews and
 - d. Proposals for the Evaluation with a personal file.
-

Then, the general theme was defined as the unit of data recording. The topic is mainly used in studies investigating values, attitudes, or opinions [33]. The material under investigation, after being sorted, was classified. Finally, the final system of categories and subcategories was established based on which the final reports are presented.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Suggestions for the Organization of the Personal File

The suggestions of the teachers regarding the evaluation criteria of the personal file include the following:

- a. the increase of points in actions related to their educational work
- b. the control of administrative support in the school unit
- c. the Evaluation of the teaching material developed by the teachers
- d. the redefinition of the award of points for innovative actions
- e. more accurate certification of innovative actions
- f. the Evaluation of the quality of scientific articles and books
- g. increasing the award of points for formal qualifications and checking their relevance to the subject
- h. the examination of the supporting documents attached in order to avoid the award of points of incorrect information or cases of fake degrees
- i. their concern regarding the high award of points of second-level training, which, however, is not accessible for all specialties.

Additional evaluation criteria are proposed:

- a. the inclusion of parents' and students' views through questionnaires and
- b. the production of teaching material and published teaching scripts.

Regarding the process of evaluating the personal file of teachers, it is proposed:

- a. the clarity of the criteria based on which the personal file is evaluated
 - b. taking care of the time requirements for preparing the personal file
 - c. the advance notification of the evaluation criteria
 - d. the retargeting of the criteria so that the process is not aimed at collecting certificates and attestations but at its substantial contribution
 - e. the need to connect the content of the file with the teaching and pedagogical competence of the teacher
 - f. the inclusion of a self-reflection report for each element submitted by the teacher, as well as its individual qualitative Evaluation.
 - g. the expansion of the elements that can be included in the personal file (literary work, involvement in the arts and sports, translations, book editing, voluntary actions, and social presence of the teacher)
 - h. the organization of training seminars for teachers regarding the use of digital tools and software for the organization of the portfolio
 - i. the need to abolish the existing electronic bureaucracy
 - j. the protection of teachers' data and
-

-
- k. the creation of a central database, which can be updated at specific periods and can also be automatically updated by the School.

Finally, regarding the award of points for the personal file, the teachers suggest:

- a. greater award of points in the overall evaluation process
- b. the reduction of points and
- c. the existence of points per School year.

4.2. Proposals for Evaluation by the director

The comments and suggestions of the teachers regarding the evaluation process by the director include:

- a. the current lack of objectivity in the implemented process
- b. the need to document the Evaluation in reports and official data
- c. the establishment of measurable objective elements
- d. the need to have more criteria in a more organized and defined way.
- e. the expansion of the evaluation scale to include additional elements
- f. the consolidation of the process in terms of consistency and honesty and not in customer-party relations
- g. the existence of universal objective criteria for all teachers of all schools
- h. avoiding the influence of personal relationships on the Evaluation (sympathy/empathy)
- i. the creation of a committee in which the manager will participate
- j. the existence of alternatives to the person conducting the assessment, such as the deputy director or the board of pedagogical responsibility
- k. the ability to reject the rating of the current manager and accept the rating of previous managers
- l. the existence of an evaluation by the students, the teachers' association, and the parents' and guardians' association, as well as by an external evaluator
- m. the advanced communication of the criteria and the evaluation form by the director to the teachers
- n. the Evaluation of the directors by the teachers' association
- o. the director's knowledge of the institutional and legal framework and
- p. the Evaluation of the Director with the same criteria.

Regarding the criteria according to which the director carries out the Evaluation of the teacher, the teachers point out:

- a. the need to evaluate the teacher as a total personality
- b. the inclusion of characteristics such as consistency, cooperation, camaraderie, and fulfilling of basic duties
- c. the investigation of participation in organizational processes, administrative work and
- d. the need to recognize current and recent evidence (e.g., qualifications) instead of old ones.

Through the teachers' responses, special references were also made regarding the necessity of the evaluation process by the director of the school unit. Expressly, it is stated that:

- a. The process should not exist as it creates a problem, or at least it should not be of particular importance
- b. on the one hand, the criteria are satisfied. On the other hand, the process is necessary and should continue to exist
- c. the Evaluation by the director as a process, beyond the fact that it is necessary, should acquire weighty importance
- d. The director is the person who experiences the teacher daily in the school unit, but also that in a relationship between the employee and the director, the latter evaluates the former in terms of specific formal obligations.

4.3. Suggestions for Evaluation by the School Counselor

The suggestions of the teachers regarding the Evaluation of the teachers by the School Counselor includes:

- a. the existence of two School Counselors during the Evaluation of teachers
- b. the unannounced attendance/observation of teachings
- c. the involvement of external observers, but also the involvement of students through the filling of an anonymous questionnaire
- d. the establishment of an evaluation association in which School Counselors will participate
- e. the timely notification of the evaluation criteria to the teachers
- f. communication and feedback between teachers and School Counselors
- g. the increase in evaluation sessions
- h. the adoption of formative Evaluation and
- i. the joint (educators-School Counsellors) planning of teaching practices, which will then be implemented and evaluated.

However, the teachers point out that the Evaluation by the School Counselor presupposes:

- a. evaluation of the School Counselor by the teachers to check their formal qualifications
- b. training in matters of Evaluation, psychology, and counseling of Counsellors
- c. investigation of the School Counselor's training and teaching experience
- d. existence of precise justification in the rating
- e. existence of a guidance and evaluation framework with objective, universal and measurable elements/criteria
- f. abolition of sample teachings
- g. extension of time for attending the course by the School Counselor
- h. relevance of his cognitive object to that of teachers
- i. acquaintance and cooperation of the School Counselor with the teachers
- j. the more frequent presence of the School Counselor in the school unit and especially in the school classroom throughout the school year
- k. disconnection of Evaluation from teachers' professional and salary development and its (re)targeting in the educational work.

In conclusion, the teachers submit their opinions regarding the procedure's necessity. Specifically, they state that:

- a. They were satisfied with both the process and the evaluation criteria, but also that
- b. The process must remain as it is because the Evaluation by the School Counselor is of great importance, the second most important in comparison with the Evaluation by the director.

4.4. Suggestions for the Evaluation through Interview

In conclusion, the teachers submitted opinions and suggestions for improvement regarding their Evaluation through an interview. Their opinions consist of their concerns, the conditions that must exist during the process, the necessity, and the award of the evaluation points.

The teachers' concerns refer to the following:

- a. the objectivity of the process and
- b. the targeting of the Evaluation.

According to the views of the teachers, the conditions for the implementation of the Evaluation through the interview are:

- a. the Evaluation of School Counselors
- b. the training of evaluators
- c. the relevance of the cognitive object between teachers and evaluators
- d. objectivity and
- e. the establishment of objective, universal and measurable criteria.

Teachers' suggestions regarding the Evaluation through the interview include:

- a. maintaining the anonymity of teachers and members of the evaluation committee
- b. random selection of assessors via software shortly before the interview
- c. lack of knowledge of the teacher's qualifications by the interview committee
- d. the necessity of having University Professors in a relevant specialty
- e. participation of School Counselors of the relevant subject, parents, but also teachers with experience in the teaching subject
- f. the involvement of a psychologist in order to investigate the mental state, but also the personality of the teacher
- g. formation of evaluation committees by specialty
- h. a standard level of education and subject knowledge between teachers and assessors
- i. the geographical discrepancy between assessors and assessees
- j. the focus of the Evaluation is on the educational profile, the pedagogical and teaching work
- k. emphasis on the personality of teachers and
- l. abolition of the standard procedural form of the procedure.

Regarding the necessity of the procedure, the teachers suggest:

- a. the abolition of the procedure due to the lack of solvency and purpose
 - b. its implementation in evaluations of managers and executives
 - c. its implementation to exclude cases of teachers who are unsuitable for socializing with students and
 - d. the continued implementation of the process.
-

Finally, regarding the award of points of the Evaluation through an interview, it is proposed:

- a. The reduction of award of points and
- b. Adopting a confirmatory function regarding the teacher's competence without additional award points.

5. CONCLUSION

Among the four procedures (portfolio evaluation, Evaluation by the director, Evaluation by the school counselor, Evaluation through interview) that were applied during the Evaluation of the teachers, the teachers of Model Experimental Schools while declaring satisfaction with the use of the personal portfolio and the Evaluation by the school counselor, however, there is not the same satisfaction with the evaluation procedures by the director and the interview committee. As they agree to a greater extent with the evaluation criteria of the first two procedures, it is concluded that teachers' agreement on the criteria shapes their subsequent satisfaction with each evaluation procedure. However, the teachers of Model Experimental Schools who were evaluated with the old evaluation regime (2012-2013) perceive the Evaluation by the School Counselor as more important, in contrast to the teachers who were evaluated in 2013-2014, who emphasized the Evaluation with a committee interview. This finding is linked to the outstanding difference between the two procedures, as those evaluated in 2013-2014 did not have an evaluation by the school counselor and the director.

Regarding the proposals of the teachers in the Model Experimental Schools for conducting the Evaluation through an interview, it was found that particular emphasis was placed on the dimension of objectivity, which has been an element of reflection in the Evaluation [28]. In order to achieve the desired reliability, the training of the evaluators, the establishment of objective, universal and measurable criteria, and the preservation of the anonymity of the teachers and the members of the evaluation committee are proposed. In addition, the random selection of evaluators via software shortly before the interview, the geographical discrepancy between evaluators and evaluated people, and the prior lack of knowledge of the teacher's points by the interview committee can be ways of ensuring the solvency of the overall process.

According to the teachers' opinions in the Model Experimental Schools, a necessary condition for conducting the Evaluation is the relevance of both the cognitive object and the level of service between teachers and evaluators. After all, as Kvale [26] points out that the effective interviewer, among other things, must be knowledgeable about the subject he is asked to evaluate.

Concerning the process and the interview committee, the teachers of Model Experimental Schools suggest having academics, school counselors of a related subject, and parents and teachers with excellent teaching experience. At the same time, the formation of multiple committees per specialty is proposed, a proposal highlighted by the research of Geladaki & Trimis, as well as the assistance of a psychologist to investigate the mental state and personality of the teacher, as they very emphatically point out. From the above, the proposal of utilizing the interview results as a suitable method for evaluating the

comprehensive education's executives and checking the teachers' suitability. Therefore, it must function as a confirmation of the teaching competence of the teacher, either with a limited degree of points or without additional points.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. J. Shinkfield and D. L. Stufflebeam, *Teacher Evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 1996.
- [2] M. Scriven, "Teacher Selection," in *The new handbook of teacher Evaluation Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*, J. Millman and L. Darling- Hammond, Eds. California: Corwin press, INC, 1990, p. 76.
- [3] J. H. Stronge, "Improving Schools Through Teacher Evaluation," in *Evaluating Teaching A Guide to Current Thinking and Best Practise*, J. H. Stronge, Ed. California: Corwin Press, Inc, 1997, p. 1.
- [4] C. Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), 2007.
- [5] OECD, *Education at a Glance 2013*. OECD, 2013.
- [6] W. A. Firestone, "Teacher Evaluation Policy and Conflicting Theories of Motivation," *Educ. Res.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 100–107, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.3102/0013189X14521864.
- [7] P. D. Tucker and K. P. Kindred, "Legal Considerations in Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems," in *Evaluating Teaching, A Guide to Current Thinking and Best practice*, J. H. Stronge, Ed. California: Corwin Press, INC, 1997, p. 85.
- [8] M. Kassotakis, *Evaluation of school units and teachers of primary and secondary education*. Athens: Grigoris, 2018.
- [9] K. Wolf, C. Lichtenstein, and C. Stevenson, "Portfolios in Teacher Evaluation," in *Evaluating Teaching, A Guide to current thinking and Best Practice*, J. Stronge, Ed. California: Corwin Press, INC, 1997, p. 198.
- [10] C. Mosely, "The value of professional teaching portfolios to prospective employers: School administrators' views," *Prof. Educ.*, vol. 27, no. 1–2, pp. 58–72, 2005.
- [11] S. Tas and L. Cengizhan, "Teacher portfolios are on stage for professional development: A qualitative case study," *Sos. Bilim. Araştırma Derg.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–14, 2016, [Online]. Available: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ssrj/240518>.
- [12] J. I. Gelfer, Y. Xu, and P. G. Perkins, "Developing Portfolios to Evaluate Teacher Performance in Early Childhood Education," *Early Child. Educ. J.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 127–132, Oct. 2004, doi: 10.1007/s10643-004-1079-3.
- [13] T. Bird, "The schoolteacher's portfolio: an essay on possibilities," in *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Assessing Elementary and Secondary Schoolteachers*, J. Millman and L. Darling, Eds. California: Corwin press, INC, 1990, pp. 241–256.
- [14] M. Scriven, "A unified theory approach to teacher evaluation," *Stud. Educ. Eval.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 111–129, Jan. 1995, doi: 10.1016/0191-491X(95)00009-J.
- [15] M. Kassotakis, "Career Counselling and Guidance in Greece," in *Career Guidance and Livelihood Planning across the Mediterranean*, 2017, pp. 303–322.
- [16] X. Mai, "The Application of Formative Evaluation Strategies in College English Classroom from the Perspective of Teacher Questioning," *Open J. Mod. Linguist.*, vol. 11, no. 06, pp. 873–882, 2021, doi: 10.4236/ojml.2021.116067.
- [17] K. Schildkamp, F. M. van der Kleij, M. C. Heitink, W. B. Kippers, and B. P. Veldkamp, "Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 103, p. 101602, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602.
- [18] R. Barnett, *New relationships between research scholarship and teaching*. New York, NY: The society for research into higher education & Open University Press, 2005.
- [19] J. H. Stronge and P. D. Tucker, *Handbook On Teacher Evaluation: Assessing And Improving Performance*. Eye On Education, 2003.
- [20] OECD, *Education at a Glance 2014*. OECD, 2014.
- [21] H. Deveci, A. F. Ersoy, and A. Ersoy, "The Views of Prospective Elementary School Teachers on the Use of Portfolio Assessment in Teacher Education," *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egit. Bilim.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 193–199, 2006.
- [22] L. Darling-Hammond, A. Amrein-Beardsley, E. Haertel, and J. Rothstein, "Evaluating Teacher Evaluation," *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 93, no. 6, pp. 8–15, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1177/003172171209300603.
- [23] L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison, *Educational research methodology*. Athens: Metaichmio, 2008.
- [24] G. D. Borich, *Effective Teaching Methods: Research Based Practice*. Austin: University of Texas, 2007.
- [25] K. Marshall, *Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: How to Work Smart, Build Collaboration, and Close the Achievement Gap*, 2nd ed. Jossey-Bass, 2013.
- [26] S. Kvale, "Dominance Through Interviews and Dialogues," *Qual. Inq.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 480–500, Jun. 2006, doi: 10.1177/1077800406286235.
- [27] M. Patton, *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage Publications, 1990.
- [28] B. J. Lansing, G. Ginsburg, and K. Braaten, *An Investigation of Response Error*. Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 1961.
- [29] D. Silverman, *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: SAGE

- Publications, 1993.
- [30] P. Anastasia and B. Antonios, "Teachers' Appraisal in Model Experimental Schools," vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 349–360, 2022, doi: 10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/05.12.2022/003.
- [31] J. H. McMillan and S. Schumacher, *Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction*. New Jersey: Longman, 2001.
- [32] P. Mayring, "Qualitative Content Analysis," *Forum Qual. Sozialforsch. / Forum Qual. Soc. Res.*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2000, doi: 10.17169/fqs-1.2.1089.
- [33] N. Kyriazi, *Sociological research: Critical Evaluation of Methods and Techniques*. Athens: Pedio, 2011.
-